



Anyone facing the staggering power of government and the enormous pitfalls of the criminal justice system is in grave peril. Anyone seriously hurt, or whose loved one was killed, through the negligence of another is in grave danger of bearing the entire financial burden. If you are in either situation you must have an advocate with tremendous zeal to fight for you. Attorney Redmond is committed to using her legal training and education to safeguard liberty, and to champion fundamental principles of justice, equality, and human dignity. Hers is a litigation practice

characterized by quality representation, aggressive advocacy, high client satisfaction, legal challenge, and service to the community.

Our firm believes strongly in the constitutional principles forbidding the government from unreasonable search and seizure without a warrant, the right to remain silent, and that you are innocent until proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. We believe equally strongly that when you are treated unfairly, or you are seriously injured, or a loved one is killed through another's negligence, that other person must pay.

Attorney Profiles: Lauren Craig Redmond

As a trial lawyer, Attorney Redmond's greatest strengths are developing trial strategy, directing case investigation, preparing witnesses, arguing motions, negotiating as well as trying the case before a judge or jury. The nature of this legal practice, focused and aggressive litigation, promotes the best preparation for cases going to trial, promotes the best negotiating advantage for cases going to plea or settlement, maintains momentum on the rest of the caseload and does so without wasting money. Attorney Redmond will dedicate time, energy and passion to each and every client, a commitment that produces the best possible result in almost every instance. "While no responsible lawyer can ever guarantee a particular outcome, I am determined to do my very best. At the end of each case, I want my clients to feel that nobody could have tried harder to obtain a better outcome."



Attorney Redmond has extensive experience representing hundreds of cases including, but not limited to, employment

discrimination, sexual harassment, disparate treatment in the work place, as well as firearm charges, drug cases, domestic cases, assault & battery, crimes of theft, etc. She is a member of the Wrongful Death Attorney Network.

Attorney Redmond is a graduate of Northeastern University School of Law where she earned a Juris Doctor degree. She earned a Bachelor of Arts degree, cum laude, in Philosophy from the University of Massachusetts/Boston.

Prior to completing her education, Ms. Redmond spent over 20 years in the professional theatre in New York City.

Admitted:

- Bar of the Supreme Judicial Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts
- United States District Court for the First Circuit, District of Massachusetts

Lauren Craig Redmond, Esq.
423 Brookline Avenue, #277
Boston, Massachusetts 02215

REDMOND LAW REPORT

Redmond Law Office • 617.953.6116



Winter 2011-2012

5 Basic Qualities Needed to Successfully Defend Criminal Cases

An attorney who defends people charged with drug crimes must possess at least these five important qualities:

1. Determination to perform the work necessary to marshal a powerful defense for every client;
2. Experience handling cases involving drug charges and the judgment necessary to identify the best defense strategy;
3. Knowledge of the complex Federal and State laws, court decisions, and rules that apply to drug cases;
4. The ability to effectively communicate with judges and prosecutors before trial, and if the matter proceeds to trial, the ability to effectively communicate with a jury;
5. A strong belief in the rights guaranteed by the Federal and State Constitutions, including the right to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures, the presumption of innocence, and the right to remain silent and not help the government prove its case against you.

Knowledgeable attorneys experienced in drug defense law are best able to identify a winning defense strategy. In most drug cases, the defense attorney argues one of the following defenses: 1) insufficient evidence of possession or intent; 2) the police conducted an unreasonable search, seizure, or interrogation; 3) the police conducted and improper or inadequate investigation.

Oftentimes, when the police find drugs in a car, or in a house or apartment, they will charge everybody who is present with drug possession, or even with intent to distribute the drugs. The attorney's knowledge of the law is crucial in these circumstances. Under both Federal and Massachusetts law, merely being in the presence of illegal drugs does not prove that a person possessed them.

In cases where a defendant is arrested with just a small amount of drugs in his possession, the prosecutor will often charge the defendant with the more serious offense of intent to distribute, if the drugs were contained in separate packets. However, under Massachusetts law, the quantity of drugs possessed must be very large before the Court will sustain a conviction for intent to distribute from this fact alone. This is very important because, where the prosecutor can prove intent to distribute drugs, the punishment is usually more severe. In fact, "mandatory minimum" sentences, where a defendant is not eligible for parole, are frequently

handed down in cases involving distribution of drugs or intent to distribute drugs.

Challenging the legality of searches and seizures conducted by the police, with or without a search warrant, is one of the most complex areas of criminal defense law. If the police recover drugs by means of an illegal search, then the drugs must be excluded from evidence under the "exclusionary rule" of the Federal and Massachusetts Constitutions. Most drugs will be excluded if the defense attorney persuades the Court that the police search was conducted in an illegal manner. For this reason, it is of the utmost importance that the defense lawyer has superior knowledge and understanding of search and seizure law, and the ability to clearly explain to the judge why the evidence must be excluded. In many cases, the only defense available is to establish the illegality of the search.

A lawyer's knowledge and experience defending drug cases is very important in helping her identify improper or inadequate methods of investigation used by the police. For example, if the police allege they observed a drug transaction while conducting surveillance of someone or some location, the lawyer can cast doubt on the police testimony if there are no photographs or videotapes. The lawyer can show this to be a police failure to secure irrefutable evidence. When the police seize money or drugs, they often fail to test for fingerprints or DNA evidence. Failure to run those available tests can be grounds to doubt the testimony of police officers. If the police arrest a defendant who possesses drugs, then they fail to follow up with a search of the defendant's home for evidence of drug dealing, the defense lawyer can use that to cast doubt on the police claim that the defendant intended to distribute those drugs.

When a drug case is not dismissed prior to trial due to lack of evidence or an illegal search and seizure, and the defendant does not take a plea, then the battlefield shifts to the trial court.

A trial attorney must carefully prepare a case for trial. To be effective at trial, a lawyer must be able to think quickly, to act decisively, and to perform under pressure in public. Not every lawyer has what it takes. Many lawyers are afraid to go to trial because they lack experience. This can lead to advising the client to plead guilty even if there are good grounds to believe a jury would return a verdict of not guilty.

Just be sure the lawyer you hire to defend you has the five basic qualities listed at the beginning of this article. That is the first step in getting a not guilty verdict.



The New CORI Law Makes it Better for You

The new CORI law¹ takes effect in two stages; first stage by November 4, 2010, second stage by May 4, 2012.

In November, 2010, the Criminal History Systems Board (CHSB), the agency responsible for the collection, storage, dissemination and use of CORI, was renamed the Department of Criminal Justice Information Services. Its mission will remain the same. Other changes instituted in the first stage include a ban on questions about your criminal history on the initial written job application, unless the employer is required by state or federal law to investigate a job applicant's criminal history. This section is popularly known as the "bans the box" provision. Also under the new law, certified volunteer agencies will be able to get CORI for paid staff, vendors, and contractors as well as volunteers.

A major new change as of May, 2012, is that CORI will be available on the internet, for a fee. Employers and landlords who have standard access to CORI will be allowed to see the following: all convictions for murder, manslaughter, and sex offenses; any felony convictions that happened within the last 10 years or for which the person was incarcerated; any misdemeanor convictions that happened within the last 5 years or for which the person was incarcerated; any open criminal cases will appear including those continued without a finding (CWOFF). Please note: if any conviction appears under the above rules, then all prior convictions will appear, regardless of when the conviction happened.

Employers that require additional access to CORI because of a statutory, regulatory or accreditation requirement will have that access. This category includes schools, camps, banks, security guard companies, hospitals, day care centers, nursing homes, assisted living facilities, councils on aging, public housing authorities, security systems installers, amusement device operators, and insurance companies.

Sealed records will never appear on a CORI, and the CORI will not show that a sealed record exists. Beginning May, 2012, individuals may request that their criminal records be sealed according to the following schedule: misdemeanor: 5 years after the conviction or any period of incarceration, whichever is later; felony: 10 years after the conviction or any period of incarceration, whichever is later; sex offense: 15 years after the conviction or any period of incarceration, or after the obligation to register as a sex offender ceases, whichever is later. Sex offenders classified as Level 2 or Level 3 will not be eligible to have their convictions sealed. To be eligible for sealing, an applicant must not have a conviction for any crime during the above waiting periods.

Any member of the general public can get CORI information for a specific individual. Upon written request, they can access information about a particular conviction for a limited time: felony: convictions punishable by 5 years of imprisonment or any felony conviction, until 2 years after release from custody; misdemeanor: until 1 year after release from custody; any conviction resulting in a prison sentence, throughout the period of incarceration, probation or parole.

You may obtain a copy of your entire CORI report. You may also request, free-of-charge every 90 days, a self-audit that identifies all organizations and individuals that have requested your CORI report. This self-audit will not include any requests for your CORI made by law enforcement or criminal justice agencies. More frequent audits may be requested for a fee. Interested in getting a copy of your CORI, or getting your criminal records sealed? You must contact the Massachusetts Office of the Commissioner of Probation (OCP) at 617-727-5300. Additional information is also available at the OCP web site at: <http://www.mass.gov/courts/probation/forms.html>.



Verdict – NOT Guilty

John Doe was charged with a number of Gun Possession charges, including firing a gun within 500 feet of a building. At trial, Attorney Redmond's cross examination of the police officers got each one of them to admit that John Doe's behavior, in all respects, was inconsistent with their experience with people who have committed gun crimes. She also got each one of the police officers to admit there were dozens of people fleeing the scene who were not interviewed or identified by the police, and that any one of those people could have been the shooter. John Doe was acquitted on all charges.



Case Dismissed

John Doe was charged with Carrying a Dangerous Weapon, to wit, a Knife. After reviewing the police report and the applicable law, Attorney Redmond noted that the Clerk Magistrate had made a mistake issuing the criminal complaint. There was insufficient evidence to support the assertion that John Doe was actually armed with the knife; it was merely near him. She filed and successfully litigated a motion to dismiss.



Case Dismissed

John Doe was charged with various Drug Crimes stemming from his driving someone else's car. Attorney Redmond litigated a motion to suppress the police search of the car, based on the police going beyond the constitutional limits they must obey. The judge agreed and all charges were dismissed.



Case Negotiated – LESS time

Jane Doe was charged with Shoplifting, Resisting Arrest, and multiple counts of Assault & Battery on a Police Officer. After conducting a thorough investigation, which included having Jane Doe evaluated by a forensic psychologist, Attorney Redmond negotiated a plea which gave Doe a short sentence and allowed Doe's sentence to be nunc pro tunc ("now for then") back to the day of arrest. This shaved off one third of the total one year sentence.



**Focus. Discipline.
Determination. Results.**

