



# OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY

COUNTY OF VENTURA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

**GREGORY D. TOTTEN**  
District Attorney

**JANICE L. MAURIZI**  
Chief Assistant District Attorney

**MICHAEL K. FRAWLEY**  
Chief Deputy District Attorney  
Criminal Prosecutions

**W. CHARLES HUGHES**  
Chief Deputy District Attorney  
Administrative Services

**MICHAEL D. SCHWARTZ**  
Special Assistant District Attorney  
Justice Services

**R. MILES WEISS**  
Chief Deputy District Attorney  
Special Prosecutions

**MICHAEL BARAY**  
Chief Investigator  
Bureau of Investigation

September 8, 2015

Attention: Non-Violent Second-Strikers  
Board of Parole Hearings  
Correspondence-NVSS  
P.O. Box 4036  
Sacramento, CA 95812-4036

**Re: Inmate Amezcua, Jaime Mendez; CDC Number AU2841  
Court Case Number; 2011024581**

Dear Deputy Commissioner:

This letter is written to recommend the denial of an early release for second-strike inmate Jaime Amezcua. This recommendation is based on:

- (1) The circumstances of the commitment offenses, which were committed while on parole.
- (2) The inmate's substantial criminal history, including a conviction for vehicular manslaughter.

## **CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE COMMITMENT OFFENSES**

On July 9, 2011, at 2:15 a.m., CHP officers were dispatched to State Route 118 near Vineyard Avenue, after a cab driver called 9-1-1 to report a single vehicle traffic collision. Upon arrival, CHP contacted with two people, Denise Lopez ("Lopez") and the inmate. Lopez told CHP she was the driver and that the inmate was a stranger that stopped to render aid. The inmate, on the other hand, told CHP Lopez was his girlfriend and he was dropped off at the scene by an unknown friend after following behind Lopez' car. Lopez later stated she was not the driver at the time of the crash. Upon speaking with the inmate, CHP officers saw signs and symptoms of impairment and arrested the inmate for driving under the influence. After advising him of California's implied consent law under Vehicle Code section 23612, the inmate stated he was not going to take any test. Thereafter, the inmate was transported to the hospital for a forced blood draw, resulting in a .24 percent blood alcohol level.

Amezcuca, Jaime Mendez  
CDC #AU2841  
September 8, 2015

On June 22, 2013, around 8:48 p.m., Oxnard Police officers see a Toyota Camry quickly cross several lanes of traffic to block a pick-up truck from exiting a gas station. The police make contact with both drivers, one of whom tells them that he was just rear-ended by the inmate, who he believed was attempting to flee the accident. The inmate is swaying, smells of alcohol, is on parole, and slurring his speech. He does not answer the pre-field sobriety exercise questions and declines to do the exercises with the exception of the horizontal gaze nystagmus; the results which indicate he is impaired by alcohol. He is arrested for driving for DUI and transported to hospital for a blood draw. The result is a .25 BAC.

### **INMATE'S CRIMINAL HISTORY**

At the time the inmate was arrested on the commitment offenses, he was on parole for a 2007 felony DUI as a result of driving with a .17 percent blood alcohol content, more than double the legal limit. He drove at this excessive blood alcohol content, despite suffering a 2004 felony conviction for vehicular manslaughter, where a friend and passenger was ejected from the car and killed. In that case, the inmate's blood alcohol content was .13 percent, and he committed that offense while he was on probation for a misdemeanor DUI. Despite these prior convictions, including for manslaughter, the inmate chose to continue to drive under the influence of alcohol, suffering the commitment offenses at blood alcohol contents levels of .24 percent and .25 percent. He did not learn from his earlier incarcerations, but continued to place the community in serious danger by driving at excessively high blood alcohol levels. Further, he suffered the commitment offenses while on parole, a significant factor demonstrating the inmate does not take his parole seriously. He is unfit for early release.

Please refer to the Report of Probation Officer for the inmate's full criminal history which began in 1994 at the age of 13. There are 12 separate entries leading up to the commitment offense.

### **CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

The inmate has not served his full sentence imposed by the court. Moreover, based on his commitment offense and criminal history, the inmate does not deserve to be released early from prison simply because he is a second-striker. The inmate, if released, puts citizens at risk. Allowing the inmate to be released early will only enable him to victimize the community as he has done before. I request that you deny the inmate an early release because he poses an unreasonable risk to the public when released from custody.

Very truly yours,



KEVIN DRESCHER  
Supervising District Attorney

Sent by US Mail and Email to BPH.CorrespondenceUnit@cdcr.ca.gov