

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

BRADLEY R. FREEMAN,

Petitioner,

v.

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,

Respondent.

**On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the
Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico**

**APPENDIX TO THE
BRIEF IN OPPOSITION**

HECTOR H. BALDERAS
Attorney General

MARIS VEIDEMANIS
Assistant Attorney General

LAUREN JOSEPH WOLONGEVICZ
Assistant Attorney General
Counsel of Record

Office of the Attorney General
201 Third Street N.W., Ste 300
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102
lwolongevicz@nmag.gov
(505) 717-3562

Counsel for Respondent

February 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Exhibit A – Transcript of March 8, 2019 hearing1a

STATE OF NEW MEXICO
COUNTY OF OTERO
TWELFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

No. D-1215-CR-2017-00217

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,

Plaintiff,

vs.

BRADLEY R. FREEMAN,

Defendant.

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

MARCH 8, 2019

THE HONORABLE JAMES WAYLON COUNTS PRESIDING

A P P E A R A N C E S

FOR THE PLAINTIFFS:

James Andrew Dickens, Esq.
State of New Mexico Deputy District Attorney

FOR THE DEFENDANT:

Michael A. Tighe, Esq.

P R O C E E D I N G S

1

2

3

4

5

THE COURT: Next cause to come before the Court is in Otero County Cause No. CR-2017-217, Division Two, State of New Mexico, Plaintiff, versus Bradley Freeman, Defendant.

6

7

8

State appears through Deputy District Attorney James Dickens. Defendant appears in person, together with counsel, Michael Tighe.

9

10

The matter before the Court is Defendant's Motion to Withdraw a Plea which was filed on October the 19th, 2018.

11

Mr. Tighe?

12

13

14

MR. TIGHE: Yes, your Honor. As the Court is aware, we, as Public Defender's Office, filed these Motions to Withdraw Pleas --

15

16

17

THE COURT: Start with your -- let's -- let's start with the jurisdictional question. Do I have jurisdiction to hear this?

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. TIGHE: Yes, your Honor, because it's -- it -- in particular, because Mr. Freeman is still on probation for this particular offense that he pled to, which would mean that it still falls under your jurisdiction to hear motions such as this. And then pending the outcome of this Motion, that would be grounds for jurisdiction in maybe the Court of Appeals or et cetera. But as far as right now, you do have jurisdiction

1 to hear such a motion as this.

2 I don't know if the State is going to contradict that,
3 but --.

4 THE COURT: Well, if that's all you got, that's all
5 you got. Okay. Go ahead.

6 MR. TIGHE: All right. So, your Honor, we filed these
7 Motions in regards to the Giglio material that was released
8 regarding Joshua Marchand and the practices that he utilized
9 when obtaining evidence and building cases against defendants,
10 and in this particular case, Mr. Freeman.

11 And newly-discovered evidence is grounds for a
12 potential new trial, or for a Defendant to withdraw a plea.
13 And in regards to that -- in particular, that's State v. Sosa,
14 123 N.M. 564, and I'm looking at Paragraph 16, which goes
15 through six factors, which discusses grounds for a new trial.
16 And this ties into the plea itself.

17 And the Court has jurisdiction to permit withdraws of
18 guilty pleas. And there is cases on that, such as State v.
19 Ramirez, which was determining whether or not the Court can
20 allow withdraw of plea -- and that's 149 N.M. 698. And I
21 believe that addresses your other question, your Honor, about
22 jurisdiction, because there is case law that addresses
23 situations such as this.

24 So, New Mexico case law, however, is silent in regards
25 to Giglio material -- Giglio material being new evidence,

1 grounds for a new trial, and potential withdraw of plea. But
2 Federal Courts have addressed issues such as this.

3 In regards to U.S. v. Calderon, that's 829 F.3d 84,
4 and that's out of the First Circuit, and that case was decided
5 in 2016. And newly -- newly-discovered evidence involves
6 impeachment withheld in violation of Giglio versus the United
7 States, which is 405 U.S. 150, and that was a 1972 case. And
8 the Court in -- the Federal Courts then analyzed, there's a
9 more defendant-friendly standard applies to the prejudice
10 inquiry encompassed by the third and fourth prongs, and they
11 cite to U.S. v. Calderon, and a defendant must establish only
12 to a reasonable probability of a different outcome if the
13 government had disclosed the evidence prior to trial, or in
14 this particular case, prior to the plea.

15 And State v. Sosa talks about granting a motion for a
16 new trial, because again, New Mexico case law is silent as
17 regards to newly-discovered evidence and withdrawal of plea.

18 But it will probably -- the first factor, it will
19 probably change the result of the trial. And I -- and I say
20 to the Court, this newly-discovered evidence in the Giglio
21 material that was disclosed to us would absolutely potentially
22 change the outcome of the case for Mr. Freeman. And I think
23 that speaks in itself inherently through the thirty *nolle*
24 *prosequis* that were filed by the State, because there was some
25 serious issues with the way that evidence was collected. There

1 was some serious issues in regards to potential entrapment
2 defenses. So, it's not just merely impeachment purposes that
3 we're talking about here in regards to Giglio.

4 Two, the -- the discovery had been since after-the-
5 fact of trial, or in this particular case, after plea.

6 Three, it could not have been discovered with due
7 diligence, and it couldn't -- not from Defense. It was
8 disclosed by the State, as we cited in our Motion in August of
9 2018, and Mr. Freeman pled to this case back in October.

10 And four, that it is material, and it absolutely would
11 be material in this particular case.

12 It's -- five, not merely cumulative.

13 And six, it must not be merely impeaching or
14 contradictory.

15 And again, as I addressed earlier, this isn't merely
16 for impeachment purposes. There are some serious issues that
17 we discovered through the Giglio material that was disclosed
18 through the State on how Joshua Marchand entrapped many of his
19 suspects and -- which ended up being our clients. Serious
20 issues regarding evidentiary matters and -- and -- and the
21 handling of that evidence, and drugs and the narcotics. And
22 some serious issues with standard operating procedures in the
23 Narcotics Enforcement Unit with the Sheriff's Office.

24 So, with that in mind, your Honor, and I -- and it's
25 going to be undisputed that there is Giglio material that was

1 disclosed in all the Joshua Marchand cases, and it's going to
2 be undisputed that it resulted in thirty -- thirty,
3 approximately, *nolle prosequis* from the State after they
4 disclosed the Giglio material of Joshua Marchand.

5 So, I do believe that we meet all the elements
6 that -- that's stated in State v. Sosa, and U.S. v. Calderon,
7 and -- and also State v. Ramirez, because it all ties together
8 that there's grounds for -- under the Sosa factors, for a new
9 trial, but that also ties in to whether or not Mr. Freeman's
10 plea was knowing, because the -- the three factors in regards
11 to a plea needs to be knowing, voluntary and intelligent. And
12 this plays into whether or not Mr. Freeman's plea was knowing
13 and intelligently made.

14 And knowing -- not knowing at the time of his plea
15 all the Giglio material that was disclosed and the -- the
16 mishandling of Joshua Marchand cases, it -- it greatly affects
17 whether or not Mr. Freeman knowingly pled to these charges, and
18 he didn't know all the particular defenses that we could have
19 brought at trial when and if we contested this. But this newly-
20 discovered evidence changes the face of everything in regards
21 to Mr. Freeman.

22 So, with that, your Honor, we're asking the Court to
23 permit Mr. Freeman to withdraw his guilty plea and reset this
24 for a new trial, or on a trial docket, and -- because I do
25 believe that Mr. Freeman was greatly prejudiced by entering

1 into a plea prior to the disclosure of this new evidence in
2 this Giglio material.

3 So, therefore, your Honor, I would ask you to grant
4 Defense's Motion to Withdraw Plea.

5 THE COURT: Does the fact that the Defendant entered
6 a guilty plea as opposed to a no-contest change anything? I
7 mean, he's saying that he's actually guilty and he established
8 a factual basis for that as opposed to merely saying, I think
9 the State can prove their case?

10 MR. TIGHE: Your Honor, I don't think that changes
11 anything in regards to whether it's a no-contest or guilty plea,
12 because guilty plea in regards to whether or not there was a
13 transfer of some controlled substances, but there are some
14 serious issues regarding potential entrapment defenses that
15 could have been raised, and also the evidentiary matters
16 regarding handling of evidence.

17 THE COURT: Would your client be privy to the
18 entrapment issues?

19 MR. TIGHE: Well, your -- would he be privy to
20 entrapment issues?

21 THE COURT: I mean, wouldn't he -- you know, I mean,
22 wouldn't he, during the course of the -- the transaction, you
23 know, I mean that -- you know, that he -- that -- that -- that
24 the -- you know, that -- that the -- the undercover agent or
25 the C.I. or whatever he was at that point, you know, somehow

1 entrapped your client? Would -- I mean, wouldn't -- wouldn't
2 your client be -- have -- have some information on that?

3 MR. TIGHE: Now, I can't speak to anything regarding
4 that, because Ms. Gerads was Mr. Freeman's attorney at the time.
5 And so, I am here on the Motion itself -- the Motion to Withdraw
6 Plea. So, I don't know the discussions that Mr. Freeman and
7 Ms. Gerads had with each other.

8 But yes, of course, they would have -- it would be
9 logical that they would discuss matters like this in potential
10 defenses. However, also to take into consideration that many
11 people enter into pleas because they are favorable pleas. And
12 in this particular case, Mr. Freeman was originally granted a
13 deferred sentence and supervised --

14 THE COURT: Well, Conditional Discharge.

15 MR. TIGHE: A Conditional Discharge. Yes, your Honor.
16 And with that, there's pros and cons and balancing tests that
17 need to be weighed, because jury trials in themselves are always
18 unpredictable. We can never predict an outcome of a trial in
19 front of a jury of twelve peers. And sometimes the -- the risk
20 and cost benefit analysis, it is more beneficial to take a plea
21 which guarantees a Conditional Discharge and probation, rather
22 than risk the potential exposure one could face if found guilty
23 at trial, and then potentially sentenced to a number of years
24 in the Department of Corrections.

25 And that is, unfortunately, always things that are

1 taken into consideration where people enter into pleas. And
2 in this particular case, part of the plea was that a guilty
3 plea would be entered. That was part of the Plea and
4 Disposition Agreement, that it would be a guilty plea. And
5 that is something that Mr. Freeman accepted and weighing
6 the -- the -- the risks and benefit analysis of it. But in
7 regards to that, your Honor, I -- I think that addresses your
8 question.

9 So, with that, your Honor -- with all the
10 consideration of the new evidence that was disclosed after Mr.
11 Freeman entered his plea, again, that affects whether or not
12 that plea was knowing and intelligently made, in particular
13 because after the Giglio material was disclosed, it bolstered
14 some potential defenses that we have and will have at trial in
15 regards to Joshua Marchand and the way that he handled cases,
16 and everything else that I've already cited.

17 So, with that, your Honor, I do believe that we meet
18 the factors that his plea was not knowing or intelligently made.
19 We're not disputing whether or not it was voluntary. But then
20 in regards to the six prongs that is stated in State v. Sosa,
21 and the six factors to be weighed, I do believe that we meet
22 every single factor as discussed in State v. Sosa, because,
23 again, New Mexico case law is silent in regards to withdrawal
24 of plea based on Giglio material that is disclosed, but it
25 still has the same effect and the -- the weight in regards to

1 the knowing, voluntary, and intelligent nature of the plea
2 itself.

3 So, I would ask the Court to grant the Defense's
4 Motion to allow the withdrawal of plea.

5 THE COURT: Mr. Dickens?

6 MR. DICKENS: Your Honor, going, I think, to the
7 Court's first question, which was jurisdiction, I think that
8 the Court does have jurisdiction because we're under A,
9 withdrawal of plea. Defense's Motion to sort of intermingle
10 this with a idea of a new trial is wrong for two reasons.

11 One, I think we're -- we're out of the time for the
12 new trial. That has been -- been long since -- the Court's
13 lost jurisdiction on a motion for retrial. But also, your
14 Honor, there was not a first trial. You get a motion for a new
15 trial if you had that first trial. Defense never did that
16 first trial; therefore, there is no basis for a quote/unquote
17 new trial.

18 So, we're strictly under an idea of motion to
19 withdraw. So, looking at State v. Hunter, which is a 2006 New
20 Mexico Supreme Court 043. This is the case which sort of does
21 away with the old idea that there is two standards. There is
22 a change of plea -- I mean, a withdrawal of plea standard for
23 pre-sentence, and a withdrawal of plea standard for post-
24 sentence.

25 The Court in Hunter is very clear. Paragraph Eleven,

1 when it states: "A motion to withdraw a plea is addressed in
2 the sound discretion of the trial court, and we review the
3 trial court's denial of such a motion only for abuse of
4 discretion. A court abuses its discretion when it is shown to
5 have acted unfairly, arbitrarily, or committed manifest error.
6 A denial of a motion to withdraw a plea constitutes manifest
7 error when the undisputed facts establish that the plea was not
8 knowingly and voluntarily given."

9 So, that's the only issue at this point is, has the
10 Defense shown that this is not a plea that was knowing and
11 voluntarily given.

12 With that, first off, I'd like to simply applaud Mr.
13 Sugg on his decision to go public on these issues with Mr.
14 Marchand. I think he acted very much above-board in getting
15 that disclosed. That information was not withheld from the
16 Defense in any way. When it was finally made public, he -- he
17 made it public in a very -- very dramatic fashion.

18 So, there's no issues here, as the Defense is citing
19 to the Federal case on Sosa, of Giglio material that was
20 withheld by the State. No Giglio material was withheld by the
21 State. The State made it public to the Public Defender's Office
22 in all those cases.

23 I have agreed on one case to withdraw -- allow a
24 defendant to withdraw her plea. That is Brooke Bathun. And
25 the reason I did that was because before she entered a Plea

1 Agreement, she did a Motion to Suppress the evidence due to
2 entrapment. She discussed that with Mr. Walker and made that
3 clear to Mr. Walker, and he filed the Motion. And the Motion
4 was heard by Judge Schneider. Judge Schneider at that time
5 denied the Motion. Obviously later, we discovered more
6 information. It became clear that there might have been
7 something to that Motion, and therefore, I allowed her to
8 withdraw.

9 When we look at the history of this particular case,
10 we see no such indication the Defense ever put that forward.
11 And I know that Ms. Gerads is no longer with the Public
12 Defender's Office, but we've also heard nothing today from the
13 Defense indicating that that was discussed with Ms. Gerads.

14 Instead, what we see in this particular case is, it
15 was charged in May of 2017. We have Notice of Noncompliance
16 for Drug Use in June of '17. We have Notice of Noncompliance
17 in August of '17. We have a Bench Warrant for failure to appear
18 in September of '17. We have the Plea then in January of 2018.
19 Two months later, in March of 2018, we have the probation
20 violation. Bench Warrant for failure to appear on that
21 particular probation violation. A guilty plea proceeding as
22 to the probation violation, October '18. And only after all
23 of that, do we have the Defense filing this Motion to
24 Withdraw.

25 In the Motion itself, filed by Ms. Gerads, the

1 attorney who would be in the best position to know what -- what
2 was discussed, besides, of course, the Defendant, there's no
3 mention that he raises issue with Ms. Gerads beforehand. There
4 is no mention of, this was a viable entrapment defense-type
5 case. That this was something that was known and discussed
6 with her. And so, I think this is simply a generic motion by
7 the LOPD that they filed in all of Mr. Marchand's cases, asking
8 to withdraw, based on really no evidence that in fact Mr.
9 Marchand ever entrapped their clients.

10 So, when we look at the standard that we have in the
11 Hunter decision, we have a defendant who discussed this matter
12 with his attorney, no -- no indication that she did not make
13 herself available to discuss the matter in full, including
14 possible defenses. The issues with Mr. Marchand were raised
15 much earlier, such as through Ms. Bathun's case, through Mr.
16 Walker.

17 And I'd also point out that we know that this was not
18 information had by the State at the initiation of this case
19 because Mr. Tighe himself was a prosecutor at the initiation
20 of this case. So, if we -- if the State was withholding this
21 information way back then, I'm certain that Mr. Tighe would
22 have told his client well in advance that in fact the State had
23 that information. The State withheld no Giglio information.

24 Even today when Mr. Tighe talks about the discussions
25 that the client had with Ms. Gerads, he talks about a risk

1 benefit analysis. As soon as we get into making a risk benefit
2 analysis, is it more beneficial to take the plea as opposed to
3 taking the risk that the Court will deny the Motion to Suppress,
4 then we're into the world of a knowing, voluntary plea.

5 The standard of a Strickland knowing, voluntary plea,
6 the standard of a effective counsel, is not one where we have
7 to be perfect, not one where the attorneys have to know
8 everything that's possibly going to come down the road in the
9 future -- simply that the attorney exercises due diligence.
10 And that's what we have here when they start talking about a
11 risk benefit analysis.

12 So, when we're not in the world of a new trial, we're
13 in the world of complete Court discretion -- we're looking at
14 knowing, voluntary plea. There's been nothing presented by the
15 Defense here today that there was not a knowing, voluntary plea
16 by the Defendant, and we're asking the Court to deny the Motion.
17 Thank you.

18 THE COURT: Mr. Tighe?

19 MR. TIGHE: I would disagree that there has been
20 nothing that has been presented here today in regards to whether
21 or not Mr. Freeman's plea was knowing, voluntary and
22 intelligent. And the case in point is the Giglio material that
23 is undisputed that was disclosed after Mr. Freeman made his
24 plea.

25 And -- and I'm not disputing -- I'm not -- I'm not

1 stating that Giglio material was held. That is part of the
2 reason why I am making an argument under a new trial analysis,
3 because that is where New Mexico case law has addressed issues
4 such as this. And the issue that has been addressed by motions
5 for new trials is the newly-discovered evidence, and that is
6 the six-prong factor that I have listed out for the Court in
7 State v. Sosa.

8 So, that is why -- I'm not stating that Giglio
9 material was held. There is newly-discovered evidence. And I
10 cited to the Federal law, which is persuasive, but the Federal
11 law agrees that Giglio material that was not disclosed or not
12 discovered in this particular case prior to a plea or -- or --
13 or trial, is newly-discovered evidence that warrants an
14 analysis. And that is what I'm asking the Court, is that there
15 should be an analysis here, and weighing the totality of the
16 circumstances of whether or not Mr. Freeman's plea was knowing,
17 voluntary and intelligent.

18 Now, I can't speak for Ms. Gerads' trial strategy
19 or -- or her reasons for not raising certain particular
20 defenses, but when I review a case such as this, I would put
21 in a notice of potential entrapment, because I would -- I would
22 utilize something like that at trial. Because I can proffer
23 to the Court that if Mr. Freeman took the stand here today, he
24 would readily admit that he was a drug addict, that he used
25 drugs with Joshua Marchand. He was never predisposed to sell

1 drugs until Joshua Marchand entrapped him and -- and made him
2 exchange controlled substances with Joshua Marchand. And that
3 is an entrapment defense, your Honor.

4 So, I can't speak for Ms. Gerads. I can only speak
5 for myself, and this case is now assigned to me. I would have
6 raised that at trial. I would have put in notice of it at
7 trial.

8 But again, it is -- it's a cost and benefit analysis
9 in regards to why people take certain pleas. And in this
10 particular case, there was a very favorable plea -- a
11 Conditional Discharge, supervised probation, with the risk that
12 could be taken to trial.

13 So, again, this is new evidence. And I'm not saying
14 the State was withholding evidence. There was an investigation
15 that was occurring for an extended period of time. But this
16 new evidence that is discovered warrants an analysis of whether
17 or not Mr. Freeman's plea was knowing, voluntary and
18 intelligent.

19 And it -- I purport to the Court that it was not. It
20 was not a knowing plea because of all these issues that the
21 State now readily admits were issues with Joshua Marchand that
22 we could have utilized at trial, and would have been
23 uncontested, and would have bolstered a defense such as
24 entrapment.

25 So, this isn't just for impeachment purposes. Yes,

1 Giglio material is for impeachment purposes, but also, this
2 would affect our defense at trial. And not knowing that that
3 evidence -- this newly-discovered evidence was out there or --
4 or was being formulated, alters this -- the situation for Mr.
5 Freeman.

6 So, I -- I would ask again to grant this Motion to
7 allow a withdrawal of plea. And one thing I just want to state
8 again, because I don't think I fleshed it out, is regards to
9 this newly-discovered evidence. And there should be a -- an
10 analysis on -- on the prejudice that it causes Mr. Freeman as
11 well. Because of this evidence that was not yet formulated --
12 it was not yet disclosed -- it wasn't being withheld -- I'm not
13 saying it was being withheld, but this newly-discovered
14 evidence greatly prejudices Mr. Freeman and -- and his analysis
15 on whether or not this was a knowing plea -- a knowing and
16 intelligent plea.

17 So, I do believe that if there is a prejudice
18 analysis, that should occur here as well. But I would ask the
19 Court again to grant our Motion.

20 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

21 What I just heard you say is that your client would
22 be -- you know, as an offer of proof, I guess, is your client
23 would say that he used drugs with Marchand, and that he was a
24 user, and not inclined to sell drugs, but for Marchand getting
25 him to do so.

1 He knew that before he decided to take the plea. He
2 knew -- presumably -- I mean, he presumably knew that he used
3 drugs with Marchand. He presumably knew that he chose to --
4 you know, that he didn't -- you know, he wasn't inclined to
5 sell drugs, but for the urging of Marchand, and -- and -- and
6 certainly, it was known at the time that he took the plea that
7 Marchand was the undercover and -- and the source of these
8 charges. And so, I find that his -- his plea is knowing and
9 voluntary.

10 One -- one -- you know, our system is -- is -- is far
11 from perfect. And there's a lot of issues with -- with plea
12 bargaining, and -- and I think the plea bargaining is -- is --
13 is -- is viewed with some substantial amount of suspicion in
14 the system. I mean, it's -- it's a necessary evil to keep
15 things moving.

16 If we go to trial on every case, we'd never get to
17 trial on anything. I mean, even as it is, you know, and -- and
18 trying to efficiently utilize our -- our trial dates available
19 and -- and -- you know, it's still -- you know, there's a --
20 there's a severe backlog of trials, and that's even in light
21 of the fact that people take plea bargains.

22 But the fact that the Defendant is presented with an
23 offer that is -- is on its face beneficial, and but for the
24 fact the Defendant couldn't live up to the terms of his
25 probation, you know, would have been highly beneficial to him,

1 it is -- that's part and parcel of -- of a plea bargain.

2 And -- and so, I don't find that -- you know, the
3 State dismissed a bunch of cases because once it became public
4 that -- that Marchand was engaged in inappropriate activities,
5 then he became so credibility-challenged, even if in an
6 individual case, he was not -- there was nothing improper, you
7 know, the -- the general public perception of his credibility
8 issues, you know, would -- would -- would make it difficult for
9 the State to -- to -- to obtain a conviction based upon his
10 testimony.

11 That's a cost benefit analysis the State does. I
12 mean, they -- they could have said, no, we're hanging tough.
13 We're going to trial on every one of these cases and maybe the
14 jury will think that this guy is a bad actor and -- and -- and
15 you know, conducted his undercover improperly, or maybe the
16 judge will find that he conducted it improperly, but you know,
17 there may be some certain percentage of the cases where the
18 judge is -- you know, the judge doesn't find improper actions
19 in this case, and -- and -- and the jury find that in this
20 case, they're convinced beyond a reasonable doubt of the
21 defendant's guilt. Nevertheless, you know, the State chose
22 to -- to let a certain percentage of those cases go.

23 But if you're telling me the Defendant is prepared to
24 testify that he used drugs with Marchand and that he would not
25 have been inclined to sell them, I mean, that was also -- and

1 the fact that you, as a new counsel coming in, would --
2 would -- would say, "Oh, well, I would have raised the issue,"
3 it -- it may well be that -- that -- that -- that Ms. Gerads
4 was prepared to raise the issue, but, you know, then you're
5 presented with a beneficial plea, and that's not -- that doesn't
6 mean you're not -- it's not knowing or voluntary. That just
7 means that you choose -- you choose Option A over Option B.
8 And we're not going to undo everything that happens simply
9 because a defendant has chosen Option A over Option B.

10 The Court finds that there is nothing presented to
11 the Court today that indicates that his plea was not knowing,
12 voluntary and intelligent, and there is no reason to set it
13 aside, and the Motion is denied.

14 MR. DICKENS: I'll prepare the Order. Thank you.

15 THE COURT: Prepare the order, Mr. Dickens. Court is
16 in recess.

17 (WHEREUPON, the proceedings stood
18 in recess.)

19
20 * * * * *

21

22

23

24

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the March 8, 2019 Motion to Withdraw Plea Hearing, in the matter of *State of New Mexico v. Bradley Freeman*, as the same was transcribed by me and to the best of my ability from an audio recording provided by the New Mexico Attorney General's Office.

I further certify that I am neither an attorney nor counsel for, nor related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action, and that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, or financially interested in the action.

Dated this 20th day of November, 2020.

Krisann Y. Quintana

THE PARALEGAL GROUP, LLC
20 Faith Road, Santa Fe, New Mexico
87506 (505) 514-9303

Email: kris@paralegalgroupnm.com
www.paralegalgroupnm.com