

Sacramento County District Attorney's Office

ANNE MARIE SCHUBERT District Attorney Rod Norgaard Chief Deputy

Michael M. Blazina Assistant District Attorney

July 6, 2021

Board of Parole Hearings Attn: Pre-Hearing Correspondence P.O. Box 4036 Sacramento, CA 95812-4036

Re: Carter, Jason

CDC # BG6825

Court Docket: 15F05921

Inmate Carter is a violent criminal and sex offender who has proven that members of the community are not safe when he is out of custody. He should not be paroled. The circumstances surrounding his criminal record show that he poses an unreasonable risk of violence to the community.

Inmate Carter's current prison commitment is due to a crime spree that he committed over the course of 15 days. On September 26, 2015, at approximately 6:42am, Inmate Carter walked into a convenience store attached to a Union 76 gas station in Sacramento. He walked directly behind the counter where and and were working. Inmate Carter walked to the safe had not even opened yet. Mr. Interest later suspected Inmate behind the counter that Carter had watched the store's operations in prior days as Mr. always opened the safe at the exact same time, the same time Inmate Carter walked into the store and proceeded straight to the safe. Inmate Carter reached for rolls of pennies that were located on top of the safe. The two employees tried to prevent him from taking any items. On surveillance, Inmate Carter can be seen reaching for the second s also was thrown to the ground against a step stool, later resulting in bruising. Inmate Carter was not able to retrieve any property, so he started to leave. In one last attempt to take something, he tried to take the whole cash register, but was prevented because it was attached by cords to the counter. Ms. a small elderly woman, tried to push Inmate Carter out of the store. In the process, he dragged her to the ground. In a fit of frustration, Inmate Carter knocked down various displays in the convenience store as he left. Ms. where the door closed to prevent Inmate Carter from returning and Mr. called 911, and then helped hold the door closed. Officers reported to the scene, but Inmate Carter had already fled.

Later that same day at approximately 12:50pm, Inmate Carter forcefully entered a closed down Sutter Hospital located in Sacramento. Was a security guard working for Sutter. He stated that he checked all the doors and windows earlier that day to make sure all points of entry were locked. He discovered Inmate Carter inside and asked him to leave. Mr. Saw Inmate Carter with a hospital rolling cart containing bags of hospital supplies, looking like he was leaving with the items. Mr. Saw Inmate Carter picked up a 4'x1" wooden plank and tried to hit Mr. Saw with it. When Inmate Carter swung, he hit the wall above Mr. Saw Causing the plank to shatter and not reach full impact on Mr. Saw directly. The victim was able to grab it from Inmate Carter. Inmate Carter and the victim struggled and

- sacda.org

traveled through a double door onto the loading dock of the hospital. Inmate Carter picked up a flat screen TV that he already had in his stash of stolen goods and began to swing it at the victim, striking him multiple times. Mr. **Second** reached up to his shoulder to try to call for back up on his walkietalkie. Inmate Carter then bit down on the victim's thumb so hard that it broke skin and he did not let go for a long time. Back up security came at the same time officers reported to the scene. The officers realized that this suspect matched the same physical description and clothing description as the suspect in the gas station robbery. They brought the convenience store victims to the scene for an in-field show up and they identified Inmate Carter as the suspect from their robbery. Carter was still wearing the same clothing that he was wearing in the gas station surveillance.

After booking Inmate Carter on the September 26 incidents, a positive match was made between Inmate Carter and a latent print lifted inside the house of a residential burglary that occurred on September 11, also in the Sacramento area. Interference left his house at approximately 9:30am that morning. Interference who also resided in the house, left at approximately 10:00 a.m. with her granddaughter. She noticed a person she did not recognize in her neighbor's driveway when she left, but continued despite her suspicions. On a neighbor's surveillance camera, Inmate Carter was seen emerging from the car in the neighbor's driveway and then running across the street and into the victims' house. A few minutes later, he ran back to the car. When Mr. Interference and Ms. Interference returned after their alarm company called them, they noticed tools laid about that were used to force entry into the home. The house was ransacked, especially areas with paperwork and jewelry. Ms. Interference estimated that \$800-\$1000 worth of priceless jewelry was taken. On a CD case that was found on the staircase, a latent print resulted in a positive match to Inmate Carter. The victims said they did not know Inmate Carter, nor did they give him permission to be in the house.

Though it was dismissed as a term of the plea agreement in his initial 19-year, 4-month plea, Inmate Carter was also charged with a violation of failing to register under Penal Code section 290.

If the sheer number of offenses and victims from this one case are not enough to show that Inmate Carter has established himself as a danger to the community, the rest of his criminal record also supports that conclusion. Since the time he was a juvenile. Inmate Carter has committed criminal offenses and never ceased, spending his entire adult life in and out of prison custody. His criminal offenses include 3 felonies (narcotics sales, robbery, and burglary), six misdemeanors (child annoyance or molestation, domestic violence, weapons possession, and narcotics possession), and at least six parole violations. Inmate Carter has been sentenced to prison at least four times. He has never gone more than a nominal amount of time out of jail or prison custody.

The facts surrounding Inmate Carter's 1994 Penal Code Section 211 conviction are violent and dangerous as well. Per the Sacramento Police Department report from the incident, the victim and his passenger were stopped at an intersection in Sacramento when Inmate Carter walked up to the car and pointed a small black semi-automatic handgun at the victim. Inmate Carter told the victim to get out of the vehicle. The victim began getting out and Inmate Carter climbed into the driver's seat, putting his arm around the victim's neck, and demanded money. Inmate Carter then pointed the firearm at the passenger, telling him to get out. Inmate Carter fled in the victim's vehicle. Officers were able to find the car and began following it. During the pursuit Inmate Carter crashed into a fence and tree. After the crash, he fled on foot. He was found in the area and positively identified by the victims as the suspect. The fact that Inmate Carter was sentenced to 2 years State Prison for one violation of Penal Code section 211 under this set of circumstances shows the leniency that Inmate Carter has already been given.

Even in the commitment offense, Inmate Carter has already been shown more than enough leniency. Inmate Carter initially entered a plea deal that included an approximately 10-year sentence. At some point during the proceedings, he asserted that his attorney at the time did not correctly go over all of the evidence with him before he entered his plea. During the course of his motion to withdraw his plea, Inmate Carter was granted a Faretta motion and represented himself after he was strongly discouraged to do so by the Court. The People strongly opposed the motion to withdraw the plea at every step of the proceedings, warning Mr. Carter that the previous deal would not only be revoked, but also increased based on the facts, his criminal history, as well as the input from the victims in the case. Ultimately, Inmate Carter's motion to withdraw his plea was granted.

On the eve of trial, Inmate Carter stated he no longer wished to represent himself and desired an attorney. By the time this case was able to see a trial courtroom, it was now 2018; three years after the events occurred. Though the numerous victims had not heard a word of the status of this case in years, every one of them showed up willingly ready for trial because of how much this event impacted their lives. Mr. **Second** was actually in India taking care of his sick mother when it was set for trial and he was willing to fly back early in order to testify. In the middle of jury selection, Inmate Carter desired to enter a plea. Carter then entered a plea that included a sentence of 19 years, 4 months.

In 2020, Inmate Carter's case was remanded to the trial court in order to dismiss his prison priors based on a change in the sentencing laws. The Trial Court was also asked to consider whether or not to dismiss his 5-year prior, because the application of that sentencing enhancement was now discretionary. The Court stated that although nothing about his criminal history or the facts of this case supported dismissal, the fact that Inmate Carter had completed classes while incarcerated led the Court to dismiss the 5-year prior. Inmate Carter's sentence was reduced substantially to 12 years, 4 months. Now, even after that leniency, Mr. Carter still wants to lessen the time he serves by applying for early parole.

Inmate Carter has been a violent criminal for all of his life and is constantly exhibiting assaultive behavior. From the crimes that first sent him to prison to the crimes he has committed most recently, it is apparent that Inmate Carter will not adhere to the rule of law and is consistently manipulating the system to try and lessen his sentence. He has hurt and threatened too many members of the community for him to even be considered remotely safe. The victims in this case deserve every year they were promised by the Court when they sat there and watched him plea in 2018. Inmate Carter should not be released as he poses a significant, unreasonable risk of violence to the community as soon as he is surrounded by the temptation of the world outside of prison. Parole should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

Amanda Sanchez Deputy District Attorney Sacramento County District Attorney's Office