

APPENDIX



SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS

SUPREME COURT BUILDING
200 East Capitol Avenue
SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS 62701-1721
(217) 782-2035

FIRST DISTRICT OFFICE
160 North LaSalle Street, 20th Floor
Chicago, IL 60601-3103
(312) 793-1332
TDD: (312) 793-6185

January 25, 2023

In re: People State of Illinois, respondent, v. Derrick D. Hayes,
petitioner. Leave to appeal, Appellate Court, Fourth District.
129071

The Supreme Court today DENIED the Petition for Leave to Appeal in the above entitled cause.

The mandate of this Court will issue to the Appellate Court on 03/01/2023.

Very truly yours,

Cynthia A. Grant

Clerk of the Supreme Court

Appendix-d

2022 IL App (4th) 210409

NO. 4-21-0409

IN THE APPELLATE COURT

OF ILLINOIS

FOURTH DISTRICT

FILED
October 6, 2022
Carla Bender
4th District Appellate
Court, IL

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,)	Appeal from the
Plaintiff-Appellee,)	Circuit Court of
v.)	Sangamon County
DEREK D. HAYES,)	No. 17CF635
Defendant-Appellant.)	
)	Honorable
)	Raylene Grischow,
)	Judge Presiding.

JUSTICE DeARMOND delivered the judgment of the court, with opinion.
Justices Harris and Steigmann concurred in the judgment and opinion.

OPINION

¶ 1 In February 2021, a jury found defendant, Derek D. Hayes, guilty of first degree murder (720 ILCS 5/9-1(a)(1) (West 2016)), finding he personally discharged the firearm resulting in the death of Sheena Malone, aggravated discharge of a firearm (720 ILCS 5/24-1.2(a)(2) (West 2016)), and aggravated unlawful use of a weapon (720 ILCS 5/24-1.6(a)(1), (a)(3)(A-5) (West 2016)). The trial court sentenced defendant to an aggregate sentence of 55 years' imprisonment.

¶ 2 On appeal, defendant argues (1) he received ineffective assistance of counsel where counsel pursued a theory of second degree murder by provocation at trial and (2) the trial court erred in denying his requested jury instruction for second degree murder. We disagree and affirm.

¶ 3 I. BACKGROUND

(Appendix - A)

¶ 4 On May 30, 2017, a vehicle stopped at the traffic light at the corner of 1st Street and Ash Street in Springfield, Illinois. Attendees of a barbeque at the house of Sanatra Sullivan heard sounds like fireworks, and witnesses saw a man leaning out the window of the vehicle with a gun in hand. A bullet struck and killed Malone.

¶ 5 A grand jury indicted defendant with one count of felony murder (720 ILCS 5/9-1(a)(3) (West 2016)) (count I), two counts of aggravated discharge of a firearm (720 ILCS 5/24-1.2(a)(2) (West 2016)) (counts II and III), and one count of aggravated unlawful use of a weapon (720 ILCS 5/24-1.6(a)(1), (a)(3)(A-5) (West 2016)) (count IV).

¶ 6 A. Pretrial Motions

¶ 7 In March 2019, the State filed a motion to add two additional charges of first degree murder, adding alternative theories of first degree murder. After a hearing, the court allowed the State to add the two additional counts of first degree murder under the intentional murder theory (720 ILCS 5/9-1(a)(1) (West 2016)) (count V) and the knowing murder theory (720 ILCS 5/9-1(a)(2) (West 2016)) (count VI). The State subsequently presented the charges to a grand jury, who returned true bills of indictment on the two additional charges of first degree murder.

¶ 8 In January 2020, defendant filed a motion *in limine* to present evidence of collateral crimes. According to defendant, on August 25, 2016, defendant was in the Handy Pantry located at Spring Street and Cook Street. He exited the store with a bottle of liquor and noticed his car and brother were missing. An unknown individual struck defendant in the head with a gun. Defendant received treatment for a laceration to his head as a result of the attack, which left a scar. Police did not apprehend anyone in relation to the assault. The State offered no objection, and the trial court allowed defendant's motion *in limine*. Subsequently, during a final

pretrial hearing in February 2021, the State inquired about any defense intent to submit lesser included or lesser mitigated offense instructions—like second degree murder. Defense counsel refused to say, arguing “trials are dynamic” and noting the distinction between required disclosure of affirmative defenses and the possible tendering of lesser included offenses that might become relevant as the trial progressed.

¶ 9 In November 2020, the State and defendant filed a joint motion to dismiss count I, which the trial court granted.

¶ 10 On February 16, 2021, the State filed an amended exhibit list, listing the exhibits it intended to admit during trial. Included in the list was the “Recorded Interview of Defendant.” They previously filed additional discovery on February 11, listing “One CD Hayes Interview Exhibit; Transcript—Consecutively numbered pages 1-42.”

¶ 11 B. Jury Trial

¶ 12 On February 22, 2021, defendant’s jury trial began. During opening arguments, defense counsel laid out the case as follows:

“Now, ladies and gentlemen, you might be taken aback to hear this from me, [defendant’s] advocate, but [defendant] did in fact shoot and kill Sheena Malone just as the State just told you they would prove. This trial is not some kind of whodunit. We’re not going to ask you to solve a crime.”

Counsel informed the jury its role was to “explain to you why [defendant] did just that.” Counsel named Mylas Donald as defendant’s intended target and acknowledged defendant’s accidental shooting of Malone did not absolve him of criminal wrongdoing. Instead, counsel explained, “the reason [defendant] shot and killed Ms. Malone is as equally important as the evidence that’s going to be presented to you that he’s the one that did it.”

¶ 13

1. State's Case

¶ 14 Sullivan lived at 1940 South 1st Street and was hosting a barbeque the day of the incident to celebrate the birth of her granddaughter. Donald, Sullivan's brother, was present with his girlfriend, Malone. Sullivan heard a noise which "at first sounded like fireworks, but then it kept happening." She looked up and "saw a guy shooting at [them]." Sullivan saw the gunman "[h]anging out" of the front passenger window of a vehicle stopped at the stoplight. She did not get a good look at the gunman but described him as a "younger" "dark-skinned" black male with a lower haircut.

¶ 15 Cassandra Rechner attended the barbeque at 1940 South 1st Street. Rechner heard a loud bang, and Sullivan pushed Rechner and her child out of the way. Rechner testified she saw a man holding a gun "hanging" out of the window of an older vehicle, but she did not see the gunman's face.

¶ 16 Dashayaa Jones, Sullivan's daughter, was also living at 1940 South 1st Street. According to Jones, "a car rolled past" the house and "was sitting at the light" at the corner of 1st Street and Ash Street, when "they just started shooting." Jones described the vehicle as burgundy or a "purple red." The car was older with tinted windows and had black leather bra (a type of covering over the nose of a vehicle) on the front. She believed an acquaintance's sister owned a similar car. Jones saw the gunman leaning out of the window of the vehicle. She described him as "a dark male with a low fade," meaning "a black male and had a short haircut." The gunman was skinny, and Jones estimated him being between 20 and 25 years old.

¶ 17 Brittney Splain, a neighbor of Sullivan's, heard gunshots and then witnessed a car "speeding through a stop sign." She described the car as "an older model, shade of purple, four-door car."

¶ 18 Kevin Cash, a dispatcher in Sangamon County, received a 911 call related to the incident. The State played a recording of the call for the jury.

¶ 19 Jacob Ward, a police officer with the Springfield Police Department, responded to a call about shots being fired. Ward arrived at 1940 South 1st Street, where a large group of people surrounded Malone. Ward rendered aid until paramedics arrived and transported Malone to the hospital. Once paramedics removed Malone from the scene, Ward attempted to speak with witnesses. A recording of Ward's body-worn camera footage was played for the jury. On cross-examination, Ward stated he attempted to speak to Donald but "[h]e was very emotional and angry, upset, and [Ward] was unable to speak with him clearly." Donald was uncooperative and threatened Ward.

¶ 20 Police officers collected video surveillance from a nearby businesses that showed the suspect vehicle. The surveillance videos were played for the jury.

¶ 21 Springfield police officer Robert Fleck testified how several days before the shooting, he conducted a traffic stop on a "purplish, four-door sedan" with a black vinyl car bra on the front. The driver of the car was Yvette Bustamante.

¶ 22 *2. Redactions*

¶ 23 Before the jury was brought in on the second day of defendant's trial, defense counsel brought to the court's attention the State's intent to redact two items from the recording and transcript of defendant's interview with police—namely, two statements from police officers during the interrogation that implied defendant was justified in shooting at Donald and that defendant had no intention to shoot the girl. Defense counsel argued the State should not be permitted to redact the statements and must play the interview in full. The State contended it was presenting the interview to the jury because although he initially denied involvement, defendant

ultimately confessed to the shooting during the course of the interrogation, explaining it was the result of being robbed nine months before. The State further argued defendant would have to introduce the statements supporting his theory of the case during his own case-in-chief, noting how defendant's theory of defense acknowledged "he did commit the murder and this is why." During the arguments of counsel, both sides acknowledged the defense theory was that the shooting was "somehow justified or reasonable." After further argument, the court took the matter under advisement.

¶ 24

3. State's Case Continued

¶ 25

The parties stipulated a 1995 Chevrolet Lumina was registered to Bustamante. Bustamante then took the stand.

¶ 26

Bustamante testified she owned a 1995 Chevrolet Lumina, which was "grayish" in color, had tinted windows at one point, and had a car bra on the front. A few days before the shooting, she received a traffic ticket for running a red light while driving the Lumina. Around the time of the shooting, Bustamante and defendant were "messaging around" and in a "romantic involvement."

¶ 27

Bustamante received a call from defendant and went to pick defendant and his brother up. Defendant seemed "[r]egular" and not "particularly emotional." Defendant sat in the front passenger seat, and his brother sat in the back seat. She took the pair to defendant's mom's house, and defendant went inside the house for a few minutes, then returned. She did not see defendant carrying anything. Defendant's brother directed Bustamante where to drive until they arrived at the stoplight at the corner of 1st Street and Ash Street. Bustamante stopped at the red light, at which point she noticed defendant rolling down his window. She started to ask him why since she had the air conditioning on when defendant "just started shooting." Defendant was

leaning out of the car and fired about six shots. Bustamante was in shock and "didn't know what was going on." She "snapped out of it" after defendant's brother told her to go, and she drove off. After the shooting, defendant took the tint and car bra off Bustamante's car, then they drove the car to Missouri.

¶ 28 When Bustamante arrived at court for her traffic violation, detectives asked to speak to her about the Lumina. Initially, Bustamante lied and told them her transmission was broken, but she eventually talked to detectives about the shooting. Bustamante retrieved the Lumina. Before police collected the Lumina, defendant attempted to disable the car so it would not start, cleaned it out, and washed it. Bustamante also agreed to assist in the investigation and wear a listening device around defendant.

¶ 29 After Bustamante's testimony, the court denied the State's request to redact the police officers' statements and ruled the defendant's interview should be played in its entirety if the State intended to play it.

¶ 30 Detective Donald Edwards administered photo lineups to Sullivan and Jones. Sullivan did not make any identification from the photo lineups. Jones thought two of the subjects looked like the gunman but could not make a positive identification.

¶ 31 Detective Michael Mazrim of the Springfield Police Department investigated the shooting. Through interviews and security camera footage, he was able to identify the suspect vehicle as a 1995 Chevrolet Lumina registered to Bustamante. After speaking with Bustamante, Mazrim obtained a warrant for the overhear, set up the covert recording device with Bustamante, and helped her with a cover story to not arouse suspicion for her cooperation. The recordings of the resulting conversations were played for the jury, and the jury was provided with a transcript. At one point during the conversations, Bustamante stated, "It probably wouldn't even be this bad

if you would've shot dude and not her, right?" Defendant responded, "I know this, Yvette."

When talking about how they were going to clean the inside and outside of the car, presumably to remove any evidence of gunshot residue, defendant mentioned how "I was out the window when I did the s***."

¶ 32 The State rested without entering defendant's police interview into evidence.

¶ 33 *4. Defendant's Case*

¶ 34 Defendant moved for a directed verdict, which the trial court denied.

¶ 35 Defendant, after receiving admonishments, chose to testify. He testified about the August 25, 2016, incident nine months before the shooting. He recounted how he and his brother went to the Handy Pantry at Cook and Spring Streets in Springfield. Defendant went inside while his brother waited in the car. When defendant came out of the Handy Pantry with a bottle of liquor, he noticed the car and his brother were gone. At this point, an unknown individual struck defendant in the head with a gun. He fell to the ground and dropped the bottle he was carrying. Defendant got up to "charge" the assailant but found the assailant pointing the gun at him. Defendant fled. He received treatment at the hospital for the wound on his head, which left a scar. Defendant filed a police report, but to his knowledge, the crime was never solved.

¶ 36 On May 30, 2017, defendant received a call "stating that the guy that robbed me was down the street from me." Defendant rode with Bustamante to his mom's house, where he retrieved a gun. Defendant was only planning to confront the person but brought the gun because he assumed the person who assaulted him would also be armed. When Bustamante stopped at a red light, defendant, who was riding in the front passenger seat, saw the man he believed had assaulted him. In defendant's words, "[O]nce I seen the guy, my emotions just took over, and I intended on trying to kill him." Defendant began firing his gun. He never intended to hit Malone

and “felt terrible” when he learned she died. Defendant helped conceal Bustamante’s car because he was scared of being arrested. On cross-examination, defendant confirmed he did not know the person he believed assaulted him was Donald at the time of the shooting but had learned Donald’s name since the incident.

¶ 37 Springfield police officer Michael Brown testified he investigated the Handy Pantry assault. After defendant’s report, Brown reviewed surveillance video from Handy Pantry and confirmed defendant was struck by an unknown assailant with an object that appeared to be a handgun. Defendant had a visible injury on his head from the assault. Brown stated no one was ever arrested in connection with the assault and the crime was never solved.

¶ 38 *5. Jury Instructions and Closing Argument*

¶ 39 Defense counsel moved for a jury instruction on second degree murder based on provocation. In summary, defense counsel acknowledged the time between the armed robbery and the shooting was longer than normally seen in cases of provocation but argued that seeing the person who robbed and beat him on the day of the shooting “rekindled the defendant’s passion” and was such that it was sufficient to “trigger the passion of a reasonable man” quoting from Wayne LaFave’s treatise on substantive criminal law (see 2 Wayne R. LaFave, Substantive Criminal Law § 15.2(d) (3d ed. 2021)). As a result, defendant’s “emotion took over and he tried to kill him,” thereby justifying a second degree murder instruction. The State maintained the disproportionate nature of defendant’s retaliation to the initial provocation removed his conduct from any consideration of a second degree murder instruction. They also argued the delay between the provocation and the shooting was too long, and there was no clear evidence defendant could even identify the person who originally struck him as the person he was shooting at on the day in question. After extensive argument from both parties, the court

concluded it did not “believe the evidence supports the giving of a second-degree murder instruction” and denied the jury instruction.

¶ 40 In closing argument, defense counsel reiterated defendant did in fact shoot and kill Malone, but defendant chose to testify at his trial because “[h]e wanted [the jury] to know why he killed Sheena Malone.”

¶ 41 The jury found defendant guilty of first degree murder, including a finding defendant personally discharged a firearm that caused death to another person, aggravated unlawful use of a weapon, and aggravated discharge of a firearm.

¶ 42 C. Posttrial Motions and Sentencing

¶ 43 Defendant filed a motion for a new trial, arguing, in part, the trial court erred when it denied defendant’s motion to instruct the jury on second degree murder on a theory of provocation. The court denied defendant’s motion.

¶ 44 The trial court determined defendant’s other convictions merged into his first degree murder conviction. For first degree murder, the court sentenced defendant to 30 years in prison with a firearm enhancement of 25 years, for an aggregate term of 55 years’ imprisonment.

¶ 45 This appeal followed.

¶ 46 II. ANALYSIS

¶ 47 On appeal, defendant argues (1) he received ineffective assistance of counsel where counsel pursued a theory of second degree murder by provocation at trial and (2) the trial court erred in denying his requested jury instruction for second degree murder. As an aside, we note a defendant may have the right to argue inconsistent defenses at trial. See *People v. Wheeler*, 200 Ill. App. 3d 301, 558 N.E.2d 758 (1990). It seems a less tenable pursuit on appeal. Defendant argues vociferously on the one hand counsel was ineffective for asserting second

degree provocation, contending it was “patently untenable and doomed to fail” and “given the caselaw and established authority, the judge was never going to grant the requested provocation instructions” because “no law supported giving such instructions.” Then, in the next breath, defendant maintains the trial court committed not just error, but reversible error by refusing to give the provocation instruction for which he had just contended there was no basis in “caselaw and established authority”—meaning everything he just argued was not true and indeed there was sufficient evidence and support in the law for the giving of such an instruction and it was error for the court not to do so. Regardless, we take each argument in order.

¶ 48

A. Ineffective Assistance of Counsel

¶ 49

Defendant alleges defense counsel was ineffective for presenting a defense of second degree murder under a theory of provocation, as defendant’s situation does not meet the legal definition of provocation. Defendant contends, therefore, counsel pursued an invalid defense that not only proved defendant’s guilt, “but did so at the expense of a valid and plausible defense—challenging [defendant’s] identity as the shooter.” Defendant’s claim on appeal ignores the record evidence of an extensive and aggressive defense mounted on his behalf by trial counsel. It also ignores the dynamics of the trial as it progressed. Prior to trial, defendant’s counsel was confronted with the fact his client confessed to shooting at Donald who he believed to be the person responsible for robbing and hitting him with a gun at the Handy Pantry nine months before. The State previously tendered defendant’s interview and a transcript of the interview in discovery and expressed their intention to use them in evidence at trial. Defendant knew Detective Mazrim told the grand jury defendant admitted firing several shots in the direction of the man who robbed him earlier. When defendant sought to have the incident at the Handy Pantry ruled admissible at trial, the State did not oppose the request, noting their intention

to introduce it as well. Defendant was also aware Bustamante would be testifying about driving him to the location, seeing him shoot from the passenger side window of the car, and the conversations later when trying to hide or destroy evidence. Defendant's choice of defense strategy must be considered in light this evidence.

¶ 50

1. *Standard of Review*

¶ 51

A defendant's claim of ineffective assistance of counsel is analyzed under the two-pronged test set forth in *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668 (1984). *People v. Veach*, 2017 IL 120649, ¶ 29, 89 N.E.3d 366. To prevail on such a claim, "a defendant must show both that counsel's performance was deficient and that the deficient performance prejudiced the defendant." *People v. Petrenko*, 237 Ill. 2d 490, 496, 931 N.E.2d 1198, 1203 (2010). To establish deficient performance, the defendant must show "counsel's performance 'fell below an objective standard of reasonableness.'" *People v. Valdez*, 2016 IL 119860, ¶ 14, 67 N.E.3d 233 (quoting *Strickland*, 466 U.S. at 688). Prejudice is established when a reasonable probability exists that, but for counsel's unprofessional errors, the result of the proceeding would have been different. *People v. Evans*, 209 Ill. 2d 194, 219-20, 808 N.E.2d 939, 953 (2004) (citing *Strickland*, 466 U.S. at 694). A defendant must satisfy both prongs of the *Strickland* standard, and the failure to satisfy either prong precludes a finding of ineffective assistance of counsel. *People v. Clendenin*, 238 Ill. 2d 302, 317-18, 939 N.E.2d 310, 319 (2010).

¶ 52

"Effective assistance of counsel refers to competent, not perfect representation." *Evans*, 209 Ill. 2d at 220 (quoting *People v. Stewart*, 104 Ill. 2d 463, 491-92, 473 N.E.2d 1227, 1240 (1984)). "Mistakes in trial strategy or tactics do not necessarily render counsel's representation defective." *People v. Thomas*, 2017 IL App (4th) 150815, ¶ 10, 93 N.E.3d 664. "The decision to rely on one theory of defense to the exclusion of other theories of

defense is a matter of trial strategy.” *People v. Clark*, 207 Ill. App. 3d 439, 450, 565 N.E.2d 1373, 1380 (1991). The Illinois Supreme Court wrote, “We have also made it clear that a reviewing court will be highly deferential to trial counsel on matters of trial strategy, making every effort to evaluate counsel’s performance from his perspective at the time, rather than through the lens of hindsight.” *People v. Perry*, 224 Ill. 2d 312, 344, 864 N.E.2d 196, 216 (2007). “[I]n order to establish deficient performance, the defendant must overcome the strong presumption that the challenged action or inaction may have been the product of sound trial strategy. [Citations.] Matters of trial strategy are generally immune from claims of ineffective assistance of counsel.” (Internal quotation marks omitted.) *People v. Manning*, 241 Ill. 2d 319, 327, 948 N.E.2d 542, 547 (2011). “ ‘Only if counsel’s trial strategy is so unsound that he entirely fails to conduct meaningful adversarial testing of the State’s case will ineffective assistance of counsel be found.’ ” *People v. Peterson*, 2017 IL 120331, ¶ 80 (quoting *Perry*, 224 Ill. 2d at 355-56). However, a counsel’s failure to understand the law can constitute deficient performance. See, e.g., *People v. Patterson*, 192 Ill. 2d 93, 121, 735 N.E.2d 616, 633 (2000).

¶ 53

2. Second Degree Murder by Provocation

¶ 54

We review the standard for finding a defendant guilty of second degree murder by provocation to explain counsel’s attempted trial strategy.

¶ 55

A person is guilty of second degree murder when he commits the offense of first degree murder and at the time of killing he (1) is acting under a sudden and intense passion resulting from serious provocation by the individual killed or (2) he believes the circumstances justify using self-defense, but his belief is unreasonable. *People v. Blackwell*, 171 Ill. 2d 338, 357, 665 N.E.2d 782, 790 (1996). Trial counsel presented a theory based on the former.

¶ 56 Serious provocation is defined as “conduct sufficient to excite an intense passion in a reasonable person.” 720 ILCS 5/9-2(b) (West 2016). The categories of provocation courts have recognized as sufficient to warrant a second degree murder instruction based on serious provocation are (1) mutual quarrel or combat, (2) substantial physical injury or assault, (3) illegal arrest, and (4) adultery with the offender’s spouse. *People v. Page*, 193 Ill. 2d 120, 133, 737 N.E.2d 264, 272 (2000). However, serious provocation will only constitute a mitigating factor if the killing occurs before the defendant has had enough time for tempers to cool. *People v. McDonald*, 63 Ill. App. 2d 475, 479, 212 N.E.2d 299, 301 (1965). Whether a sufficient cooling off period existed depends upon the magnitude of the provoking act and the degree to which passions have been aroused in the defendant. *People v. Hudson*, 71 Ill. App. 3d 504, 511, 390 N.E.2d 5, 10 (1979). “ ‘[N]o yardstick of time can be used by the court to measure a reasonable period of passion but it must vary as do the facts of every case.’ ” *People v. Yarbrough*, 269 Ill. App. 3d 96, 101, 645 N.E.2d 423, 426 (1994) (quoting *People v. Harris*, 8 Ill. 2d 431, 435, 134 N.E.2d 315, 317 (1956)).

¶ 57 In light of the evidence confronting defendant at trial, counsel’s strategy was to convince the jury the assault nine months before, involving the threat with a gun, which resulted in substantial physical injury to defendant, was serious provocation. On the date of the shooting, being informed of the location of the person who robbed and pistol-whipped him nine months before—a person who had not yet been apprehended for the crime—defendant’s observation of the person who had done this to him was sufficient provocation for defendant to act under sudden and intense passion and begin shooting at him. Under counsel’s theory, seeing his assailant caused defendant to experience flashbacks to his assault, thereby causing an incident from nine months before to result in a sudden and intense passion that led to the shooting.

129071



PLD
Rehearing Denied

CLERK OF THE COURT
(217) 782-2586

STATE OF ILLINOIS
APPELLATE COURT
FOURTH DISTRICT
201 W. MONROE STREET
SPRINGFIELD, IL 62704

RESEARCH DIRECTOR
(217) 782-3528

October 28, 2022

RE: People v. Hayes, Derrick D.
General No.: 4-21-0409
Sangamon County
Case No.: 17CF635

The Court today denied the petition for rehearing filed in the above entitled cause. The mandate of this Court will issue 35 days from today unless a petition for leave to appeal is filed in the Illinois Supreme Court.

If the decision is an opinion, it is hereby released today for publication.

Carla Bender
Clerk of the Appellate Court

c: Jennifer Lynn Bontrager
Linda Susan McClain

Appendix - ①

People v. Hayes, 2022 IL App (4th) 210409

Decision Under Review: Appeal from the Circuit Court of Sangamon County, No. 17-CF-635; the Hon. Raylene Grischow, Judge, presiding.

**Attorneys
for
Appellant:** James E. Chadd, Douglas R. Hoff, and Jennifer L. Bontrager, of
State Appellate Defender's Office, of Chicago, for appellant.

**Attorneys
for
Appellee:** Daniel K. Wright, State's Attorney, of Springfield (Patrick
Delfino, David J. Robinson, and Linda S. McClain, of State's
Attorneys Appellate Prosecutor's Office, of counsel), for the
People.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF SANGAMON COUNTY, ILLINOIS
SEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

Date of Sentence: 6/9/2021

Defendant DOB: 8/16/93

Victim DOB: _____

FILED
6/14/2021 1:21 PM

Paul Palazzolo

7th Judicial Circuit

Sangamon County, IL

2017CF000635

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS)
)
VS.)
)
DERRICK D. HAYES,)
Defendant)

CASE NO. 17-CF-635

JUDGMENT-SENTENCE TO ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

WHEREAS the above-named defendant has been adjudged guilty of the offenses enumerated below:

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the defendant be and hereby is sentenced to confinement in the Illinois Department of Corrections for the term of years and months specified for each offense.

<u>COUNT</u>	<u>OFFENSE</u>	<u>DATE OF OFFENSE</u>	<u>STATUTORY CITATION</u>	<u>CLASS</u>	<u>SENTENCE</u>	<u>MSR</u>
I	FIRST DEGREE MURDER	5/30/17	720 ILCS 5/9-1(a)(1)	M	55 Years	3 Years

and served at 100% pursuant to 730 ILCS 5/3-6-3

The Court finds that the defendant is:

☐ Convicted of a Class _____ offense but sentenced as a class X offender pursuant to 730 ILCS 5/5-4.5-95(b).

☒ The Court finds that the defendant is entitled to receive credit for time actually served in custody of 1451 days as of the date of this order from 6/16/17-6/9/21. The defendant is also entitled to receive credit for the additional time served in custody from the date of this order until defendant is received at the Illinois Department of Corrections.

☒ The Defendant remained in continuous custody from the date of this order.

☐ The Defendant did not remain in continuous custody from the date of this order (Less _____ days from a release date of _____ to a surrender date of _____).

☐ The Court further finds that the conduct leading to conviction for the offense(s) enumerated in count(s) _____ resulted in great bodily harm to the victim (730 ILCS 5/3-6-3(a)(2)(iii)).

☐ The Court further finds that the defendant meets the eligibility requirements for possible placement in the Impact Incarceration Program. (730 ILCS 5/5-4-1(a)).

☐ The Court further finds that offense was committed as a result of the use of, abuse of, or addiction to alcohol or a controlled substance and recommends the defendant for placement in a substance abuse program. (730 ILCS 5/5-4-1(a)).

☐ The defendant successfully completed a full-time (60-day or longer) Pre-Trial Program _____ Educational/Vocational _____ Substance Abuse _____ Behavior Modification _____ Life Skills _____ Re-Entry Planning - provided by the county jail while held in pre-trial detention prior to this commitment and is eligible and shall be awarded additional sentence credit in accordance with 730 ILCS 5/3-6-3(a)(4) for _____ total number of days of program participation, if not previously awarded.

☐ The defendant passed the high school level test for General Education and Development (GED) on _____ while held in pre-trial detention prior to this commitment and is eligible to receive Pre-Trial GED Program Credit in accordance with 730 ILCS 5/3-6-3(a)(4.1).

THEREFORE IT IS ORDERED that the defendant shall be awarded 60 days of additional sentence credit, if not previously awarded.

☐ IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the sentence imposed on count _____ be concurrent with the sentence imposed in Case Number _____ in the Circuit Court of _____ County.

☐ IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that _____

The Clerk of the Court shall deliver a certified copy of this order to the Sheriff. The Sheriff shall take the defendant into custody and deliver defendant to the Department of Corrections which shall confine said defendant until expiration of this sentence or until otherwise released by operation of law.

This order is effective immediately.

DATE: 6/9/2021

ENTER: Raylene D. Grischow
Honorable Raylene D. Grischow

(Appendix - B)

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF SANGAMON COUNTY, ILLINOIS
SEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS)
)
VS.) CASE NO. 17-CF-635
)
DERRICK D. HAYES,)
Defendant)

OFFICIAL STATEMENT OF STATE'S ATTORNEY
PURSUANT TO 730 ILCS 5/5-4-1(d)

NAME: DERRICK D. HAYES DATE OF BIRTH: 8/16/93
ALIASES: DATE OF OFFENSE(S): 5/30/17
CRIME(S): FIRST DEGREE MURDER DATE OF SENTENCE: 6/9/2021
PLEA: JAIL CREDIT DUE: 1451 Days
TYPE OF TRIAL: Jury

SENTENCE(S): 55 Years DOC/3 Years MSR

CODEFENDANT(S):

DISPOSITION OF CODEFENDANT(S):

STATE'S ATTORNEY: Daniel K. Wright and First Assistant State's Attorney Derek Dion

DEFENSE ATTORNEY: Mark Wykoff

PRESIDING JUDGE: Honorable Raylene D. Grischow

COMPLAINING WITNESS:

HISTORY OF PROBATION IN SANGAMON COUNTY:

AGENCY CONDUCTING PRE-TRIAL OR PRE-SENTENCE INVESTIGATION: Sangamon County Court Services

DESCRIPTION OF EXACT CIRCUMSTANCES OF OFFENSE:

Defendant, while committing a forcible felony, Aggravated Discharge of a Firearm, personally discharged a firearm from a motor vehicle, striking Sheena Malone, who was not present in the vehicle, thereby causing the death of Sheena Malone.

This official statement is hereby submitted in accordance with the provisions of 730 ILCS 5/5-4-1(d) of the Unified Code of Corrections.



Derek Dion
First Assistant State's Attorney