SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

,	
United States of America Vs.	JUDGMENT IN A CRIMINAL CASE (Incarceration)
ERIC FOREMAN DOB:09/18/1993	Case No. <u>2010 CF1 017920</u> PDID No. <u>617414</u> DCDC No.
THE DEFENDANT HAVING BEEN FOUND O	GUILTY ON THE FOLLOWING COUNT(S) AS INDICATED BELOW: <u>Charge</u>
 Jury Trial Guilty 	Attempted Robbery While Armed(Pistol) Poss Firearm During Crime of Violence Felony Murder While Armed Drive-by or Random Shooting While Committing or Attempting to Commit a Robbery(Pistol) Poss Firearm During Crime of Violence Murder I While Armed Drive-by or Random Shooting While Committing or
	Attempting to Commit a Robbery(Pistol)
<u>SI</u>	ENTENCE OF THE COURT
Count 1: Attempted Robbery While Armed(year(s) supervised release., \$100.00 VVCA, V	(Pistol) Sentenced to 72 month(s) incarceration, 60 month(s) mandatory minimum, 3 VCA Due Date 12/14/2059
Count 2: Poss Firearm During Crime of Vio year(s) supervised release, \$100.00 VVCA, VV	lence Sentenced to 72 month(s) incarceration, 60 month(s) mandatory minimum, 3 //CA Due Date 12/14/2059
	e-by or Random Shooting While Committing or Attempting to Commit a nearceration, 360 month(s) mandatory minimum, 5 year(s) supervised release, \$100.00
Count 4: Poss Firearm During Crime of Viol year(s) supervised release, \$100.00 VVCA, VV	lence Sentenced to 72 month(s) incarceration, 60 month(s) mandatory minimum, 3 I/CA Due Date 12/14/2059
Count 5: Murder I While Armed Drive-by o	r Random Shooting While Committing or Attempting to Commit a acarceration, 360 month(s) mandatory minimum, 5 year(s) supervised release, \$100.00
504 MONTHS . MANDAT	the custody of the Attorney General to be incarcerated for a total term of ORY MINIMUM term of 480 MONTHS applies.
	efendant shall be on supervised release for a term of: 5 YEARS nendations to the Bureau of Prisons/Department of Corrections:
5	
Advised of right to file a Motion to Suspen	been paid. Appeal rights given Gun Offender Registry Order Issued
Restitution is part of the sentence and judg	
12/14/2012 Date	ROBERT E MORIN
Certification by Clerk pursuant to Crimina	Case: 2010 CF1 017920 Judge
12/14/2012 Date	David Phillips Deputy Clark
Received by DUSM: Ma H 16364 B	Deputy Clerk sadge#: 4977 Signature: Date: 12-14-12 Time: 4.15
Printed Name	

CASE NUMBER: 2010 CF1 017920 (Additional Charges Page)
DEFENDANT: ERIC FOREMAN

JUDGMENT IN CRIMINAL CASE (CONT'D)

Count	Court Finding		<u>Charge</u>
6	Jury Trial Guilty		Poss Firearm During Crime of Violence
7	Jury Trial Guilty		Carry Pistol W/O Lic -Outside Home/Business
8	Jury Trial Guilty		Possession of Unregistered Firearm/Unlawful Possession of a Firearm or
		***	Destructive Device
9	Jury Trial Guilty		Unlawful Poss Ammunition

Count 6: Poss Firearm During Crime of Violence Sentenced to 72 month(s) Incarceration, 60 month(s) mandatory minimum, 3 year(s) supervised release, \$100.00 VVCA, VVCA due date 12/14/2059

Count 7: Carry Pistol W/O Lic -Outside Home/Business Sentenced to 60 month(s) Incarceration, 60 month(s) mandatory minimum, year(s) supervised release, \$100.00 VVCA, VVCA due date 12/14/2059

Count 8: Possession of Unregistered Firearm/Unlawful Possession of a Firearm or Destructive Device Sentenced to 12 month(s) Incarceration, \$50.00 VVCA, VVCA due date 12/14/2059

Count 9: Unlawful Poss Ammunition Sentenced to 12 month(s) Incarceration, \$50.00 VVCA, VVCA due date 12/14/2059

Counts 1, 2, and 5 to run consecutively to each other; remaining counts to run concurrently with each other and Count 5. All periods of supervised release to run concurrently with each other. VVCC costs to be paid from prison funds; outstanding VVCC costs to be paid as a condition of supervised release.



SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MINAL DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

٧.

2010 CFI 019720

2012 DEC 13 P 2: 22

ERIC FOREMAN

Defendant

Sentencing 12/14/12 J. Morin

FILED

SENTENCING MEMORANDUM

Defendant submits this memorandum to assist this Court in imposing a just sentence¹. Defendant requests that this Court impose no more than the statutorily required minimum sentence for first degree murder; 30 years, with all other sentences imposed to run concurrent to that sentence. Defendant recognizes that this is the most lenient sentence the court could impose in this case but given all the factors defendant suggests this would be a just sentence.

The PSR² accurately gives a sense of defendant's background. His father abandoned defendant when the parents separated; Eric was 8 or 9 at the time. His father refused to play any role in defendant's life. His mother has never been employed, having been raised by a grandmother who threw her out of the house because she was pregnant at 17. For a brief time defendant's mother became romantically involved with Eric Walker who assumed some parenting role for defendant and his siblings. Unfortunately Mr.

¹The defendant recognizes that he has been found guilty and the court must impose sentence based on those convictions. Nonetheless the defense maintains that defendant did not commit the offense at issue.

²Defendant denies several of the representations contained in the PSR, particularly that he had \$3,000 on his person from drug proceeds on the night the instant offense occurred. It is not anticipated these factual discrepancies will effect the court's imposition of sentence.

Walker was the apparent victim of a random murder when defendant was 13. His mother provided little guidance or support for Eric. She relied on public assistance leaving Eric to hustle in the streets to help support her and the family since the age of 12 or 13.

Most significant is the fact that Eric was diagnosed as being bipolar with ADHD when he was a young child. Despite those severe disorders, both of which are amenable to medication and treatment, he received none. Eric unfortunately appears to be the classic example of someone who ends up in the criminal justice system because he suffers from mental health diseases that were never addressed. Although the defendant must be punished for the offenses of conviction, in assessing what punishment needs to be imposed it should not be ignored that defendant probably is where he is because of the neglect he suffered. Had he received even the most basic of mental health treatment, routine medication, along with any parental guidance or stability he likely would not be where he is today. He self medicated using primarily alcohol since approximately 13.

Eric was 16 and heavily intoxicated when the instant offense occurred. It was clearly not a calculated crime from which the defendant sought any benefit. It was the impulsive act of an intoxicated teenager suffering from unaddressed mental illness and rage provoked by the murder of his best friend, prior murder of his stepfather along with a lifetime of neglect. His young age, along with the concurrent lack of mature judgment, aggravated by unaddressed mental health disease as well as lack of any meaningful guidance and support should be mitigating factors in determining how harsh a sanction to impose.

As the prosecution points out the defendant is no stranger to the criminal justice system. What is noteworthy though is that despite the length of the defendant's record the

His record consists of adjudications for misdemeanor destruction of property, 2 simple assaults, false fire alarm, Possession of CDS and attempted robbery. Although lengthy the record does not indicate an intractable proclivity to violence. Given the defendant's age and apparent lack of propensity towards violence the need to protect society by locking up the defendant for the rest of his life, essentially what the prosecution is requesting, is unwarranted.

Defendant recognizes the points made in the prosecutions sentencing memorandum that the instant case warrants severe punishment. This was a senseless random murder. The victim did nothing to contribute to his demise. The court is required to impose a minimum sentence of 30 years in this case. It is hard to imagine that anyone would characterize that sentence as anything other than severe, particularly when applied to a teenager. Mr. Foreman is now 18 years old. When the instant offense was committed he was 16. What the prosecution seems to ignore is that if the court imposes the minimum sentence the defendant will be in his latter 40s when eligible for release. At that age, particularly after 30 years of incarceration, hopefully with the benefit of many years of rehabilitative programs that will be provided in the federal correctional system, defendant will be a different person than the person who committed the instant offense at 16.

It is generally accepted that with age and maturity most offenders become less likely to be involved in violence. The defendant displays none of the sociopathic tendencies that indicate he would be an exception. Given the defendant's moderate criminal past coupled with maturity it is fairly safe to assume a low probability that defendant will be involved in similar conduct upon release. The prosecution argues that

society needs to be protected from the defendant notwithstanding the lack of significant violent or criminal conduct in his past. It is respectfully suggested that protecting society by incarcerating the defendant until he is in his late forties is sufficient. It would be overkill and needlessly vindictive to incarcerate him for essentially the rest of his life as the prosecution requests. If the court imposes the minimum sentence, when released in his late 40s the defendant will be on strict supervised release with whatever conditions the court and probation department impose³. If the defendant starts to stray towards resumed criminal conduct there is a strong likelihood it would be addressed or he would be revoked prior to committing any violent or serious crime.

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, as well as any others that may arise at the sentencing hearing, defendant requests that the Court impose the minimum sentence of thirty years for murder one and impose all other sentences to run concurrent to that sentence.

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan Zucker, # 384629

1350 Connecticut Av. NW

Suite 202

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 624-0784

Counsel for Defendant

Certificate of Service

I certify that a copy of the foregoing has been served by email attachment to AUSA Stephen Gripkey on December 13, 2012. Paper copies will be served by hand on December 14, 2012.

Jonathan Zucker

³Defendant does not oppose any of the suggested conditions in the intervention plan suggested in the PSR.