DIRECT/MULERO/PEOPLE

- 1 was like hysterical, like he was mad, he was telling Chacal
- 2 that, who told you to do that? Why you did that? We not
- 3 suppose to do that. We just went there to make a phone call,
- 4 you're not supposed to do that, why did you do that?
- 5 He said that was accident I am sorry.
- 6 Q. He said that was a what?
- 7 A. Accident.
- 8 Q. That's what Chacal said?
- 9 A. Yeah.
- 10 Q. Okay. And what else was done in the hotel, what else
- 11 happened that night in the hotel?
- 12 A. Chacal is staying in the hotel that night and we went
- 13 to our house or to the our -- I don't remember where we went
- 14 that night. I don't believe that was the house.
- 15 Q. And what happened with Chacal the next day?
- 16 A. Cachie told him that it's better to go to the
- 17 Dominican Republic for a little while until everything calm
- 18 down. So he buy the ticket for him and he flew to the
- 19 Dominican Republic.
- Q. Who bought the ticket?
- 21 A. Cachie bought the ticket.
- 22 Q. For Chacal to go back to the Dominican Republic?
- 23 A. Yeah.
- 24 Q. And what did you and the defendant do in the
- 25 following days?

- Did you see any of these gentlemen there on the board Q. 1 or Miguel with any weapons on that day before they went into the 2 building? 3 Α. No. 4 Did Miguel have any weapons on him on that day at all? O. 5 No, he's not a violent person. Α. 6 As far as you know have you ever seen Miguel in 7 Q. possession of a gun or a knife or any other type of weapon? 8 Never. Never. Α. 9 Now, you said that in 2000 you were arrested and Q. 10 charged with kidnapping, right? 11 Α. Yes. 12 Were there any other charges other than kidnapping that 13 you were accused of? 14 No. Conspiracy. 15 Α. THE COURT: I'm sorry? 16 THE WITNESS: No, they accused me of kidnapping. Just 17 kidnapping.
- Yes. 21 Α.

Q.

than Ellerman?

18

19

20

Who was with you on the day during the events that led 22 Q.

Did you have any other codefendants in that case other

- up to your arrest of kidnapping, who was with you? 23
- It was Wanda. Wanda Tavarez. Α. 24
- THE COURT: Who is she? 25

- 1 after.
- Q. Before or after you went to the police?
- 3 A. That's what I don't remember.
- 4 Q. And did you speak to the police detectives in
- 5 Manhattan?
- 6 A. They went to get me in Connecticut.
- 7 Q. And did they tell you about what happened to Manuel,
- 8 your cousin Manuel?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. And at any time before you went to the police were you
- 11 aware of the defendant trying to contact you either directly or
- 12 through people in your family?
- MR. WILLIAMS: Objection. Asked and answered already,
- 14 your Honor.
- 15 THE COURT: I will allow it.
- 16 INTERPRETER: Could you repeat that last part, please.
- 17 Q. At any time before you went to the police were you
- aware of the defendant trying to reach you?
- A. No, because I didn't have a phone or anything.
- 20 Q. And you're not aware of any phone call to your brother
- or to your father?
- 22 A. I don't remember. If I'm not mistaken I don't
- 23 remember. I was 20-years-old. That was 15 years ago.
- Q. And, again, so it's clear, you first learned Manuel was
- 25 killed after you had gone, after you spoke to the police; is Lourdes Torres-Fuster, Senior Court Reporter

- 1 that correct?
- 2 A. I don't remember. As I said, I can't remember.
- 3 Q. And soon after that did you leave the United States?
- 4 A. After I declared, I testified, I left the United
- 5 States. I went to Europe. Then I came back from Europe to
- 6 testify again. I testified again and here I am again
- 7 testifying.
- 8 Q. And you live in Europe now?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. And you've been living there since 1999; is that
- 11 correct?
- 12 A. Yes, from '99.
- MR. DRUCKER: No further questions.
- 14 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 15 BY MR. WILLIAMS:
- 16 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Gonzalez.
- 17 Have you ever been threatened by this man?
- 18 A. No.
- 19 Q. You testified earlier you said that he was never your
- 20 boss, correct?
- 21 A. No, he was never my boss.
- Q. Now, he used to date your cousin Wendy, right?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. Who met him first you or Wendy?
- 25 A. Wendy.

WILSON GONZALEZ / CROSS / MR. WILLIAMS

- 1 A. I don't understand, in what way?
- Q. What do you do for work?
- 3 A. I had an accident. I fell from a forth floor and I am
- 4 handicap now and I don't work.
- 5 Q. Before your unfortunate accident how were you
- 6 supporting yourself?
- 7 A. I worked in construction.
- 8 Q. Have you ever been involved in the drug business, Mr.
- 9 Gonzalez?

1 . .

- 10 A. No.
- 11 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you. Nothing further.
- MR. DRUCKER: No questions.
- 13 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
- 14 (Witness is excused).
- THE COURT: We're going to take just a five minute
- 16 break, jurors.
- 17 (Recess).
- THE COURT: Mr. Drucker, who is your next witness?
- 19 MR. DRUCKER: Retired Detective Dimuro.
- THE COURT: Jury in.
- 21 COURT OFFICER: Jurors entering.
- THE COURT: Next witness.
- 23 MR. DRUCKER: People call retired Detective Gerard
- 24 Dimuro.
- 25 COURT OFFICER: Witness entering.

SUMMATION/DRUCKER

Ţ	(T	he jury	was exc	used ar	nd exits	the court	room.)
2		MR.	DRUCKER:	One l	egal po	int on you	r charge.
3	*	THE	COURT: (Of cour	rse.		
4		MR.	ORUCKER:	The f	irst co	unt is Kid	lnapping in
5	the First De	gree. '	The seco	nd cour	nt is the	e Felony M	urder for
6	Kidnapping.	Kidnap	oing fir	st degr	ree invo	lves abduc	tion with
7	other elemen	ts.					
8	(C	ontinue	d on nex	t page.)		
9		,	,				
10			•				
11	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •			. " -			
12							
13							
14	•						
15			•				
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25					s salah sala		

Proceeding

1	CONTINUED BY
2	MR. DRUCKER:
3	Which I believe we've fully proven.
4	But, the Count 2, the felony murder kidnapping would
5	not require.
6	THE COURT: I know.
7	MR. DRUCKER: Kidnapping first-degree.
8	THE COURT: We handled that.
9	MR. DRUCKER: Okay. Then I'll shut up.
10	THE COURT: Thank you.
11	Anything else anybody wants to tell me that's obvious?
12	MR. WILLIAMS: No, your Honor.
13	THE COURT: Thank you.
14	************
15	(Proceedings were concluded until July 10, 2014)
16	
17 ⁻	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	the furtherance of that kidnapping caused the death of
2	Manuel Gonzalez. And that Mr. Gonzalez was not a
3	participant in that crime.
4	If you find that the prosecution has proven both of
5	these elements beyond a reasonable doubt then you must find
6	Mr. Dellos Santos guilty of murder in the second-degree in
7	this count.
8	On the other hand, if you find that the prosecution has
9	not proven either one or both of these elements beyond a
10	reasonable doubt then you must find him not guilty.
11	Now, the third count charges Mr. Dellos Santos with
12	kidnapping in the first-degree.
13	Again, a person is guilty of kidnapping in the first
14	degree when he abducts another person with the intent to
15	compel another person to engage in a particular conduct.
16	In this case it is the prosecution's theory that Manuel
17	Gonzalez was kidnapped in order to compel Wilson Gonzalez
18	to pay money for drugs that were allegedly purchased from
19	Mr. Dellos Santos.
20	I have already given you all of the definitions that
21	pertain to the legal definitions of abduct. And that
22	applies here.
23	In order for you to find Mr. Dellos Santos guilty of
24	kidnapping in the first-degree the prosecution must prove
25	not only that acting in concert with others he abducted Mr.

1	Gonzalez but that he did so with the intent to compel a
2	third person to engage in certain conduct in this case in
3	order to compel Wilson Gonzalez to pay them.
4	In order for you to find Mr. Dellos Santos guilty of
5	kidnapping in the first-degree the prosecution is required
6	to prove from all the evidence in the case beyond a
7	reasonable doubt:
8	One, that on October 8, 1999 in New York Mr. Dellos
9	Santos acting in concert with others restricted the
10	movements of Manuel Gonzalez in such a manner as to
11	interfere substantially with his liberty by moving him from
12	one place to another or by confining him in the place where
13	the restriction began or to a place to which he had been
14	moved.
15	Two, that he did so without the consent of Mr.
16	Gonzalez.
17	Three, that he intended to do so.
18	Four, that the restriction of Mr. Gonzalez movements
19	were unlawful. And Mr. Dellos Santos knew that it was
20	unlawful.
21	Five, that Mr. Dellos Santos restrained Mr. Gonzalez
22	with the intent to prevent his liberation by using or
23	threatening to use deadly physical force. And that Mr.
24	Dellos Santos abducted Manuel Gonzalez with the intent to
25	compel Wilson Gonzalez to pay for drugs that were allegedly
	Lourdes Torres-Fuster, Senior Court Reporter

purchased for Mr. Dellos Santos. 1 If you find that the prosecution has proven each of 2 these elements beyond a reasonable doubt then you must find 3 Mr. Dellos Santos guilty of this count of kidnapping. 4 On the other hand, if you find that the prosecution has 5 failed to prove one or more of these elements then you must 6 find him not guilty. 7 Count 4, unlawful imprisonment in the first-degree. 8 9 This is regarding Angelly Ortiz. Count 4 charges Mr. Dellos Santos with unlawful 10 imprisonment in the first-degree on the theory that acting 11 in concert with others he unlawfully imprisoned Angelly 12 Ortiz. 13 Under our law a person is guilty of unlawful 14 imprisonment in the first-degree when he restrains another 15 person under circumstances which exposed that other person 16 to a risk of serious physical injury. 17 I remind you that restrain means to restrict a person's 18 movements intentionally and unlawfully in such a manner to 19 interfere substantially with her liberty by moving her from 20 one place to another or by confining her either to the 21 place where the restriction commenced or in a place to 22 which she had been moved without her consent and without 23 knowledge that the restriction is unlawful. 24 In order for you to find Mr. Dellos Santos guilty of 25

1	this count the prosecution is required to prove beyond a
2	reasonable doubt:
3	One, that on October 8, 1999 in New York Mr. Dellos
4	Santos acting in concert with others restricted the
5	movements of Angelly Ortiz in such a manner as to interfere
6	substantially with her liberty by moving her from one place
7	to another or by confining her either in the place where
8	the restriction began or in a place to which she had been
9	moved.
10	Two, that the movements of Ms. Ortiz were restricted
11	without her consent.
12	Three, that Mr. Dellos Santos acted intentionally.
13	Four, that the restriction of Ms. Ortiz movements was
14	unlawful. And that Mr. Dellos Santos knew that.
15	Five, that Mr. Dellos Santos or one or more people
15 16	Five, that Mr. Dellos Santos or one or more people acting with him restrained Ms. Ortiz under circumstances
16	
	acting with him restrained Ms. Ortiz under circumstances
16 17	acting with him restrained Ms. Ortiz under circumstances which exposed her to a risk of serious physical injury.
16 17 18	acting with him restrained Ms. Ortiz under circumstances which exposed her to a risk of serious physical injury. If you find that the prosecution has proven all of
16 17 18 19	acting with him restrained Ms. Ortiz under circumstances which exposed her to a risk of serious physical injury. If you find that the prosecution has proven all of these elements to your satisfaction beyond a reasonable
16 17 18 19	acting with him restrained Ms. Ortiz under circumstances which exposed her to a risk of serious physical injury. If you find that the prosecution has proven all of these elements to your satisfaction beyond a reasonable doubt then you must find Mr. Dellos Santos guilty of this
16 17 18 19 20	acting with him restrained Ms. Ortiz under circumstances which exposed her to a risk of serious physical injury. If you find that the prosecution has proven all of these elements to your satisfaction beyond a reasonable doubt then you must find Mr. Dellos Santos guilty of this count.
116 117 118 119 20	acting with him restrained Ms. Ortiz under circumstances which exposed her to a risk of serious physical injury. If you find that the prosecution has proven all of these elements to your satisfaction beyond a reasonable doubt then you must find Mr. Dellos Santos guilty of this count. On the other hand, if you find that the prosecution has
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22	acting with him restrained Ms. Ortiz under circumstances which exposed her to a risk of serious physical injury. If you find that the prosecution has proven all of these elements to your satisfaction beyond a reasonable doubt then you must find Mr. Dellos Santos guilty of this count. On the other hand, if you find that the prosecution has failed to prove one or more of these elements beyond a

imprisonment in the first-degree on the theory that acting
in concert with others he unlawfully imprisoned Carlos
Ortiz. It is the same as the last one. The same
elements but this time you look at the action vis-a-vis
Carlos Ortiz.

So, in order for you to find Mr. Dellos Santos guilty of Count 5 the prosecution is required to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that on October 8, 1999 in New York Mr. Dellos Santos acting in concert with others restricted the movements of Carlos Ortiz in such a manner as to interfere substantially with his liberty by moving him from one place to another or by confining him either in a place where the restriction began or in a place to which he had been moved.

Two, that his movements were restricted without his consent. That Mr. Dellos Santos acted intentionally. That the restriction was unlawful. And Mr. Dellos Santos knew that. And that Mr. Dellos Santos or one or more people acting in concert with him restrained Mr. Oritz under circumstances which exposed him to risk of serious physical injury.

If you find that the prosecution has proven all of these elements beyond a reasonable doubt then you must find Mr. Dellos Santos guilty of this count of unlawful imprisonment.

On the other hand, if you find that the prosecution has Lourdes Torres-Fuster, Senior Court Reporter

1 3

1	failed to prove one or more of these elements beyond a
2	reasonable doubt then you must find him not guilty.
3	Count 6 charges Mr. Dellos Santos with burglary in the
4	first-degree on the theory that he or someone acting in
5	concert with him was armed with a deadly weapon while
6	burglarizing Apartment 33 at 478 West 145 Street.
7	The penal law states a person is guilty of burglary in
8	the first-degree when he knowingly enters unlawfully a
9	dwelling with the intent to commit a crime. And when he
10	uses or threatens the immediate use of a dangerous
11	instrument. In this case a gun.
12	The term dwelling means a building which is usually
13	occupied by a person who sleeps there at night.
14	Where a building consist of two or more units
15	separately secured or occupied each unit is considered both
16	a separate building in itself and part of the main
17	building.
18	According to the law a person unlawfully enters a
19	dwelling when he has no permission to do so. And he
20	knowingly enters the dwelling unlawfully when he is aware
21	that he doesn't have permission.
22	A person also enters a dwelling unlawfully when he
23	enters by means of a trick or deception.
24	In addition, the prosecution must prove that at the
25	time that Mr. Dellos Santos entered the building he

PROCEEDING

1	comes in.
2	***(DELIBERATIONS***
3	THE COURT: We have a note. I'm going to read to ther
4	the charge on murder in the second-degree and kidnapping
5	MR. DRUCKER: Yes, your Honor.
6	COURT OFFICER: Jury entering.
7	MR. WILLIAMS: Your Honor, may we approach briefly?
8	THE COURT: Yes.
9	(Discussion at the bench was held off the record).
10	THE COURT: Okay. So you asked me for the instructions
11	on the law regarding felony murder. Regarding the
12	kidnapping. And I will do that
13	The penal law states a person is guilty of murder in
14	the second-degree when acting either alone or with one or
15	more other persons he commits or attempts to commit a
16	kidnapping and in the course of and in furtherance of the
17	crime or of the immediate flight from the crime he or
18	another participant causes the death of a person other than
19	one of the participants.
20	Under our law a person is guilty of kidnapping in the
21	second-degree when he abducts another person. To abduct
22	means to restrain a person with the intent to prevent the
23	person's liberation either by secreting or holding him in a
24	place where he is not likely to be found or by using or
25	threatening to use deadly physical force.

PROCEEDING

1	Restrain means to restrict a person's movements
2	intentionally and unlawfully in such a manner as to
3	interfere substantially with his liberty by moving him from
4	one place to another or by confining him either in a place
5	where the restriction began or in a place to which he has
6	been moved without consent and with knowledge that the
7	restriction is unlawful.
8	A person restricts another's movements intentionally
9	when his goal, his conscious objective is to restrict that
10	person's movement.
11	A person restricts another's movement unlawfully when
12	he is not authorized by law to do so and when he is aware
13	that the restriction is not authorized by law.
14	A person is moved or confined without consent when such
15	is accomplished by physical force, intimidation or
16	deception.
17	Intent means conscious objective or purpose.
18	Thus, a person acts with intent to prevent another's
19	liberation either by secreting or holding him in a place
20	where he is not likely to be found or by using or
21	threatening to use deadly physical force when that person's
22	goal or purpose is to do so.
23	Deadly physical force means physical force which under

Lourdes Torres-Fuster, Senior Court Reporter

causing death or other serious physical injury.

24

25

the circumstances in which it is used is readily capable of

PROCEEDING

1	In order for you to find Mr. Dellos Santos guilty of
2	murder in the second-degree the prosecution is required to
3	prove from all the evidence in this case beyond a
4	reasonable doubt:
5	One, that on October 8, 1999 in New York Mr. Dellos
6	Santos acting in concert with others committed a
7	kidnapping.
8	And, two, that in the course of and in furtherance of
9	the commission of that kidnapping Mr. Dellos Santos or
10	another participant in the kidnapping caused the death of
11	Manuel Gonzalez and Mr. Gonzalez was not a participant in
12	the crime.
13	If you find that the prosecution has proven beyond a
14	reasonable doubt both of these elements then you must find
15	him guilty of murder in the second-degree as charged in
16	this count.
17	On the other hand, if you find that the prosecution has
18	not proven one or both of those elements beyond a
19	reasonable doubt then you must find him not guilty.
20	I hope that helped you.
21	So bring the jury in to deliberate.
22	COURT OFFICER: Jurors.
23	THE COURT: Please, I want them to stay.
24	COURT OFFICERS: Yes.
25	(Jurors exit the courtroom).
	Lourdes Torres-Fuster, Senior Court Reporter