IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF IN AND FOR DADE COUNTY

- FILED LORIDANN 1977
RICHARD P. BRINKER

THE STATE OF FLORIDA

VS.	#	74-6113
-----	---	---------

LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO ET AL

ORDER FOR DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE

IT APPEARING UNTO THE COURT that the above styled and numbered cause has been disposed of in accordance with the law and it further appearing that certain evidence is now in the possession of the Clerk which should be disposed of, and the Court being otherwise fully advised in the premises, it is, upon consideration,

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the Clerk of this Court dispose of the following evidence as indicated, to-wit:

RETURN the following exhibits to: Mr. Tom Brodie of PSD LAB
Instanter: State's Exhibit 8 - BOOK "The British at the Gates"
State's Exhibit 9 - BOOK (Hellew inside with batteries)
State's Exhibit 10 - Wide Board (Makeshift table top work bench)
State's Exhibit 27 - Large Sketch Floor-Plan of Garage
State's Exhibit 29 - Brown bag containing 2 balls string, roll tape
State's Exhibit 30 - Bag containing fragments of book and paper
State's Exhibit 31 - Plastic bag containing fragments of book & paper
State's Exhibit 32 - Plastic envelope containing receipts & tapes
State's Exhibit 33 - Plastic bag containing burned items State's Exhibit 34 - Envelope containing miscellaneous items
State's Exhibit 34 - Envelope containing miscellaneous items
State's Exhibit 35 - Plastic bag containing fragments and wire
State's Exhibit 38 - BOOK "The British at the Gates"
Defendant Exhibit B - Fake Book "World's Greates Jokes" (Novelty)
AND the cassette tape recording used in Defendant B, Humberto Lopez, Motion to Revoke Bail.
NOTE: Deft A - 5 Yrs. St.Pen. 12-5-74 Deft B - 72 Yrs.St.Pen. 11-14-75 at expir.sentence 73-5087
Deft C - Acquitted
x x ponythe expiration of the enneat periods on the remark shell be filter announted announce and the contract of the contract
Deft A Appeal dismissed by DCA 7-1-75 Deft B Appeal dismissed by DCA 5-5-76
DONE AND ORDERED at Miami, Dade County, Florida this2nd. day of
June A. D., 19 <u>77</u>
ALAN R. SCHWARTZ JUDGE

A. D. 19 _____ and recorded in Circuit Court

Minutes No _____ on Page _____

RICHARD P. BRINKER, Clerk

By _____ Deputy

CIR/CT/CRI-118 (FF 9698 PG2014

RECORDED

JUN 6 1977

RICHARD P. BRINKER

DECEIVE MAY 31 1977

STATE ATTORNEY OFFICE

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF FLORIDA, IN AND FOR DADE COUNTY

CASE NO. 74-6113

STATE OF FLORIDA,

DISCOVERY UNDER FLORIDA CRIMINAL

PROCEDURE RULE 3.220

VS.

STATEMENT OF PARTICULARS UNDER ≥ FLORIDA CRIMINAL PROCEDURE RULE

3.140 (n)

LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO, HUMBERTO LOPEZ and JUAQUIN MIRANDA

Defendant.

Plaintiff,

DEMAND FOR NOTICE OF ALIMINDER FLORIDA CRIMINAL PROCEDURE QUILE

Comes now, RICHARD E. GERSTEIN, State Attorney of the Eleventh Judicial Circuit of Florida, by and through the undersigned Assistant State Attorney, and files this Discovery, Statement of Particulars, and Demand for Notice of Alibi under Florida Criminal Procedure Rules 3.220; 3.140 (n) and 3.200, as follows:

The alleged offense occurred on or about _ March 20, 1974 at or about 12:30 A.M. at or in the vicinity of 2344 Southwest 16 Street Dade County, Florida.

The persons, known to the State at this time, that have information which may be relevant to the offense charges, and to any defense with respect thereto, are as follows:

Lt. James Gilbert Miami Fire Department Alfredo Sayus, Sr. 567 Southwest 3 Street #3

C. Felipe MPD

Miami, Florida

R. Sanchez MPD I.D.

Custodian of Records or Mr. William Lynch 2001 Palm Bch Lakes Blvd. #202

Ed Stone

George E. Davis, Jr. FBI, Miami, Florida

PSD Lab

David W. Nichols

Ed Buff

FBI Lab, Washington, D. C.

W. Palm Beach, Florida 33401

MPD

Edmund W. Kelso, Jr., FBI Lab, Washington, D. C.

Charles Samen MPD I.D.

William A. Gavin FBI Lab, Washington, D. C.

H. Whitaker MPD

> Richard Kelly Hialeah PD

Tom Brodie PSD Lab

Robert Potter Hialeah PD

Robert Dwyer

FBI, Miami, Florida

Newton Porter PSD Lab

Robert Ross

FBI, Miami, Florida

Lt. Cole Hialeah Fire Department

Alfredo Sayus, Jr. 567 Southwest 3 Street #3 Miami, Florida

Charles Hale

NOTE: Paragraphs designated by asterik * apply to the reciprocal provisions pursuant to Rule 3.220 of the Florida Rules of Criminal Procedure only.

201.01-274 Page 1

C

Robbie Clavier Hialeah Fire Department

Tom Quar**∦** PSD Lab

Ellory Richtarcik Broward Sheriffs Office

Earnest Zaremba
Palm Springs Station
U. S. Post Office

3. Pursuant to Rule 3.220 (a) (1) of the Florida Rules of Criminal Procedure, the State will disclose to defense counsel and permit him to inspect, copy, test and photograph the material and information, if any, provided for in paragraphs (ii) through (xi), upon request, within five (5) days of receipt of this Discovery at a mutually convenient place.

4*. Pursuant to Rule 3.220 (b) (3) of the Florida Rules of Criminal Procedure, the State demands that within seven (7) days after receipt of this Discovery the defense counsel shall furnish to the prosecuting attorney a written list of all witnesses whom the defense counsel expects to call as witnesses at the trial or hearing.

5*. Pursuant to Rule 3.220 (b) (4) of the Florida Rules of Criminal Procedure, the State demands that within fifteen (15) days after receipt of this Discovery that the defense disclose to the prosecuting attorney and permit him to inspect, copy, test, and photograph the following information and material which corresponds to that which the defense sought and which is in the defendant's possession or control:

(i) the statements of any person whom the defense expects to call as a trial witness other than that of the defendant;

(ii) reports or statements of experts made in connection with the particular case, including results of physical or mental examinations and of scientific tests, experiments or comparisons;

(iii) any tangible papers or objects which the defense counsel intends to use in the hearing or trial.

6. Comes now, RICHARD E. GERSTEIN, State Attorney of the Eleventh Judicial Circuit of Florida, by and through the undersigned Assistant State Attorney, and files this Demand for Notice of Intention to Rely upon Alibi Defense pursuant to Rule 3.220 of the Florida Rules of Criminal Procedure, demanding that the defendant furnish the prosecuting attorney with a Notice of Alibi, not less than ten (10) days prior to trial, stating the place the defendant claims to have been at the time of the alleged offense and the names and addresses of the witnesses by whom he proposes to establish such an alibi, if such a defense will be relied upon at time of trial.

RICHARD E. GERSTEIN STATE ATTORNEY

BY: ASSISTANT STATE ATTORNE

JAMES H. WOODARD

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and exact copy of the above and foregoing was mailed

Laurence D. Faye, Suite 306, 66 West Flagler, Miami, Florida and Melvin Greenspahn, 1150 Building Suite 210, Miami, Florida on this ________, 1974____.

ASSISTANT STATE ATTORNEY

IN THE CIRDUIT COURT OF THE 11TH

OODICIAL	CIRCUIT	ΤIJ	CINA	FOR	1
COUNTY,	FLORIDA				

NOTICE OF PLEA

CRIMINAL DIVISION

JUDICIAL CIRCUI	r in <i>P</i>	AND FO	R DADI
COUNTY, FLORIDA			
	_	2 -	J
CASE NO: 74-6113	3	τ .	<u>~</u>

STATE OF FLORIDA,

Plaintiff,

LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO, HUMBERTO

Defendants,

LOPEZ and JUAQUIN MIRANDA,

-Vs-

COMES NOW the Defendant, LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO, by and through his undersigned attorney and does allege:

- 1. That the Defendant does enter a plea of not guilty to all pending charges against him herein.
 - 2. That defendant demands trial by jury.
 - 3. That defendant demands speedy brial.
- 4. That the Defendant moves reciprocal discovery pursuant to the Florida Rules of Criminal Procedure and the applicable local rules.
- The instant pleading is in lieu of the personal appearance of Defendant or counsel at the time set for arraignment herein.

MELVYN GREENSPAHN, P.A. Suite 210-1150 Building 1150 S.W. 1st Street Miami, Florida 33130

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true copy of the foregoing Notice of Plea was hand-delivered to the office of the States Attorney, 1351 N.W. 12th Street, Miami, Florida this 19th day of August, 1974.

Velugn Stranspahn

chen

August 19, 1974

DADE COBNITATION OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPER

Melvyn Greenspahn . 1150 Building, Suite 210 1150 Southwest 1 Street Miami, Florida

Re: State v. Luis Crespo, et al Case No. 74-6113

Dear Mr. Greenspahn:

Enclosed please find contact photographs requested from Tom Brodie. Please be advised that wereare not representing that these comprise all photographs taken in the case.

Sincerely,

RICHARD E. GERSTEIN STATE ATTORNEY

By:

JAMES H. WOODARD Assistant State Attorney

JHW:rrl

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF FLORIDA, IN AND FOR DADE COUNTY SPRING TERM, 1974

CASE NO. 74-6113

STATE OF FLORIDA

AMENDED WITNESS LIST

vs.

LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO, HUMBERTO LOPEZ and JUAQUIN MIRANDA,

DEFENDANTS.

Comes Now RICHARD E. GERSTEIN, State Attorney of the Eleventh Judicial Circuit of Florida, by and through the undersigned Assistant State Attorney, and files as Amended Witness List the following:

The additional witnesses which the State may call at the time of trial are as follows:

Ralph Aguirre MPD

James E. Jenkins FBI Lab Washington, D. C.

RICHARD E. GERSTEIN STATE ATTORNEY

> JAMES /H. WOODARD Assistant State Attorney

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true copy of the foregoing Amended Witness List was mailed to Melvyn Greenspahn,
1150 Building, Suite 210, 1150 Southwest 1 Street, Miami,
Florida and Laurence Faye, Concord Building, Suite 306, 66
West Flagler Street, Miami, Florida, this ______ day of
August, 1974.

Assistant State Attorney

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 11TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND FOR DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA

CRIMINAL DIVISION

NO. 74-6/13

TERM OF COURT Spring

)	
)	
)	MOTION FOR SEVERANCE
)	AS TO MIRANDA
)	
)	
))))

COMES NOW the Defendant, Juaquin Miranda, by and through his undersigned counsel and respectfully moves this Honorable Court to sever the Defendant Juaquin Miranda from the other two defendants herein, and as grounds, therefore, would show the great prejudice would result from trying Juaquin Miranda together with the other two defendants.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true copy of the foregoing Motion to Severance was mailed this 26 day of August, 1974, to Assistant State Attorney, Jim Woodard, for the Eleventh Judicial Circuit, 1351 N. W. 12th Street, Miami, Florida, and for Melvyn Greens, Ahn Esq. 1150 S.w. 18757.

Respectfully submitted,

LAURENCE D. FAYE, For the Firm Attorney for Defendant 306 Concord Building 66 West Flagler Street Miami, Florida 33130

LAW OFFICES LAURENCE D. FAYE . 306 CONCORD BLDG. . 66 W. FLAGLER STREET . MIAMI, FLORIDA 33130 . PHONE (305) 379-1808

THE STATE OF FLORIDA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO, HUMBERTO LOPEZ and JUAQUIN MIRANDA

Defendant.

AND/OR STATEMENTS

AS TO MIRANDA

The defendant, <u>Juaquin Miranda</u>, by and through his undersigned attorney, LAURENCE D. FAYE, respectfully moves this Honorable Court pursuant to Rule 3.190 (i) of the Florida Rules of Criminal Procedure to suppress as evidence at the trial in the above styled cause any and all written and oral statements made by the defendant to the police or other agents of the State of Florida, and would state as grounds the following:

- 1. The written and oral statements were obtained from the defendant in violation of the defendant's privilege against self-incrimination and the defendant's right to counsel guaranteed by the Fifth, Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution as interpreted by the United States Supreme Court in Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436, 86 S. Ct. 1602, 16 L. Ed. 3d 694 (1966).
- 2. The statements made by the defendant constitute the fruit of an unlawful arrest of the defendant by the police in violation of the defendant's right of privacy guaranteed by the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, Wong Sun v. United States, 371 U.S. 471, 83 S. Ct. 407, 9 L. Ed 2d 441 (1963); Traub v. Connecticut, 374 U.S. 493, 83 S. Ct. 1899, 10 L. Ed. 2d 1048 (1963); reversing State v. Traub, 187 A. 2d 230 (Conn. 1962); French v. State, 198 So. 2d 668 (Fla. App. 1967).

Law Offices
Laurence D.Faye
Concord Building
Miami, Florida

3. The defendant's statements were not freely and voluntarily given in violation of the defendant's rights guaranteed by Section 12 of the Declaration of Rights of the Florida Constitution and the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

WHEREFORE, the defendant prays this Honorable Court to suppress as evidence at the trial in the above styled cause any and all written and oral statements obtained from the defendant by the police or other agents of the State of Florida.

Respectfully submitted,

LAURENCE D. FAYE Attorney for Defendant 306 Concord Building 66 West Plagler

LAURENCE D. FAYE

Miani, Florida

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true copy of the foregoing Motion to Suppress Confession and/or Statements was mailed this day of August _____, 197<u>4</u> to Assistant State Attorney ____for the Eleventh Judicial Circuit, Jim Woodard Street
1351 N.W. 12th XXXXX, Miami, Florida,
and to Meluya Greensplan Esg. 1/50 S.W. 1575X

1,9m1, FLA

Law Offices Laurence D.Faye Concord Building

Miami, Florida

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 11TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND FOR DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA

CRIMINAL DIVISION

		NO. 74-6/13 ERM OF COURT
THE STATE OF FLORIDA)	
Plaintiff,)	
vs.)	r.
LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO, HUMBERTO LOPEZ and)	MOTION FOR STATEMENT OF PARTICULARS AS TO MIRANDA
JUAQUIN MIRANDA)	
Defendants.)	

COMES NOW the Defendant, Juaquin Miranda, by and through his undersigned attorney, LAURENCE D. FAYE, and respectfully asserts that the discovery filed herein by the State is Lague and ambiguous as applies to the Defendant, Miranda and although said discovery may or may not be sufficient compliance as to the other two defendants herein it is constitutionally Lague as applies to Miranda.

THEREFORE the Defendant, Miranda would respectfully move for discovery that applies solely to him or in the alternative Motion For Severance and separate discovery applicable to him pursuant to the Florida criminal rules of procedure.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true copy of the foregoing

Motion for Statement of Particulars was mailed to Assistant

State Attorney, Jim Woodard for the Eleventh Judicial Circuit

1351 N. W. 12th Street, Miami, Florida this Lo day of

August, 1974, and to Meluyu Greenspahn Ess.

1750 S.w./5757. Miami, Fix.

Respectfully submitted,

LAURENCE D. FAYE, For the Firm Attorney for Defendant 306 Concord Building 66 West Flagler St.
Miami, Florida 33130

Damil TC

LAW OFFICES LAURENCE D. FAYE . 306 CONCORD BLDG. . 66 W. FLAGLER STREET . MIAMI, FLORIDA 33139 . PHONE (305)

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 11TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND FOR DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA

CRIMINAL DIVISION

CASE NO: 74-6113

TERM OF COURT: SPRING

	1.	ERM OF COURT: SPRING
STATE OF FLORIDA,)	.
Plaintiff,)	74 S
-vs-)	MOTION FOR ORDER M.O.V. OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL
LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO, HUMBERTO LOPEZ and JUAQUIN MIRANDA,)	THE ADDRESS FOR THE TRIANGLE AND THE TRI
Defendants,)	38 575.
201001001	`	

COME NOW the Defendants, LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO and HUMBERTO LOPEZ, by and through their undersigned attorney and each Defendant moves new trial herein, for and in that:

- 1. The verdict is contrary to the Law.
- 2. The verdict is contrary to the evidence.
- 3. The verdict is contrary to the law and the evidence.
- 4. The Court erred in permitting the Defendants to be referred to by the prosecuting attorney during the course of the proceedings as "terrorists" said description being unsupported by the material and relevant evidence in the cause and further tending to inflame the passions of the jurors.
- 5. That the Court erred in denying the Defendants Motion for Mistrial when the prosecutor asked the witness, Alfredo Zayus, Jr. whether or not said witness claimed the privilege of the Fifth Amendment at the preliminary hearing wherein Juaquin Miranda was the Defendant. That the Court sustained the objection to the question asked by the prosecutor as aforesaid but the Court's action was not enough to prevent irreversible prejudice in the minds of the jurors as to the Defendants, Crespo and Lopez.
- 6. That the Court erred in refusing prior to the trial of the cause to sever the trial of the Defendants, Crespo and Lopez, from the trial of the codefendant, Juaquin Miranda, in that ultimately and during the course of the trial, the State did

announce to the Court that it did not have sufficient evidence to further proceed against the Defendant, Miranda, and accordingly, upon Defendant's, Miranda, Motion for Judgment of Acquittal, said Defendant was discharged from further prosecution by the effect of relieving Defendant, Miranda, from prosecution in the midst of the trial of the Defendants, Crespo and Lopez, could only have placed in the jurors' minds the prejudicial impression that the Defendants, Crespo and Lopez, were guilty or else the Court would have discharged them as well.

- 7. The Court erred in permitting the prosecution to introduce objects and items which were not ever tied into the case against the Defendants.
- 8. The Court erred in denying the Defendants, Crespo and Lopez, Motion for Judgment of Acquittal at the conclusion of the State's case and at the close of all evidence as to Count I of the Information in that there was not evidence direct or indirect or circumstantial which indicated that the explosive device involved was intended to cause property damage or mortal injury.
- 9. The Court erred in admitting for the prosecution certificates from the Office of the Insurance Commissioner and Fire Marshall of the State of Florida as to each Defendant, which said certificates were not executed in accordance with the Law.

WHEREFORE, and by reason of the foregoing, Defendants, Crespo and Lopez, respectfully move entry of an Order granting Judgment to the Defendants notwithstanding verdict or in the alternative granting each Defendant new trial.

MELVYN GREENSPAHN, P.A. Suite 210-1150 Building 1150 S.W. 1st Street Miami, Florida 33130

W Eluyn Treuspahn

Attorney for Defendants, Crespo & Lopez

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true copy of the foregoing Motion for Order M.O.V. or in the alternative Motion for New Trial, was mailed to the office of the States Attorney, 1351 N.W. 12th Street, Miami, Florida 33125 and the offices of Laurence D. Faye, Esquire 306 Concord Building, 66 W. Flagler, Miami, Florida 33130 this 11th day of September, 1974.

c., . *

MElvyn Streenspahn

in THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 11TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND FOR DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA

TO: OFFICE OF THE STATES ATTORNEY
1351 N.W. 12th Street
Miami, Florida 33125

YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED that Defendant's Motion for On Calendar

Advancement of Sentencingwill be brought on for hearing before the Honorable Arden M. Siegendorf , Judge of the above styled Court, in his chambers at 1351 N.W. 12th Street , Miami, Florida on Monday , October 7, 1974 , at9:00 a..m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard.

PLEASE GOVERN YOURSELF (SELVES) ACCORDINGLY.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true copy of the foregoing Notice of

Hearing was maited hand-delivered to the above addressee this 4th

day of October , 1974 .

MELVYN GREENSPAHN, ESQUIRE Suite 210-1150 Building 1150 S.W. 1st Street Miami, Florida 33130 Tel: XXXXXXXX 545-0487

Attories for Defendant

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 11TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND FOR DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA

CASE NO: 74-6113

CRIMINAL DIVISION

STATE OF FLORIDA,)	
Plaintiff,)	
-vs-)	MOTION FOR ADVANCEMENT OF SENTENCING ON CALENDAR
LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO,)	PEMIENCING ON CUITADEN
Defendant,)	Œ
)	

COMES NOW the Defendant, LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO, by and through his undersigned attorney and moves this Honorable Court to set an immediate date and time for sentencing upon said Defendant pursuant to the verdict rendered against Defendant by a trial jury in the captioned cause on September 6, 1974, for and in that:

- 1. At the time of the rendition of the verdict, the Court set bond upon the Defendant in the sum of \$10,000, said bond being intended to permit Defendant his liberty until the sentencing of the Defendant which was at that time docketed for October 21,1974.
- 2. That Defendant in reliance upon the Court's Order setting bond at \$10,000 did contract with a licensed and authorized bail bondsman and in accordance therewith, a surety bond in the sum of \$10,000 was on September 6, 1974 posted in behalf of the Defendant.
- 3. That in order to obtain the posting of the surety bond as aforesaid, Defendant, who is financially insolvent, was required to pay a bond premium of \$1,000 to the bail bondsman and in addition thereto, to execute a mortgage constituting a lien upon the Defendant's homestead to collateralize said bond.

4. That the Defendant did thereafter at all times while at liberty conduct himself in a manner consistent with the obligation of his bond and did not default therein.

5. That on October 2, 1974, upon the Motion of the State the Court did revoke the bond as previously set upon Defendant and did issue a Capias for the arrest of the Defendant. That on October 3, 1974, the Court did reset bond upon the Defendant in the sum of \$100,000.

- 6. That Defendant is now in the custody of the Public Safety Department of Dade County and is incarcerated in the Dade County Jail.
- 7. That the Defendant is without sufficient means to enable himself to obtain a surety bond in the sum of \$100,000 and is, therefore, unable to obtain his liberty pending sentencing by the Court.
- 8. That the Defendant is not entitled to appellate review of his conviction until such time as the Court disposes of the pending Motion for New Trial made and filed in the Defendant's behalf which said motion is set for hearing before the Court at the same time and upon the same date as the sentencing as heretofore scheduled. That the Defendant is without recourse in challenge of the verdict and the subsequent revocation of bond and resetting of bond.
- 9. That the Defendant suffers infirmities of the body which prevent him from attending his most basic and personal bodily functions and hygenic needs. That while in custody, the Defendant's inability to care for himself is not assisted nor remedied by the personnel at the Dade County Jail. That while Defendant remains incarcerated, he must suffer the greatest of physical discomforts and emotional trauma. That such incarceration of the Defendant constitutes excessive cruel and unusual punishment and is violative of every basic right guaranteed by the Constitution of the State of Florida and the United States of

America.

10. That the Defendant herewith moves and Order of immediate setting of the instant cause for sentencing in accordance with the rules of procedure and the Laws of the State of Florida upon appropriate appellate review and correction of all wrongs perpetrated upon him.

MELVYN GREENSPAHN, P.A. Suite 210-1150 Building 1150 S.W. 1st Street Miami, Florida 33130

Attorney For Defendant

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true copy of the foregoing Motion for Advancement of Sentencing on Calendar was hand-delivered to the office of the States Attorney, 1351 N.W. 12th Street, Miami, Florida 33125 this 4th day of October, 1974.

Melye Greenpale

NOV1 91974 J

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF THE ELEVE

THE STATE OF FLORIDA

VS.# 74-6113-A

LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO

RE-COMMITMENT
ORDER COMMITTING DEFENDANT
TO
THE DIVISION OF MENTAL HEALTH

	S COURT that the defendant,
LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO	in the above cause, has been examined
by a competent physician, pursuant to order of	of this Court,
AND IT FURTHER APPEA	RING UNTO THIS COURT that the said defen-
dant should be committed to theDIVISI	ON OF MENTAL HEALTH
	ECEMBER 3. 1974 Page
for treatment and rehabilitation, until **C**	WEMBER 27, 1974 (190)
IT IS THEREUPON CONSII	DERED, ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the
Sheriff of Dade County, Florida, immediately	transmit the said
LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO	to,the
	ON OF MENTAL HEALTH
and take a receipt therefor.	
IT IS FURTHER ORDEREI	O AND ADJUDGED that the Sheriff place a hold
order with the aforesaid DIVISION	requesting notification
when the said defendant is to be released.	· ·
	OPEN COURT at Miami, Dade County, Florida,
this 19th day of NOVEMBE	TR. A D 10 74

ARDEN M. SIEGENDORF

20° 50

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF FEBRUA, IN AND FOR DADE COUNTY

ORDER COMMITTING DEFENDANT

TO DIVISION OF MENTAL HEALTH

THE STATE OF FLORIDA

VS.# 74-6113-A

LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO

IT APPEARING UNTO THIS COURT that the defendant,
LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO in the above cause, has been examined
by a competent physician, pursuant to order of this Court,
AND IT FURTHER APPEARING UNTO THIS COURT that the said defendant should be committed to the <u>DIVISION OF MENTAL HEALTH</u>
for manufacturation and Medical Examination.
IT IS THEREUPON CONSIDERED, ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the
Sheriff of Dade County, Florida, immediately transmit the said
LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO to the
DIVISION OF MENTAL HEALTH
and take a receipt therefor.
IT IS FURTHER ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the Sheriff place a hold order with the aforesaid <u>DIVISION OF MENTAL HEALTH</u> requesting notification when the said defendant is to be released.

DONE AND ORDERED IN OPEN COURT at Miami, Dade County, Florida,

ARDEN M. SIEGENDORF

JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND FOR DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA

CASE NO: 74-6113

CRIMINAL DIVISION

OCT- 9 1974

Plaintiff,

ORDER

LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO,

Defendant,

JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND FOR DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA

ORDER

OCT- 9 1974

RICHARD P. BRINKER

ORDER

ORDER

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 11TH

مشيع تبوريب سم

THIS CAUSE having come on before the Court upon special setting for sentencing of the Defendant on October 8, 1974, it is ORDERED AND ADJUDGED:

- 1. That the Motion heretofore filed in behalf of the Defendant for Advancement of Sentencing from October 21, 1974 was granted by the Court and the cause set for October 8, 1974.
- 2. That on October 8, 1974, the Court, in order to enable full consideration of all material issues relevant to the sentencing of the Defendant and after rendition of a report by Mr. Suarez of the Florida Parole and Probation Commission, did continue sentencing of the Defendant until November 19, 1974 at 9:00 a.m.
- and committed to the South Florida Hospital for medical and psychiatric evaluation. All reports from any and all examining physicians relating to the medical or psychiatric status of the Defendant, LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO, shall be reduced to writing and forwarded at once to the attention of the undersigned Judge. The States Attorney and the Attorney for the Defendant shall also be provided copies of all such reports.

4. That the Court finds that the Defendant, LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO, has become so weakened by his voluntary fast since incarceration that he cannot meaningfully presently be present before the Court for sentencing. The Court also finds upon the testimony of Mr. Suarez and the medical personnel at the Dade County Jail and upon the observations by the Court of the Defendant in open Court that the Defendant is debilitated. and not desirous of further presending before the Court at this time.

It is further ORDERED AND ADJUDGED That the wife of the Defendant, LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO, namely; OLGA CRESPO, shall be permitted to visit with and attend to the needs of LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO at the South Florida Hospital, Department of Mental Health, so long as such visitations do not interfere with the orderly operations of the hospital or the medical management of the Defendant LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO.

pending admission to the South Florida Hospital, the Defendant,
LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO, shall be transferred from the Dade County
Jail to the medical facility at Jackson Memorial Hospital where
he shall be rendered all necessary medical care.

DONE AND ORDERED in Chambers at Miami, Dade County, Florida this 4 day of October, 1974.

CIRCUIT JUDGE

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF FLORIDA, IN AND FOR DADE COUNTY

74 USA -8 AMUH 1: 03 STIA OH

THE STATE OF FLORIDA

VS. #= 74-6113-A

ORDER COMMITTING DEFENDANT STOR MEDICAL TREATMENT

LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO

IT APPEARING UNTO the Court that the physical condition
of the defendant, Luis Alberto Crespo,
warrants treatment, for which the County Jail is without facilities, it is therefore
ORDERED that the Sheriff of Dade County immediately transmit the defendant to Jackson Memorial Hospital and take a receipt therefor, and it is further
ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the defendant be received and admitted to the aforesaid hospital for Medical treatment
as necessary, by the Staff Doctors of the said hospital for the period of time necessary to
effect the work required, as aforesaid, and it is further
ORDERED that the Sheriff of Dade County place a hold order with the aforesaid hospital, requesting notification when the said defendant is to be released, and upon such notification, the said Sheriff is directed to take and safely return the said defendant to this Court for such further disposition as appropriate.
DONE AND ORDERED at Miami, Dade County, Florida, this the 8th day of October A. D., 1974.
anden n. Jeegender
ARDEN M. SIEGENDORF Indge

FILED AND RECORDED
IN CIRCUIT COURT
MINUTES AS INDICATED HEREON

Richard P. Brinker, Clerk

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 11TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND FOR DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA

CRIMINAL DIVISION

CASE NO. 74-6113

STATE OF FLORIDA,

Plaintiff,

-vs- : ASSIGNMENTS OF ERROR

LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO, :

Defendant, :

COMES NOW the Defendant, LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO, by and through his undersigned attorneys and for Assignment of Error herein does state:

- 1. That notwithstanding the continued and repeated objections of the Defendant throughout the entire course of the trial proceedings herein, the Court permitted the prosecuting attorney in the presence of the jury to refer to the Defendant and to allude to the Defendant as a "terrorist", said description being wholly prejudicial and inflamatory to the Defendant and implanting in the jurors' minds an image not supported by, or consistent with the evidence.
- 2. That from the inception of the impanelment of the jury, throughout the course of the trial and in the State's closing argument the Defendant was described as a "terrorist", and his activities were likened to those of international terrorists, whose daily activities were during the course of the trial of the instant cause, being chronicled in the press and on television. The effect of the constant reference to the Defendant as a "terrorist" upon the jury so prejudiced and inflamed the jury as to deprive the Defendant of a fair trial.
 - 3. The Court erred notwithstanding the objections

by the Defendant, in permitting said references to be repeatedly made throughout.

- 4. The Court erred in denying Defendant's Motion for Mistrial when the prosecutor directly asked the witness Alfredo Zayus, Jr., whether or not said witness had claimed the privilege of the Fifth Amendment at the preliminary hearing wherein Joaquin Miranda was a named Defendant. Notwithstanding the fact that the Court did sustain the Defendant's objections to the question, the question in and of itself was of such inflamatory and prejudicial nature as related to the Defendant CRESPO, that the Court's action in sustaining the objection was not enough to prevent irreversible prejudice in the minds of the jurors as to the Defendant CRESPO.
- 5. That the Court erred in refusing prior to the trial of the cause to sever the trial of the Defendants CRESPO & LOPEZ, from that of the Co-Defendant, Joaquin Miranda, in that ultimately and during the course of the trial the State did announce to the Court that it did not have sufficient evidence to further proceed against the Defendant Miranda and accordingly upon Defendant Miranda's Motion for Judgment of Acquittal, said Defendant Miranda was discharged from further prosecution. The effect of relieving Defendant Miranda from continuing prosecution in the midst of the trial of the Defendant Crespo, could only have placed in the jurors' minds the prejudicial impression and inference that the Defendant Crespo was guilty, otherwise the Court would have discharged him, as well as the Defendant Miranda. The State's Attorney knew prior to the commencement of the trial that the State did not have sufficient evidence

or a reasonable basis for the further prosecution of the Defendant, Miranda, but in lumping the Defendant Miranda together with the Defendant Crespo, created an aura about the Defendant Crespo, of guilt as opposed to the obvious inference upon discharge that the Defendant Miranda, in the consideration of the Court was not guilty.

The Court erred in permitting the prosecution to introduce objects and items which were not ever tied into the case against the Defendant Crespo, and which were wholly irrelevant to the Defendant Crespo. As an example the Defendant would cite a prosecution exhibit introduced by the witness Thomas Browey, which was a mock up purporting to be similar to the explosive device alleged by the State to have been in possession of the Defendant. By the witness's own testimony the exhibit was constructed to different dimensions than those alleged to have existed in the destructive device allegedly possessed by the Defendant and much was made by the witness of the model device in demonstration to the jury. Many of the photographs introduced by the State were duplicitous and depicted many items that were never introduced in evidence. Receipts never tied into the Defendant were admitted in evidence,-wrapping which was never tied into the Defendant, was received in evidence. Much was made by the prosecution of the dangerous propensities of the "C-4" explosive, allegedly used in the instant incident, and the Court refused the presentment of the specimens allegedly obtained by the prosecution, notwithstanding the fact that an agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, testified that such specimens had been shipped by Railway Express from Miami to the Federal Bureau of Investigation Laboratory in Washington. Such specimens had been shipped by Railway Express from Miami to the Federal Bureau of Investigation Laboratory in Washington. Apparently, the

-3-

Federal Bureau of Investigation did not consider the propensities of the alleged explosives to be of any quality of danger. The jurors could not help but visualize the "C-4", as a large and extremely volatile explosive and the Defendant was deprived of the opportunity of examination by the jury of the substance alleged to be "C-4". Also introduced were various irrelevant books and computer print-outs relating to shipment of books which were in no way related to the pending charges.

- That the Court erred in denying the Defendant Crespo's Motion for Judgment of Acquittal at the conclusion of the State's case and at the close of all evidence as to Count I, of the information in that there was not evidence, direct, indirect or circumstancial which indicated that the explosive device was intended to cause property damage or mortal injury. That the Court inferred without substantive, competent or corraborative evidence of any kind presented by the State, that the existance of the explosive device presumed and intended use for the purpose of bring about injury or property damage. That the State did not meet its burden of proof as to the intentions, if any, of the Defendant as to the usage of the explosive device. That a Judgment of Acquittal properly should have been entered upon Count I, and in favor of the Defendant and the finding and ultimate adjudication of guilty as to Count I, were contrary to law.
- 8. That the sentence imposed upon the adjudication of guilt as to Count I, of the Defendant was contrary to law by reason of the fact that the State had not presented a prima facia case against the Defendant as to the allegations in Count I.
 - 9. The Court erred in admitting into evidence for the

prosecution, certificates from the office of the Insurance Commissioner and the Fire Marshall of the Sate of Florida, as to the Defendant, which said certificates were not executed in accordance with the law.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing Assignments of Error has been delivered to the State Attorney's Office, 1351 N. W. 12th Street, Miami, Florida, 33129, this 8th day of January, 1975.

MELVYN GREENSPAHN, P. A. Attorneys for Defendant Crespo Suite 210, Eleven Fifty Building 1150 S. W. First Street Miami, Florida 33130

By

DEFENDING CREEP, 2015 BLAKERTO DEFENDING CREEP, 2015 BLAKERTO DEFONDED CONTROL DISPOSITION OF EVENERE FOR DESCRIPTION DISPOSITION OF EVENERE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION LIST ALL EVENERE S	DISPOSE OF ON: 8/29/75	DISTITS JUDGE SIEGENDORF			
CASE 1 74-6113 LOCATION SAFE CASE 1 74-6113 LOCATION SAFE CASE 1 74-6113 LOCATION SAFE DATE OF SENTENCHINE 10/21/14 PERMARKS DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE (9) JUDICE ST. 17 S. 16 ST. 17 S. 17 ST. 17 S. 17 ST. 17 S. 17		12-12-75			
DATE OF SENTENCING 10 21 14 15 15 15 15 15 15 1	(B) HUMBERTO LOPEZ	FLADIO LOPEZ			
DATE OF SENTENCE 10 21 17 9 CA ORDER DISMISSING APPEAL FICE a 76/15 DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE TO: ORDER & DATE SHERIFF DESTROY OTHER LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE TO: ORDER & DATE LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION CASE # TY-01/3 D LOCATION DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE TO: ORDER & DATE DISPOSITION CHARLES TO ME CONTROL TO ME CONTRO	CASE # LOCATION ASSAFE -	CLERK			
DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE ORDER & DATE SHERITF DESTROY ORDER & DATE LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION DEFENDANT DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE ORDER & DATE DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE ORDER & DATE DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SID	DATE OF SENTENCEN (0) 21) 24 REMARKS FIND. 1) 6	CUILT - VERNICT			
TO: ORDER & DATE EXHIBIT # DATE RECEIPT SHERIFF DESTROY OTHER LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION LIST ORDER & DATE DISPOSE OF ON: HOLE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION CASE # TY-0113 B LOCATION DISPOSE OF ORDER & DATE DISPOSED OF: TO: ORDER & DATE LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND 21 1874, ORDER LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION PLANE CIRCULATION OTHER OTHER OTHER OTHER DATE RECEIPT	DCA ORDER DISMISSING APPEAL FICED ON 7/1/75	APPEN 12-12-75 73-5087			
TO: ORDER & DATE EXHIBIT # DATE RECEIPT SHERIFF DESTROY OTHER LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION LIST ORDER & DATE DISPOSE OF ON: HOLE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION CASE # TY-0113 B LOCATION DISPOSE OF ORDER & DATE DISPOSED OF: TO: ORDER & DATE LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND 21 1874, ORDER LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION PLANE CIRCULATION OTHER OTHER OTHER OTHER DATE RECEIPT	DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE (C) guaguin m.	randa Acquitted 9-4-74 NOLEA DISPOSED OF:			
DESTROY ORDINATED STATE TOTHER LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION DEFENDANT DEFENDANT DEFENDANT DISPOSET OF ON: DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE TO: ORDER & DATE DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE EXHIBIT: DATE DISPOSED OF: RECEIPT TOTHER LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION CIRACTORISE LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND COMPANY OF MANY OF MA		[]			
OTHER S-27-077 LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION DISPOSE OF ON: LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION CASE : TY-GII30 B LOCATION DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE TO: ORDER & DATE DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE TO: ORDER & DATE DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE EXHIBIT : DATE DISPOSITION RETURN OTHER LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLORED DATE TO SECRIPT TOM G-13-77 BREDIE PSD OTHER AND COMPANY RETURN OTHER AND COMPANY AND COMPANY RETURN OTHER AND COMPANY AND COMPA	SHERIFF				
LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION (WAD TO REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION CASE; 74-61130 B LOCATION DATE OF SENTENCE REMARKS DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE TO: ORDER & DATE DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE EXHIBIT # DATE RECEIPT SHERIFF DESTROY RETURN OTHER CIR/CT/CRI 66 LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION HOW ELL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION HOW ELL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION HOW ELL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION HOW ELL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION HOW ELL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DES	DESTROY				
LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION (WAD TO REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION CASE; 74-61130 B LOCATION DATE OF SENTENCE REMARKS DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE TO: ORDER & DATE DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE EXHIBIT # DATE RECEIPT SHERIFF DESTROY RETURN OTHER CIR/CT/CRI 66 LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION HOW ELL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION HOW ELL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION HOW ELL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION HOW ELL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION HOW ELL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION AND CLARGE DATE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ROLL STALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DES	Order Ling signed	6-13-77 Brodie DSD			
LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION DESPOSE OF ON: LOCATION DEFENDANT LOPEZ, HUMIOFETO CASE # 74-01/30 B LOCATION DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE TO: ORDER & DATE EXHIBIT # DATE DISPOSED OF: RECEIPT RECEIPT RECEIPT TOTHER LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION ROV 21 15/15/4 OMBANT ROV	RETORN	for all physical widence			
DISPOSE OF ON: HOLL DESPOSE OF ON: HOLL DEFENDANT DEFENDANT DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE TO: ORDER & DATE DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE TO: ORDER & DATE DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE TO: ORDER & DATE EXHIBIT: DESTROY RETURN OTHER LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION HOVE 1 1514, ORDER 1213 TH. HOVE 1 1514, ORDER 1213 TH. WHAT Place tell Mounts to func.	OTHER				
DISPOSE OF ON: HOLL DESPOSE OF ON: HOLL DEFENDANT DEFENDANT DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE TO: ORDER & DATE DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE TO: ORDER & DATE DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE TO: ORDER & DATE EXHIBIT: DESTROY RETURN OTHER LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION HOVE 1 1514, ORDER 1213 TH. HOVE 1 1514, ORDER 1213 TH. WHAT Place tell Mounts to func.					
DEFENDANT LOPEZ, HUMINERO CASE # 74-0113 B LOCATION DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE TO: ORDER & DATE SHERIFF DESTROY RETURN OTHER LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION HOW 21 18/4, Omner 18/2/2/2/2/2/2/2/2/2/2/2/2/2/2/2/2/2/2/2					
DEFENDANT LOPEZ, HUMBERTO CASE # 74-61/3 B LOCATION DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE ORDER & DATE DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE ORDER & DATE EXHIBIT # DATE DISPOSED OF: RECEIPT RECEIPT RECEIPT TOM G-13-77 RECEIPT TOM G-13-77 BRODIE PSD LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION NOV 21 1974, DATE ROY 21 1974, DATE ROY 21 1974, DATE ROY 21 1974, DATE Please tel Mouth to putting the property of the part of the p					
DEFENDANT LOPEZ, HUMBERTO CASE: 74-61/3 B LOCATION DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE TO: ORDER & DATE DISPOSITION OF EXHIBIT: DESTROY RETURN OTHER LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION HOV 21 1974, DATE Place tel Monte to fruit	DISPOSE OF ON: Hall	JUDGE Siegenden			
DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE TO: ORDER & DATE EXHIBIT # DATE BECEIPT SHERIFF DESTROY RETURN OTHER LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION HAND ROY 21 1514, DATE RECEIPT HOW 22 1514, DATE HOV 21 1514, DATE PLEASE TELL HOV 21 1514, DATE PLEASE TELL HOW 21 1514, DATE PLEAS					
DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE TO: ORDER & DATE EXHIBIT # DISPOSED OF: RECEIPT SHERIFF DESTROY RETURN OTHER LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION HOV 21 1914 ROW 21 1914	DEFENDANT LOPEZ, HUMBERTO				
DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE ORDER & DATE TO: ORDER & DATE EXHIBIT # DATE RECEIPT TOM 6-13-77 BRODIE PSD LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION ROY 21 1914, OMNITATION HOV 21 1914, OMNITATION ROY 21 1914, OMNITATION Please tell Month to June 12 1 1914, OMNITATION Please tell Month to June 12 1 1914, OMNITATION NOW 21 1914, OMNITATION NOW 21 1914, OMNITATION Please tell Month to June 12 1 1914, OMNITATION NOW 21 1914, O	CASE # 74-6113 B LOCATION CAFE	CLERK LOPEZ, E			
DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE ORDER & DATE TO: ORDER & DATE EXHIBIT # DATE RECEIPT TOM 6-13-77 BRODIE PSD LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION ROY 21 1914, OMNITATION HOV 21 1914, OMNITATION ROY 21 1914, OMNITATION Please tell Month to June 12 1 1914, OMNITATION Please tell Month to June 12 1 1914, OMNITATION NOW 21 1914, OMNITATION NOW 21 1914, OMNITATION Please tell Month to June 12 1 1914, OMNITATION NOW 21 1914, O	DATE OF SENTENCE DEMADES	Silvino ·			
TO: ORDER & DATE SHERIFF DESTROY RETURN OTHER LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION NOV 21 1974 annuly ROY 2	DATE OF SENTENCE REMARKS				
TO: ORDER & DATE SHERIFF DESTROY RETURN OTHER LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION NOV 21 1974 annuly ROY 2	DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE	DISPOSED OF:			
DESTROY RETURN OTHER LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION NOV 21 1914 Control for August June And 1219 The second of					
CIR/CT/CRI 66 LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION HOV 21 1974 on and 74 Control and 12 and 12 Please tell Month to Juntary Marin D. M. H. not to Jungar	SHERIFF				
OTHER LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION NOV 21 1974, annual 1213/14. Control and 1213/14. Please tell Monte to June 1213/14. Please tell Monte to June 1213/14. Marin D. M. H. not to June	DESTROY				
LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION 12/3/79 Lun Cuspo changed date MOV 21 1974 to annulate The contract of the	Deminy	RECEIPT TOM			
LIST ALL EVIDENCE ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPTION 12/3/7/ Lucy changed date NOV 21 1974, annual 74. Control for had 12/3/14. Please tell month to sure to fruit MANN D. M. H. not to fruit	I HAL	0,000			
In Cuspo changed date HOV 21 1974, annual 74. Control of North of Many 1974. Please tel month to fruit	OTHER				
In Cuspo changed date HOV 21 1974, annual 74. Control of North of Many 1974. Please tel month to fruit					
2 12/3/79 2 2 100 Changed date HOV 21 1974, amul 14. Matthet J. Cantra rad 12/3/14. Please tell month to present the present of the prese	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
Line Crops changed date HOV 21 1974, amental. The Control of the property of 12/3/14. Please tell month to grand of so. Fly. reform D. M. H. not to fruit	CIR/CT/CRI 66 ON REVERSE SIDE BY DESCRIPT	ION			
Line Crops changed date HOV 21 1974, amental. The Control of the property of 12/3/14. Please tell month to grand of so. Fly. reform D. M. H. not to fruit		Manus Constant of Manus S and P &			
Line Crops changed date HOV 21 1974, amental. The Control of the property of 12/3/14. Please tell month to grand of so. Fly. reform D. M. H. not to fruit					
Please tell moute to Just and 12/3/1. Moute to free t	$\gg 12/3/74$				
Please tell moute to Just and 12/3/1. Moute to free t					
Please tell moute to Just and 12/3/1. Moute to free t	(Line (usp) chanced Date				
Please tell moute to Just and 12/3/1. Moute to free t	The same	and			
reform D. M. H. not to frence	HOV 21 19/47, am 17/4.				
reform D. M. H. not to frence	Walther J. Can To Man & Lun				
reform D. M. H. not to frence	rider bid & S. Fly.				
reform D. M. H. not to frence	Please tell month to returned"				
the prisoner bock to Court					
until that date. (ant 11/27)	the prisoner bock to Con	y of			
	In ton) . Itab talt literer	27)			

STATE'S EXHIBITS	STATE'S EXHIBITS
#h- Tape Remaing - Casette.	#8- Red Book "The British at the Hates"
	10 Table tope (WORK BENCH).
	27 LARGE SKETCH FLOOR PLAN G
	29- Paper Bag conta BALL STRING TOLL
	30. Bag cout & tragments of Book + Boper.
	31. Clastic Bag Coul'y fragments of Brok + Paper.
	32. Plastic Cur. coul's relipte + tapes.
	33. Plastic Bay Cout of Street. items
	34. Cur. Conta misc. items 35. Plastic Bay Conta tragments + Wire
	Brank Adams Soft Magnette + Wire
	MX MOA STORM COLOR IN COLOR IN COLOR
	38. Book " The British at the Hoter"
DEFENDANT'S EXHIBITS	DEFENDANT'S EXHIBITS
#	# B- Book - Worlds Druntest Johns NOW

Casefile

Cuteria: il for	IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 11TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND FOR DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA	
(1) seventy of a offerse	CASE NO: 74-6113	
(2) as def. flex.	CRIMINAL DIVISION	
(3) 2 m Convilion - no respect Plaintiff, for u.S.	FILEN FOR	
-VS-) MOTION TO SET SUPERSEDEAS A	
LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO,	OR APPEAL BOND UPON DEFENDANT,) LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO	
Defendant,)	
)	

COMES NOW the Defendant, LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO, by and through his undersigned attorney and moves this Honorable Court to set reasonable Supersedeas or Appeal Bond upon the Defendant. Further, Defendant would offer in support of said Motion, the following:

- 1. That Defendant does incorporate and by reference make a part hereof each and every of the allegations set forth in that certain Motion for Advancement of Sentencing on Calendar heretofore filed in behalf of the Defendant, a true copy of same being attached hereto as Exhibit 1.
- 2. That the Defendant is wholly without means, directly or indirectly, of obtaining and posting a cash or surety bond of substantial proportion. The Defendant was required to collateralize the original \$10,000 bond placed upon him pending sentencing with an all encompassing mortgage upon his home and the real estate upon which it is situate. There yet remains no further equity in said home by Defendant or his wife.
- 3. That Defendant does not have available to him any sources of ready money and Defendant has become well-nigh insolvent in the expenditure of the sum of \$1,000 as and for bond premium previously paid and further in the expenditure of all monies

available to Defendant for the living expenses of the Defendant's wife and children since the date of the incident for which the Defendant stands convicted.

- 4. That the Court consider the criteria of the determination of amount of bond to be set in accordance with Younghans vs.

 State, 90 So.2d, 308 and further, in accordance with the Florida

 Rule of Criminal Procedure 3.691.
- 5. That there has never at any time been adduced any evidence whatsoever of non compliance or intent to non comply by the Defendant with all past and further Orders and Obligations including but not limited to appearance, imposed upon the Defendant by the Court and the judicial process. That Defendant should be granted an appellate bond in an amount reasonable to his circumstances and not disproportionate thereto otherwise the setting of said bond, as unreasonable, is punitive in nature, depriving Defendant of fair, adequate and reasonable protection against an abuse of judicial power.
- 6. That the Defendant is wholly without means of caring for himself and the State Penal System is entirely without means of caring for the physical and emotional needs of the defendant. That in accordance with the testimony adduced by the State at the time of sentencing herein, it is entirely probable that further penal confinement can only serve as a fixative of any formed attitudes, complexes or psychological aberrations which have, or will attach to the Defendant and no useful purpose can be served by requiring Defendant to remain in custody during such period of time as his appeal pends. That the appeal to be filed and pursued in behalf of the Defendant is based upon meritorious ground and is subject to scrutiny and possible reversal by the Appellate Court

and it constitutes grave and cruel injustice to require the Defendant, who is so seriously and permanently injured, to remain in custody without proper attendance upon him.

WHEREFORE, Defendant moves entry of an Order setting upon said Defendant reasonable and minimal appellate bond pending full and complete judicial review in accordance with the Laws of the State of Florida and the Rules of Criminal and Appellate Procedure therein.

MELVYN GREENSPAHN, P.A. Suite 210-1150 Building 1150 S.W. 1st Street Miami, Florida 33130

Melyn Theenspelin

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true copy of the foregoing Motion to Set Supersedeas or Appeal Bond Upon Defendant, LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO, was hand-delivered to the office of the States Attorney, 1351 N.W. 12th Street, Miami, Florida this 19th day of December,

1974.

CASE NO. 74-6113

STATE OF FLORIDA

RECORDED

vs.

LUIS CRESPO,

DEFENDANT.

JAN 17 1975

RICHARD P. BRINKER

ORDER DENYING
SUPERSEDEAS BOND

THIS CAUSE having come on to be heard in Open

Court, pursuant to notice, on the 8th day of January, 1975, on the Defendant's Motion to Set Supersedeas Bond, the Court having considered testimony and evidence previously received, the argument of counsel and being otherwise fully advised in the premises, finds as follows:

- 1. That the Defendant and his co-defendant, one Humberto Lopez, were found guilty by a jury on the 6th day of September, 1974, of the Unlawful Possession of Plastic Explosives with the Intent to Harm Life, Limb or Property and the Unlawful Possession of Plastic Explosives without a Permit.
- 2. That the Defendant was adjudicated guilty of the above listed felonies and sentenced to five years in the State Prison on the 5th day of December, 1974.
- 3. That the evidence adduced at the trial of this case clearly showed that the Defendant and Humberto Lopez were actively engaged in terrorist activity in concert with one another and were in the process of manufacturing a bomb hidden in a book.
- 4. That Humberto Lopez, subsequent to the finding of guilt on the 6th day of September, 1974, and prior to the pronouncement of adjudication and sentence, issued a tape recorded message to the news media professing membership in the National Front for the Liberation of Cuba, commonly known as the FLNC and fled the jurisdiction of the Court forfeiting a \$10,000 surety bond.

5. That the Defendant plead nolo contendre on the 30th day of July, 1970, to the Unlawful Possession of Explosives and the Unlawful Possession of Machine Guns in Case No. 70-907 and was sentenced to three years probation on a withholding of adjudication.

6. That psychiatric examinations of the Defendant reveal:

- 2. That, "his tenacious, circumscribe, asocial behavior most likely would persistently continue. . ." (Report of Dr. Benito Hernandez 11/25/74)
- b. That the Defendant, ". . . is preoccupied with the cause of liberating Cuba
 and. . . refuses to consider any other laws
 that interfere with this patriotism."

 (Report of Dr. C. B. Mahon, 11/8/74, incorporating the findings of Dr. Hahn, Division
 of Mental Health.)
- 7. That the severity of the sentence imposed, together with other above enumerated facts, indicates a likelihood that the Defendant will flee the jurisdiction of the Court.
- 8. That it is the opinion of this Court that the Defendant will continue his unlawful activity and constitute a serious threat to the well being of the community.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the Defendant's Motion for Supersedeas Bond be and the same is hereby DENIED and the Defendant is remanded to the custody of the proper authorities to continue serving his sentence in the above styled cause.

DONE AND ORDERED in Open Court at Miami, Dade County, Florida this the ____ day of January, 1975.

ARDEN STEGENDORF CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 11TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND FOR DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA

CASE NO: 74-6113

STATE OF FLORIDA,)	774 CL.
Plaintiff,)	
)	
-Vs-)	NOTICE OF HEARING
LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO,)	23
Defendant,)	
)	

TO: JAMES H. WOODWARD, ESQUIRE
ASSISTANT STATE ATTORNEY
Metropolitan Justice Building
1351 N. W. 12th Street
Miami, Florida 33125

Appeal Bond will be brought on for hearing before the Honorable ARDEN M. SIEGENDORF , Judge of the above styled Court, in his chambers at 1351 N. W. 12th Street , Miami, Florida on Wednesday , January 8th, 1975, at 9:00 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard.

PLEASE GOVERN YOURSELF (SELVES) ACCORDINGLY.

MELVYN GREENSPAHN, ESQUIRE Suite 210-1150 Building 1150 S.W. 1st Street Miami, Florida 33130 Tel: 371x0691 545-0487

NIA Y

BY:

٠٠,

OCT 6 1975

RICHARD P. BRINKER

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF FLORIDA IN AND FOR DADE COUNTY SPRING TERM, 1975

CASE NO. 74-6113A

STATE OF FLORIDA

VS.

:

LUIS CRESPO,

ORDER DENYING MOTION

FOR MITIGATION OF

SENTENCE

DEFENDANT. :

THIS CAUSE HAVING COME before me in Open Court on the Defendant's Motion to Mitigate the Sentence heretofore entered, and the Court being specifically advised as follows:

- 1. That the Defendant was adjudicated guilty and sentenced on the 5th day of December, 1974.
- 2. That on the 19th day of December, 1974, the Defendant filed his Notice of Appeal.
- 3. That on the 1st day of July, 1975, the Defendant's appeal was discharged.
- 4. That on the 8th day of August, 1975, the Defendant filed his Motion to Mitigate and timely set the Motion for Hearing before me for the 15th day of August, 1975.
- 5. That on the 15th day of August, 1975, the matter was not heard due to the illness of counsel.
- 6. That the Motion was next called for hearing the 1st day of October, 1975, more than sixty days after the receipt by this Court of the Order of the Third District Court of Appeal dismissing the appeal.

It is therefore ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that this Court lacks jurisdiction, under Rule 3.800(b) Rules of Criminal Procedure as interpreted by <u>State v. Evans</u>, 225 So. 2d 548, to consider the Defendant's Motion.

DONE AND ORDERED at Miami, Dade County, Florida, this day of October, 1975.

ARDEN M. SIEGENDORF CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 11TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND FOR DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA

CASE NO: 74-6113-A

CRIMINAL DIVISION

THE STATE OF FLORIDA,

Plaintiff,

NOTICE OF HEARING

-vs-

LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO,

Defendant,

TO: HONORABLE JAMES WOODARD State Attorneys Office 1351 N. W. 12th Street Miami, Florida

YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED that a Motion for Mitigation

will be brought on for hearing before the Honorable Arden M. Siegendorf , Judge of the above styled Court, in his chambers at 1351 N. W. 12th Street , Miami, Florida on Wednesday , October 1st , at10:00 .m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard.

PLEASE GOVERN YOURSELF (SELVES) ACCORDINGLY.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true copy of the foregoing Notice of Hearing was mailed handwdebbwereck to the above addressee this 16th day of <u>September</u>, 19 75.

> MELVYN GREENSPAHN, ESQUIRE Suite 210-1150 Building 1150 S.W. 1st Street Miami, Florida 33130 Tel: 3200e0690x

> > Defendant Defendant

FILTO FOR RECOVE

COUNTY, FLORIDA

CASE NO: 74-6113(A)

CRIMINAL DIVISION
)

Plaintiff,
)

-vs)

LUIS A. CRESPO,
)

NOTICE OF HEARING
Defendant,
)

(Eg. 75

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 11TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND FOR DADE

TO: OFFICE OF THE STATES ATTORNEY
1351 N.W. 12th Street
Miami, Florida

ر الح الحاسمة

YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED that Defendant's Motion for
Mitigation of Sentence will be brought on for hearing before the
Honorable Arden M. Siegendorf , Judge of the above styled
Court, in his chambers at 1351 N.W. 12th Street , Miami,
Florida on Friday , August 15, 1975 , at 10:00 am., or as
soon thereafter as the matter may be heard.

PLEASE GOVERN YOURSELF (SELVES) ACCORDINGLY.

> MELVYN GREENSPAHN, ESQUIRE Suite 210-1150 Building 1150 S.W. 1st Street Miami, Florida 33130 Tel: XXXXXXXX 545-0487

(AM)

ttorney for Defendan

IN	THE	CI	RCUIT	CC	URI	OF	THE	11TH
JUI	DICIA	L	CIRCU	${f T}$	IN	AND	FOR	DADE
COL	NTY,	F	LORID	A				

CRIMINAL DIVISION

		CASE	NO:	74-6113(A)		
STATE	E OF FLORIDA,)				
	Plaintiff,)				
-vs	5 –)	MOTIO	N FOR MITI SENTENCE		OF
LUIS	A. CRESPO,)			CLER ³²³	75
	Defendant,)			DADE C	AUG
					O2=2	ŧ

COMES NOW the Defendant, LUIS A. CRESPO, by and through this undersigned attorney and moves this Honorable Court to enter its Order mitigating the sentence of the Defendant, for and in that:

- 1. The Defendant has been in penal custody and subsequent to sentencing, has remained in incarceration having been first incarcerated at the Lake Butler Florida Prison Facility and thereafter and presently, at the Belle Glade Florida Prison Facility.
- 2. That the Defendant has been penally incarcerated for well-nigh one year and has been subjected to grievous and terrible losses as a result thereof.
- 3. That Defendant's crippling and disabling injuries have prevented him from engaging in normal and usual prison activities and such injuries have continued to impair and hinder Defendant's ability to look after himself even in the most fundamental, essential matters of personal hygiene.
- 4. That Defendant is without any source of income and while in prison can do nothing to earn or acquire monies to maintain his wife and children. That, save for the diminishing

charity of close family members whose resources are limited, the wife and children of the Defendant would be totally dependent upon the community.

- 5. That the Defendant has been punished severely enough and the privations and humiliations coupled with the agony of his injuries have fully exacted from the Defendant society's damage that the Defendant be punished for his wrongdoing.
- 6. That no useful purpose to rehabilitate, to obtain retribution or to deter others can be further served by the continued incarceration of the Defendant.

Counsel for the Defendant does respectfully suggest that
the axium that "The Law is Just" should be tempered by the
further axium that "The Law is Merciful". To further continue
the imprisonment of the Defendant can serve no purpose,
commendable or otherwise, and can only serve to exact a far greater
retribution by society upon the Defendant than should be permitted.
That there is a thin line between just punishment and cruel and
inhumane punishment. The line separating one from the other will
have been breached if the Defendant is further required to
remain incarcerated.

7. The manifest interest of justice and the humane instinct of man can only be served by mitigation of the Defendant's sentence and his release from penal custody upon such terms and conditions as to the Court are mete and proper.

WHEREFORE, the Defendant moves entry of an Order mitigating sentence herein and releasing Defendant from further incarceration.

MELVYN GREENSPAHN, ESQUIRE Suite 210-1150 Building 1150 S.W. 1st Street

Miami, Florida 33130 (545-0487)

Attorney for Defendant

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true copy of the foregoing Motion for Mitigation of Sentence was mailed to the office of the States Attorney, 1351 N.W. 12th Street, Miami, Florida this

_day of August, 1975.

ELVYN CREENSPAHN

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE
11TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND
FOR DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA
74
CASE NO: 75-6113

CRIMINAL DIVISION
)
Plaintiff,
)

-VS
HUMBERTO LOPEZ,
Defendant,

Defendant,

TO: JAMES WOODARD, ESQUIRE

Wand _

Sentence will be brought on for hearing before the Honorable Arden Siegendorf , Judge of the above styled Court, in his chambers at 1351 N. W. 12th Street , Miami, Florida on Friday , December 12, 1975 , at 12:00noom, or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard.

PLEASE GOVERN YOURSELF (SELVES) ACCORDINGLY.

1351 N. W. 12th Street

Miami, Florida

MELVYN GREENSPAHN, ESQUIRE Suite 210-1150 Building 1150 S.W. 1st Street Miami, Florida 33130 Tel: 37138691x 545-0487

BY:

torney for

Dofonday

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 11TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND FOR DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA

CRIMINAL DIVISION

CASE NO. 74-6113

STATE OF FLORIDA,

Plaintiff, :

-vs- : <u>MOTION TO MITIGATE</u>

HUMBERTO LOPEZ, :

Defendant, :

.....

COMES NOW the Defendant, HUMBERTO LOPEZ, by and through his undersigned attorney and hereby files this his Motion for Mitigation of sentence imposed herein, for and in that:

1. Sentence imposed by the Court was harsh and excessive.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing has been mailed to the office of the State Attorneys, 1351 N. W. 12th Street, Miami, Florida, this 24th day of November, 1975.

MELVYN GREENSPAHN, P. A. Suite 210, 1150 Building 1150 S. W. First Street

Miami, Florida 33130

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 11TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND FOR DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA

CASE NO: 74-6113

CRIMINAL DIVISION

STATE OF FLORIDA,

Plaintiff,

-vs-

LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO,

NOTICE OF HEARING

Defendant,

TO: JIM WOODARD, ESQUIRE
Assistant State Attorney
Metropolitan Justice Building
1351 N. W. 12th Street
Miami, Florida

YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED that Defendant's Motion for Direction & Adjudication of Insolvencial be brought on for hearing before the Honorable Arden M. Siegendorf , Judge of the above styled Court, in his chambers at 1351 N. W. 12th Street , Miami, Florida on Wednesday , January 22, 1975 , at 9:00 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard.

PLEASE GOVERN YOURSELF (SELVES) ACCORDINGLY.

> MELVYN GREENSPAHN, ESQUIRE Suite 210-1150 Building 1150 S.W. 1st Street Miami, Florida 33130 Tel: 237240691 545-0487

Attorney for Defendar

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 11TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT IN AND FOR DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA

CRIMINAL DIVISION

CASE NO. 74-6113

STATE OF FLORIDA,

Plaintiff,

-vs-

LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO,

Defendant,

MOTION OF THE DEFENDANT

FOR ADJUDICATION OF INSOLVENCY

AS TO TRANSCRIPT OF THE PRO-

CEEDINGS

COMES NOW the Defendant LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO, by and through his undersigned attorney and moves this Honorable Court to enter its Order adjudicating the Defendant, pursuant to Rule 6.8, of the Florida Rules of Criminal Appeals, to be insolvent and thereupon further ordering the State of Florida and Dade County, Florida, to pay the cost necessary upon Appeal, for the transcript of the trial proceeding and copies thereof. The Defendant would allege:

- 1. That the Defendant is incarcerated in the State
 Penal System, pursuant to conviction in the instant cause.
- 2. That the Defendant has made and taken notice of appeal in the instant cause, of the conviction therein obtained, notice of appeal being filed on December 19, 1974.
- 3. That the Defendant is by virtue of his incarceration unemployed.
- 4. That the Defendant has been mutilated and disfigured by reason of the explosion, the subject matter of the instant cause, and has no earning capacity.
- 5. That the Defendant by reason of his crippling injuries has sustained medical and hospital expense of enormous

portions and Dade County, by and through Jackson Memorial Hospital has asserted a lien against the Defendant to the extent of a great sum of money, which said lien remains unsatisfied by reason of the Defendant's insolvency.

Jul - .

- 6. That the Defendant possesses no assets, although he is the titled owner of an undivided one half interest of his residential home, said title being held by the Defendant and his wife as tenants by the entireties. That there is little if any equity in the home. That the Defendant's Wife and two children are without income or support and rely heavily upon the kindness of others in the community and family, in order to sustain themselves.
- 7. That substantial efforts have been made to obtain contribution of monies for the purpose of paying the legal costs and fees required to further and dilligently prosecute the appeal herein, but the community's response has been without success.
- 8. That the undersigned attorney, as attorney for the Defendant from the inception of the instant proceedings and through trial has, by reason of ethical obligation, agreed to proceed in the appellate phase of the case without demand of fee and has in fact, received no fee payment for services rendered therein.
- 9. That the Defendant cannot perfect his record on appeal without the full and complete transcription of the reporters' notes herein.

WHEREFORE, Appellant/Defendant LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO, respectfully moves for the entry of an Order adjudicating him insolvent for appellate purposes and ordering the cost

of the court reporter's notes herein to be born by the County of Dade or the State of Florida.

2 5 6 1

WE HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing has been hand-delivered to the State's Attorney Office, 1351 N. W. 12th Street, Miami, Florida, this 9th day of January, 1975.

MELVYN GREENSPAHN, P. A. Attorneys for Defendant 1150 S. W. First Street Suite 210, Eleven Fifty Building Miami, Florida 33130

Dy.

	IN THE CRIMINAL COURT OF RECORD IN AND FOR DADE COUNTY. FLORIDA CASE NO						
STATE OF FLORIDA,							
-vs- LUIS CRESPO , Defendant.	AFFIDAVIT OF INSOLVENCY						
LUIS CRESPO							
BEFORE ME, the undersigned authority, personally appeared							
Sworn to and subscribed before me day of FEB, 19	this 75.						
Deputy Clerk, Criminal Court of Reco	No TARY Floyd C. Schemel Notary Public, State of Florida at Large My Commissibit Expires Apr. 25, 1977 Bended by Aniertean Fire & Gasealty Ch.						
ORDER DECLARING DEFENDANT INSOLVENT AND APPOINTING COUNSEL							

After due and careful consideration, being satisfied of the good faith and truth of the foregoing Affidavit, I hereby adjudge the Defendant. LUIS CRESPO, insolvent for all judicial proceedings in this cause including trial and appeal, and the Public Defender for the Eleventh Judicial Circuit of Florida is hereby appointed as counsel for the Defendant for all judicial proceedings in this cause, including trial and appeal.

DONE AND ORDERED this ______ day of _______, 19 _____

Judge, Criminal Court of Record

Division

FILED FOR RECOR

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF FLORIDA, IN AND FOR DADE COUNTY BOND ESTREATURE NO. 74-33883

THE STATE OF FLORIDA, for the use and benefit of Dade County,

vs.

Plaintiff

SATISFACTION OF Juฐิติพยพลั

HUMBERTO LOPEZ and RESOLUTE INSURANCE COMPANY, a Rhode Island corporation,

Defendants

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of said Court at Miami, Dade County, Florida, this 11th day of February 1975

RICHARD P. BRINKER, CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT, ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF FLORIDA

(Court Seal)

By M. M. Moore
Deputy Clerk

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF FLORIDA, IN AND FOR DADE COUNTY

Case Numbered 74-6113	
THE STATE OF FLORIDA	
VS. Luis Crespo ORDER ALLOWING WITHDRAWAL OF COURT FILE	
THE OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER having made application to the	
Court for an order allowing the withdrawal of the original court file in the above styled and	
numbered cause and it appearing unto the Court that such reporter requires said file for use in	
the preparation of the transcript of testimony and proceedings in said cause, and the Court	
being otherwise fully advised in the premises, it is, upon consideration, ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that Mona R. Gesse,	
Official Court Reporter, is hereby granted permission to withdraw the original court file in the	
above styled and numbered cause for a period ofdays.	
DONE AND ORDERED in Miami, Dade County, Florida this the	ND
day of April A. D., 19 75.	
Judge	
RECEIPT IS HEREBY ACKNOWLEDGED FOR THE ORIGINAL COURT FILE in the above styled and numbered cause this	
Mona R Besse Official Court Reporter FILE RETURNED this 6 day of april A.D., 19 25.	
Maril Ungaro Deputy Clerk	

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 11TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND FOR DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA

CRIMINAL DIVISION

CASE NO. 74-6113

:

STATE OF FLORIDA,

Plaintiff,

-vs-

LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO,

Defendant,

DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR

DIRECTION OF THE REPORTER

TO TRANSCRIBE TRIAL NOTES

COMES NOW the Defendant, LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO, who having filed Notice of Appeal on December 19, 1974, in the instant cause, does pursuant to Rule 6.8, of the Florida Rules of Criminal Appeal, moves this Honorable Court to direct the Court's Reporter to transcribe the notes of the proceedings inclusive from the voir dire and inpanelment of the jury and consecutively thereafter through and inclusive of the finding and adjudication by the Court and the imposition of sentence upon the Defendant.

WE HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing has been hand-delivered to the Honorable James Woodard, State's Attorneys Office, 1351 N. W. 12th Street, Miami, Florida, this 9th day of January, 1975.

MELVYN GREENSPAHN, P. A. Attorneys for Defendant Suite 210, Eleven Fifty Building 1150 S. W. First Street

Miami, Florida 32130

FILED LOS SECON

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF FIOR LA E D IN AND FOR DADE COUNTY

THE STATE OF FLORIDA

#74-6113-A

ORDER ADJUDGING DEFENDANT __

COMPETENT

LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO

THIS CAUSE HAVING COME ON TO BE HEARD upon Motion properly made before the Court and the Court having examined the evidence presented, and the Court being fully advised in the premises, therefore

IT IS THE FINDING OF THE COURT that the Defendant, LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO ____is now ___COMPETENT IT IS THEREFORE THE JUDGMENT OF THE LAW and it is hereby adjudged that the aforesaid Defendant is now **COMPETENT** DONE AND ORDERED in open Court at Miami, Dade County, Florida, this 5th day of DECEMBER, A. D., 19 74.

ARDEN M. SIEGENDORF

RICHARD P. BRINKER

FILED AND RECORDED IN CIRCUIT COURT MINUTES AS INDICATED HEREON

Richard P. Brinker, Clerk

By: _

Deputy Clerk

REE 8862 PG 728

Japan 1 2000

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF FLORIDA IN AND FOR DADE COUNTY FALL TERM, 1974

CASE NO. 74-6113A

STATE OF FLORIDA

VS.

ORDER OF COMPETENCY

LUIS CRESPO,

DEFENDANT.

THIS CAUSE having come before this Court for determination of the Defendant's mental competency to be sentenced as provided by Rule 3.740 (a), Rules of Criminal Procedure, the Court having considered the testimony of three disinterested qualified experts and being otherwise fully advised in the premises, it is hereby

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the Defendant, LUIS CRESPO, is found to be sane and therefore competent to be sentenced according to law.

DONE AND ORDERED at Miami, Florida, this 2

, 197<u>5.</u>

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF FLORIDA, IN AND FOR DADE COUNTY FALL TERM, 1974

\$ -3 -3

CASE NO. 74-6113

STATE OF FLORIDA

vs.

LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO,
DEFENDANT.

ORDER DIRECTING SHERIFF OF DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA TO RETURN DEFENDANT TO DADE COUNTY JAIL

It appearing to this Court that the defendant is presently incarcerated in the South Florida State Hospital at Hollywood, Florida, and that it is necessary that he be brought before this Court for the purpose of sentencing, it is,

CONSIDERED, ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the Sheriff of Dade County, Florida, take the said LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO from the custody of the Superintendent of the South Florida State Hospital at Hollywood and transport him safely to the Dade County Jail by the 4th day of December, 1974, where he shall be held pending further proceedings in this Court.

DONE AND ORDERED at Miami, Dade County, Florida, this ______day of December, 1974.

ARDEN SEGENDORF)
CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE

IN AND FOR DADE COUNTY.	TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF FLORIDA CAUSE NUMBERED 74-6113
	CAOSE TYOMBERIES()
STATE OF FLORIDA)	DARIO .
-vs-)	ORDER
LOUIS CRESPO, et al	TO PAY OUT OF STATE WITNESS
)	74
It appearing unto the Court that, whose address	CHARLES A. ELLIOTT Double Day Publishing Co.
was duly summoned as a witness in the above en	titled cause and did in response to said sum-
mons appear as a witness on behalf of the State	of Florida, for which said witness is entitled
to receive the sum of 10ϕ per mile and \$5.00 pe	er diem as provided by Statute, it is therefore
ORDERED that the Board of County Co	missioners of Dade County, Florida, pay unto
the said CHARLES	A. ELLIOTT
the following sums, to-wit:	
From New York, N. Y.	to Miami. Florida adn return
2654 miles @ 10¢	
2 , 0,07,00	¢ 10.00
Per diem days @ \$5.00	\$10.00
•	075.40
Total amount owing witness Less hotel bill to be paid by F	\$ 275.40 . Dept. 38.64
•	\$ 275.40 . Dept. \$ 38.64 \$
Total amount owing witness Less hotel bill to be paid by F Less transportation advanced (if any) Net amount owing witness	\$ 275.40 . Dept. 38.64 \$ \$ 236.76
Total amount owing witness Less hotel bill to be paid by F Less transportation advanced (if any) Net amount owing witness and the Clerk of this Court be and he is hereby	\$ 275.40 . Dept. \$ 38.64 \$ \$ 236.76 directed to forthwith forward a certified copy
Total amount owing witness Less notel bill to be paid by F Less transportation advanced (if any) Net amount owing witness and the Clerk of this Court be and he is hereby of this Order to the said Board in order to effect t	\$ 275.40 38.64 \$ \$ 236.76 directed to forthwith forward a certified copy he provisions hereof.
Total amount owing witness Less notel bill to be paid by F Less transportation advanced (if any) Net amount owing witness and the Clerk of this Court be and he is hereby of this Order to the said Board in order to effect t DONE AND ORDERED in Miami, Dade	\$ 275.40 38.64 \$ \$ 236.76 directed to forthwith forward a certified copy he provisions hereof.
Total amount owing witness Less notel bill to be paid by F Less transportation advanced (if any) Net amount owing witness and the Clerk of this Court be and he is hereby of this Order to the said Board in order to effect the said Board in order the said Board in order to effect the said Board in order the said B	\$ 275.40 38.64 \$ \$ 236.76 directed to forthwith forward a certified copy he provisions hereof.
Total amount owing witness Less notel bill to be paid by F Less transportation advanced (if any) Net amount owing witness	\$ 275.40 38.64 \$ \$ 236.76 directed to forthwith forward a certified copy he provisions hereof.

 $M\ O\ T\ I\ O\ N$

Counsel for the State moves for entry of the above order.

RICHARD E. GERSTEIN

State Attorney

Assistant State Attorney

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE ELEVENTH IN AND FOR DADE COUNTY.	JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF FLORIDA CAUSE NUMBERED 74-6113
STATE OF FLORIDA)	of walk
~Vs-)	ORDER
LOUIS CRESPO, et al	TO PAY OUT OF STATE WITNESS
)	
It appearing unto the Court that, whose address is	Double Day Publishing Co.
	New York, N. Y.
was duly summoned as a witness in the above entitle mons appear as a witness on behalf of the State of to receive the sum of 10ϕ per mile and \$5.00 per d	Florida, for which said witness is entitled
ORDERED that the Board of County Comis	sioners of Dade County, Florida, pay unto
the said ALFRED W. THI	EM
the following sums, to-wit: From New York, N. Y. to M. 2654 miles @ 10¢	Miami, Florida and return \$ 265.40
Per diem days @ \$5.00	\$\$
Total amount owing witness Less hotel bill to be paid by F. De Less transportation advanced (if any)	
Net amount owing witness	\$ _251.33
and the Clerk of this Court be and he is hereby dire	ected to forthwith forward a certified copy
of this Order to the said Board in order to effect the	provisions hereof.
DONE AND ORDERED in Miami, Dade Co	unty, Florida this the
day of	2 L. O.

MOTION

Counsel for the State moves for entry of the above order.

RICHARD E. GERSTEIN

State Attorney

Assistant State Attorney

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF FLORIDA, IN AND FOR DADE COUNTY SPRING TERM, 1974

CASE NO. 74-6113

SEP3 - 1974

RICHARD P. BRINKER

STATE OF FLORIDA

vs.

LUIS CRESPO, ET AL DEFENDANTS.

MOTION TO HAVE PROSPECTIVE

WITNESSES MADE COURT
WITNESSES

Comes Now the State of Florida and respectfully shows unto this Honorable Court as follows:

That it is necessary for the Honorable Court and this jury panel to hear the testimony of one ALFREDO SAYUS, JR. and ALFREDO SAYUS, SR., hereinafter referred to as the witnesses, and it is my opinion, as an Assistant State Attorney, made in good faith, that the said witnesses will be reluctant to testify to certain material facts which are within their knowledge and may attempt to conceal material facts upon the question of the guilt of the above styled defendants upon the carges contained in the information of the cause now pending before this Honorable Court, to the detriment of the State of Florida.

That the testimony of these witnesses is material and not merely cumulative, and that the facts to be proven by these witnesses cannot be proven by other available witnesses.

These witnesses are personal friends of one or more of the above-styled defendants and have given diametrically opposed sworn statements to the undersigned and to Sgt. Harold Whitaker, Miami Police Department, regarding the involvement of the defendants in this case. Further, when called upon to testify at the preliminary hearing for Juaquin Miranda, Magistrate Case No. 74-6739, the witnesses refused to testify for the State and asserted their rights against self incrimination.

Attorney that these witnesses will undoubtedly prove to be hostile witnesses to the interest of the State of Florida in that there would be a reluctance to testify against the defendant. As the Assistant State Attorney prosecuting the above-captioned case, I do not wish to assume the responsibility of jeopardizing the State's case by calling the said witnesses as witnesses for the State, thereby vouching for their truthfulness and being bound by their testimony in the event that they would prove to be adverse witnesses.

WHEREFORE and for the reasons so stated, I respect-fully request that the said ALFREDO SAYUS, JR. and ALFREDO SAYUS, SR., be called as witnesses by this Honorable Court to be questioned by the Court and examined and cross-examined by the prosecution and the defense, but not as witnesses either for the State of the defendant, all of the same being in accordance with the law of this State.

Respectfully submitted,
RICHARD E. GERSTEIN
STATE ATTORNEY

: Hwoshill

Assistant State Attorney

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true copy of the above and foregoing Motion to Have Prospective Witnesses Made Court Witnesses was delivered to Melvyn Greenspahn and Laurence Faye, Attorneys for the Defendants, in open Court this _____ day of September, 1974.

Assistant State Attorney

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF FLORIDA, IN AND FOR DADE COUNTY **CRIMINAL DIVISION**

STATE OF FLORIDA LUIS ALBERTO CRESPO Defendant

ORDER FOR PRESENTENCE INVESTIGATION

IT APPEARING TO THE COURT that the Defendant has been found guilty of a criminal offense and that further information is most desirable or necessary for the Court to arrive at an appropriate disposition in this case, it is therefore

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the Florida Parole and Probation Commission and its staff are hereby directed to complete a presentence investigation of the Defendant, returnable to the Court at least two days before the disposition of the case now scheduled for _____ OCTOBER 21, 1974 _____, and it is further

ORDERED that any agency or person, having information concerning the Defendant or the offense for which he (she) has been found guilty, shall cooperate fully with said Florida Parole and Probation Commission and its staff by furnishing copies of relevant reports or documents and giving whatever other information is requested.

DONE AND ORDERED at Miami, Dade County, Florida, this ___ day of SEPTEMBER, 19 74.

> CIRCUIT JUDGE ARDEN M. SIEGENDORF

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing Order was furnished to the Florida Parole and Probation Commission on...

> RICHARD P. BRINKER Clerk, Circuit Court

VS.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF FLORIDA, IN AND FOR DADE COUNTY **CRIMINAL DIVISION**

Case No. 74-6113-B

STATE OF FLORIDA				
vs. HUMBERTO LOPEZ				
Defendant	~			

RICHARD P. BRINKER

ORDER FOR PRESENTENCE INVESTIGATION

IT APPEARING TO THE COURT that the Defendant has been found guilty of a criminal offense and that further information is most desirable or necessary for the Court to arrive at an appropriate disposition in this case, it is therefore

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the Florida Parole and Probation Commission and its staff are hereby directed to complete a presentence investigation of the Defendant, returnable to the Court at least two days before the disposition of the case now scheduled for ____ OCTOBER 21, 1974 , and it is further

ORDERED that any agency or person, having information concerning the Defendant or the offense for which he (she) has been found guilty, shall cooperate fully with said Florida Parole and Probation Commission and its staff by furnishing copies of relevant reports or documents and giving whatever other information is requested.

DONE AND ORDERED at Miami, Dade County, Florida, this 6th day of <u>SEPTEMBER</u>, 19 <u>74</u>.

ARDEN M. SIEGENDORF

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing Order was furnished to the Florida Parole and Probation Commission on_

> RICHARD P. BRINKER Clerk, Circuit Court

_____ , 19 _____ .

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF FLORIDA, IN AND FOR DADE COUNTY SPRING TERM, 1974

SEP**3 -** 1974 &

RICHARD P. BRINKER

AMENDED WITNESS

CASE NO. 74-611

STATE OF FLORIDA

vs.

LUIS CRESPO, ET AL DEFENDANTS.

Comes Now RICHARD E. GERSTEIN, State Attorney of the Eleventh Judicial Circuit of Florida, by and through the undersigned Assistant State Attorney, and files as Amended Witness List the following:

The additional witness which the State may call at the time of trial is as follows:

Custodian of Records Double Day Book Company 277 Park Avenue New York, New York 10017

RICHARD E. GERSTEIN STATE ATTORNEY

Rv.

JAMES H. WOODARD

Assistant State Attorney

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true copy of the foregoing Amended Witness List was hand delivered to Melvyn Greenspahn and Laurence Faye, this the _____ day of September, 1974.

Assistant State Attorney