



NATIONAL LEGAL PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATES

Margaret A. Robinson Professional Advocacy Center

11331 Grooms Road, Suite 1000

Cincinnati, Ohio 45242

Telephone Number: (513) 247-0082

Facsimile No. (513) 247-9580

Website: www.NLPA.com

E-mail: contactus@NLPA.com

“The pursuit of justice is a team effort.”

Newsletter

Legal News Briefs for Law Libraries & Defense Attorneys

NLPA SAVES ITS CLIENTS MORE THAN 150 YEARS IN PRISON - A REFLECTION ON THE SUCCESSFUL OUTCOMES WE HELPED ACHIEVE DURING 2011

During 2011 NLPA continued obtaining successful outcomes for its clients. While obviously no one can guarantee the successful outcome of every case, we're very proud of our track record. Here is a spotlight of some of what we were able to accomplish during 2011!

Lomas, L - NLPA assisted counsel for Mr. Lomas in preparing sentencing research for his case heard in the USDC, Northern District of Texas (Dallas) in Case No.: 3:09-cr-00289-15. Mr. Lomas was charged with Conspiracy to Possess with Intent to Distribute a Controlled Substance. The PSI in his case listed a guideline range of 292-365 months.

However, at sentencing the court instead imposed a sentence of 120 months - saving Mr. Lomas **MORE THAN TWENTY YEARS IN PRISON!**

Wright, C - NLPA assisted counsel for Mr. Wright in the preparation of sentencing research for his case heard in the USDC WD KY (Case No. 3:09-cr-00179-2) involving charges of Conspiracy to Distribute Controlled Substance (Cocaine). Mr. Wright plead guilty and his guideline range was 262-327 months. However, at the sentencing hearing the court imposed only 120 months - saving Mr. Wright more than **SEVENTEEN YEARS IN PRISON!**

Grimes, W - NLPA assisted counsel in the preparation of sentencing research in Mr. Grimes' case which was heard in the USDC W D N Y (Case No. 6:06-cr-06229-11) and involved charges of narcotics and conspiracy. The PSI listed a

guideline range of 360-LIFE in prison. However, at sentencing the judge instead imposed a term of confinement of 168 months - saving Mr. Grimes **SIXTEEN YEARS TO LIFE IN PRISON!**

Ross, C - NLPA assisted Mr. Ross' counsel with sentencing research for his case which was heard in the USDC ED TN (Knoxville) Case No.: 3:10-cr-00053-13. Mr. Ross was charged with Conspiracy to Possess with Intent to Distribute 5 Kilograms or More of Cocaine w/ Criminal Forfeitures; Conspiracy to Commit Money Laundering. The PSI in the case called for a guideline range of 360 to LIFE in prison. However, at sentencing the court imposed 234 months - saving Mr. Ross more than **TEN YEARS TO LIFE IN PRISON!**

Sawyer, B - NLPA assisted Attorney Malarcik with the preparation of sentencing research to help fight Mr. Sawyer's guideline range of 210-

CONTENTS:

NLPA Victories 2011.....1-4
 New Website!.....4
 NLPA on the Social Scene.....4-5
 Cases of Interest.....5-6
 District Court in Fed Sentencing..... 6-7
 Hiring NLPA.....7
 About NLPA.....8

262 months. Mr. Sawyer was charged in the USDC Northern District of Ohio (Akron Division) in Case No.:5:11-cr-00139-1 with Receipt/Distribution of Visual Depictions of Minors Involved in Sexually Explicit Conduct and Possession of Child Pornography. At sentencing the court imposed only 100 months - saving Mr. Sawyer **MORE THAN THIRTEEN YEARS IN PRISON.**

Kennedy, AJ - NLPA assisted counsel for Mr. Kennedy's case which was heard in the USDC SD OH (Columbus) Case No. 2:10-cr-00095-1. Mr. Kennedy was charged with Conspiracy to Distribute Narcotics; Conspiracy to Manufacture Marijuana; Sell, Distribute or Dispense Narcotics; Bank Larceny and Theft; Manufacture Marijuana; Violent Crime / Drugs / Machine Gun; Penalties for Firearms; Unlawful Transport of Firearms; Sell, Distribute or Dispense Marijuana; Possession of Marijuana; Money Laundering - Fraud or Other; Conspiracy to Commit Money Laundering. The PSI in his case called for a sentencing range of 360 to LIFE in prison. However, at sentencing the court imposed 180 months - Saving Mr. Kennedy **FIFTEEN YEARS TO LIFE IN PRISON!** Mr. Kennedy also received the judge's recommendation for designation at a Bureau of Prisons (BOP) facility near to his family as well as participation in the BOP's Residential Drug Abuse Program (RDAP) which will help him receive time off of his sentence as well.

Osuji, P - NLPA was hired by the firm of Robinson & Brandt in the case of Mr. Osuji's appeal. The appeal was heard in the 4th CCA

(No. 08-5207) and involved charges stemming from USDC WD NC (No. 3:06-cr-00415-1) of Conspiracy to Defraud the United States; Attempted and Conspiracy to Commit Mail Fraud; Health Care Fraud; Money Laundering - Conspiracy; Promotion Money Laundering. Mr. Osuji had been convicted and sentenced in 2008 to 211 months. The Court of Appeals upheld the conviction but vacated the sentence and remanded the case back to the District Court for a re-sentencing!

Cedillo, R - NLPA assisted Mr. Cedillo's counsel in the preparation of sentencing research to help fight a guideline range of 70-87 months. His case was heard in the USDC ED TX (No. 4:10-cr-00067-1) and involved charges of Reentry of Deported Alien. Mr. Cedillo plead guilty in the case. However, at sentencing, the court imposed a term of confinement of 61 months - saving Mr. Cedillo more than two years in prison!

Martin, N - NLPA assisted Mr. Martin's counsel in the preparation of sentencing research for his case which was heard in the USDC WD KY (No. 1:10-cr-00014-1). His charges included Sell, Distribute or Dispense Controlled Substance; Aiding and Abetting; and Felon in Possession of a Firearm. His PSI listed a guideline range of 151-188 months. However, at sentencing the court imposed 121 months and also made recommendation for designation close to his family and participation in the drug treatment program - saving Mr. Martin more than five years in prison or more than six once he has successfully completed the BOP's RDAP program!

McClam, LL - NLPA assisted Mr. McClam and counsel in preparing a case evaluation of potential appellate issues for his case which was being heard in the 4th CCA (No. 09-4737). His charges stemmed from USDC SC (No. 4:07-cr-01277-1) and included: Interference with Commerce by Threat or Violence; Using and Carrying a Firearm in the Furtherance of a Crime of Violence. He was sentenced to 276 months in 2009. Upon filing of the opening brief, the government filed a motion to rescind briefing and agreed that a remand for resentencing was appropriate! His case was remanded for a re-sentencing to be held soon.

Thompson, WP - NLPA assisted Mr. Thompson's attorney in the preparation of sentencing research for his case heard in the USDC ND NY (Case No. 1:10-cr-00310) involving charge of Conspiracy to Distribute a Controlled Substance; Sale/Distribution of a Controlled Substance. The PSI in the case listed a guideline range of 120-135 months. However, at sentencing the court instead imposed 70 months - saving Mr. Thompson more than five years in prison!

Bickerstaff, T - NLPA assisted Mr. Bickerstaff's counsel in the preparation of an appeal in the State of Ohio appeal court for Jefferson County (Case No. 9JE33). Counsel advised that although the court did not grant all issues presented on the appeal, it did grant relief on the fourth issue presented and remanded the case for a re-sentencing to take place.

Davis, R - NLPA assisted attorney Robert Ratliff in the preparation

of research to help fight a 360 months to LIFE guideline range for Mr. Davis. His case was heard in USDC ED TN (Knoxville) (Case No.: 3:10-cr-00053-1) where Mr. Davis was charged with Conspiracy to Distribute 5 Kilograms or More of a Mixture or Substance Containing a Detectable Amount of Cocaine; Conspiracy to Distribute and Possess with Intent to Distribute 5 Kilograms or More of a Mixture or Substance Containing a Detectable Amount of Cocaine w/ Criminal Forfeiture Allegation; Conspiracy to Commit Money Laundering with Forfeiture Allegations. At sentencing the court imposed 23 ½ years - saving Mr. Davis more than 6 years to life in prison!

Manna, P - NLPA assisted counsel for Mr. Manna in the preparation of sentencing research. Mr. Manna's case was heard in the USDC NJ - Newark (Case No. 2:10-cr-00126-1) with Conspiracy to Distribute Controlled Substance (Cocaine Base); Unlawful Transport of Firearms. The PSI report listed his guideline range to be at 262-327 months. However, at sentencing the court imposed 121 months - saving Mr. Manna more than **SEVENTEEN YEARS** in prison!

Foy, S - NLPA assisted counsel in the direct appeal of Mr. Foy which was heard in the 10th Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals (Case No. 09-3314). The case originated out of the USDC KS (Case No. 2:07-cr-20168-4) where Mr. Foy was charged with Conspiracy to Manufacture, Possess With Intent to Distribute, and Distribute More Than 50 Grams of Cocaine Base (Crack); Conspiracy to Manufacture, to

Possess with Intent to Distribute, and to Distribute Cocaine base (crack) and, to Possess with Intent to Distribute and to Distribute Cocaine; Attempted to Possess With Intent to Distribute 5 Kilograms or More of Cocaine. The Court of Appeals affirmed in part and vacated in part remanding the case back to the District Court for a re-sentencing based upon a Venue argument.

Ruiz-Gonzalez, D - NLPA was hired by counsel to assist in the preparation of objections at the sentencing stage of Mr. Ruiz-Gonzalez's case which was heard in the USDC, District of Colorado (Denver) Case No.: 1:10-cr-00252-9. The client was charged with Conspiracy to Distribute Controlled Substance; Unlawful Transport of Firearms; Sell, Distribute or Dispense Controlled Substance and had entered a plea of guilty. The PSI called for a sentence of 135-168 months. However, the court imposed a sentence 52 months - saving Mr. Ruiz-Gonzalez nearly ten years in prison!

Locklayer, E - NLPA was hired to assist counsel in the preparation of sentencing research for Mr. Locklayer's case which was heard in the USDC, Middle District of Tennessee (Nashville) in Case No.: 3:07-cr-00171-3. Mr. Locklayer was charged with Conspiracy to distribute and to possess with intent to distribute cocaine, cocaine base and marijuana; Conspiracy to commit money laundering. The PSI listed his guideline at 168-210 months. However, at sentencing the court imposed a sentence of 70 months - saving Mr. Locklayer **MORE THAN 10 YEARS IN PRISON!** It should be noted that significant

emphasis was placed on Mr. Locklayer's confinement conditions while being held in state custody awaiting sentencing. This combined with a number of other arguments could be implemented by the court as a downward departure. Because of the time Mr. Locklayer had already served in custody prior to the sentencing taking place, with his credit for that time, he only has ONE YEAR left to serve in the BOP before his release (10/18/12)! With access to the BOP's Residential Drug Treatment Program or through application for halfway house placement Mr. Locklayer could realistically be back with his family in just a few short months!

Sumter, A - NLPA assisted counsel in the preparation of sentencing research to assist with his case which was heard in the USDC, District of South Carolina (Columbia) Case No.: 3:10-cr-01160-3 where Mr. Sumter was charged with Conspiracy to Distribute Narcotics (Cocaine) Interference with Commerce by Threat or Violence; Conspiracy to Commit a Violent Crime/Drugs/Machine Gun. His PSI listed a sentence in the range of 235-240 months. However, the court instead imposed a sentence of 188 months - saving Mr. Sumter more than four years in prison.

Ruffin, K - NLPA assisted Mr. Ruffin's attorney with pre-sentencing research. His case was heard in the USDC, Eastern District of Tennessee (Greenville), Case No. 2:09-cr-00045-15 where Mr. Ruffin was convicted at trial of defrauding the United States. Mr. Ruffin was facing 360 - LIFE. However the court imposed 360

months as opposed to life in prison.

Fortunato, J- NLPA assisted counsel for Mr. Fortunato in preparing sentencing research in his case which was heard in the USDC, Central District of California (Eastern Division - Riverside) Case No.: 5:09-cr-00101-22. Mr. Fortunato was charged with Conspiracy to Possess with Intent to Distribute; Distribution; and Aid and Abet the Distribution of a Controlled Substance. After entering a plea in the case, Mr. Fortunato's guideline range was calculated and included a five year **mandatory minimum**. However, the court instead imposed a sentence of 24 months! - Saving Mr. Fortunato 3 years in prison, avoiding the mandatory minimum and, with participation in the Bureau of Prison's Residential Drug Abuse Program (RDAP) which NLPA is also assisting him with, he will receive one year off of this sentence as well which should leave Mr. Fortunato being released after shortly after completing the program!

Gedeon, K - NLPA assisted Mr. Gedeon's stand by counsel in the preparation of a 2255 motion for his case which was heard in the USDC ND WV (Martinsburg) (Case No. 3:09cr00030-2). Mr. Gedeon was charged with Narcotics - Sell, Distribute, or Dispense. After pleading guilty he was sentenced to a term of 189 months in prison. Through arguments presented in the opening motion, the court granted his motion immediately following the government response (even before his final

reply brief was filed) and reduced his sentence from 189 months to the 151 months requested in the motion NLPA prepared. This saved Mr. Gedeon more than three years off his sentence.

Conzelmann, S - NLPA assisted Ms. Conzelmann (a family member for one of our clients) in pursuing a release and return of her vehicle seized as the result of the defendant's indictment. The government, which had seized her vehicle, alleged it was part of the case. NLPA prepared a request for the return of the vehicle through a verified notice of claim. We also assisted Ms. Conzelmann in following up with the authorities regarding her request. The authorities then agreed to release the vehicle to Ms. Conzelmann. However, they advised that before she could have the vehicle she would have to pay \$3,000.00 in storage fees since the time it had been seized. NLPA again followed up with the impound lot and authorities and was able to get the storage fee reduced to \$1,000.00.!

Sims, S - NLPA assisted counsel for Ms. Sims in preparing research for use at her sentencing. Her case was heard in the USDC Middle District of Florida (Tampa Division) Case No.:8:11-cr-00080-1 where she was charged with False or Fraudulent Claims; Fraud and Swindles. The guideline level in her PSI was listed as 77-96 months. However, the court instead imposed a sentence of 60 months - saving her up to 3 years in prison!

Carpenter, C - NLPA assisted Mr. Carpenter's attorney in the preparation of sentencing research. His case was heard in the USDC Eastern District of Tennessee

(Knoxville) Case No.: 3:10-cr-00109-1. Mr. Carpenter was charged with Manufacture of methamphetamine; Possession with intent to distribute methamphetamine; Possession of equipment chemicals, products and materials which may be used to manufacture methamphetamine. After pleading guilty, the guideline range in his PSI listed him at 262-327 months. However, at sentencing the court imposed 235 months - saving Mr. Carpenter more than 7 years in prison!

NLPA LAUNCHES NEW WEBSITE!

NLPA is proud to announce the launch of its new website on February 1st 2012. On the new site we will have more access the legal news and articles so many of you rely as well as victory alerts. The new site will also be much more user-friendly so you can access updates, submit your questions or requests for information, watch videos, follow our social networking updates, etc all in one place. Be sure to stop by and check us out at: www.NLPA.com!

NLPA IS ON YOUR FAVORITE SOCIAL NETWORKING SITES!

Whether you're an attorney, have a loved one in the system, or have been in the system, "Like" our page to get updates and to share your thoughts. Have experience working with NLPA? We'd love to hear your comments! Find us at [Facebook.com / National Legal Professional Associates](https://www.facebook.com/NationalLegalProfessionalAssociates), Follow us

on Twitter or connect with us on LinkedIn to share your thoughts on common topics.

For inmates incarcerated in the Federal Bureau of Prisons or prison offering access to Corrlinks, you can also stay up to speed as updates are released or contact us via email through Corrlinks. To request approve for email communications on Corrlinks simply send your request to: contactus@nlpa.com.

CASES OF INTEREST

CASE MAY PROVIDE GOOD OBJECTIONS TO CRIMINAL HISTORY ENHANCEMENTS AT



CING, ON APPEAL OR IN A POST-CONVICTION MOTION

United States v. Vann (2011 U.S. App. LEXIS 20612 (10/11/11)). Significant 4th Circuit holdings from the Vann case may good objections to criminal history enhancements at sentencing, appeal, or in a 2255 motion.

SUMMARY: The district court rejected Vann's characterization of his three previous indecent liberties convictions, concluding that they were for ACCA violent felonies and that he was thus subject to § 924(e)(1)'s sentencing enhancement. As a result, on

March 17, 2009, the court sentenced Vann to the statutory minimum of fifteen years in prison. Vann filed a timely notice of appeal, and we have appellate jurisdiction pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3742(a) and 28 U.S.C. § 1291. A divided panel of this Court affirmed Vann's sentence, employing the "modified categorical approach" first announced in *Taylor v. United States*, 495 U.S. 575, 602 (1990), for the purpose of analyzing prior offenses to determine whether they constitute ACCA violent felonies. See *United States v. Vann*, 620 F.3d 431 (4th Cir. 2010). Upon granting Vann's petition for rehearing en banc, we vacated the panel opinion."

The dissent's view that each of Vann's three contested convictions violated subsection (a)(2) of the Statute is erroneous in multiple respects. First, it relies on evidence never presented to the district court. It is one thing for a federal court to look at a state court docket in asserting jurisdiction over a removed case, or to note a subsequent arson conviction in determining the propriety of rescinding a fire insurance settlement offer. See post at 85 (citing *Lolavar v. de Santibañes*, 430 F.3d 221 (4th Cir. 2005); *Colonial Penn Ins. Co. v. Coil*, 887 F.2d 1236 (4th Cir. 1989)). It is materially different to rest a sentencing decision – transforming a ten-year maximum into a fifteen-year minimum – on the basis of evidence never presented to the district court, particularly when such evidence was not requested until after oral argument.

Moreover, it bears emphasis that the basis of the dissent's view that

Vann's convictions "necessarily" rest on subsection (a)(2) is that the charging documents simply recite the language of the Indecent Liberties Statute. Recently, however, we ruled that a conviction under a so-called Alford plea – where the defendant does not confirm the factual basis for the plea, see *North Carolina v. Alford*, 400 U.S. 25 (1970) – does not qualify as an ACCA predicate offense when the statutory definition contains both qualifying and non-qualifying predicate crimes and no other Shepard-approved documents establish the offense on which the defendant was convicted. *United States v. Alston*, 611 F.3d 219, 227-28 (4th Cir. 2010). As Judge Niemeyer properly recognized in *Alston*, "Shepard prevents sentencing courts from assessing whether a prior conviction counts as an ACCA predicate conviction by relying on facts neither inherent in the conviction nor admitted by the defendant." *Id.* at 226.

Under the *Alston* precedent, it is inconsistent for the dissent to find that Vann "necessarily" pleaded guilty to the subsection of the Statute (subsection (a)(2)) that the dissent and Judge Keenan's concurrence deem a violent felony under the ACCA. Indeed, to borrow from *Alston* its analogy derived from Shepard and from *Taylor v. United States*, 495 U.S. 575 (1990), if Vann had gone to trial in the underlying cases, any resulting conviction could only be used as an ACCA predicate conviction if the jury had returned a special verdict (or answered an interrogatory) specifically finding him guilty of violating subsection (a)(2) of the Statute. See *Alston*, 611 F.3d at 228. Instead, the

dissent would have us engage in the very behavior the categorical approach is intended to avert: inappropriate judicial factfinding on appeal. See Taylor, 495 U.S. at 601 [*16] (explaining that categorical approach avoids difficulty associated with pleaded cases in which "there often is no record of the underlying facts").

When we consider Vann's charging documents in their proper legal context, we cannot determine that he was convicted of violating subsection (a)(2) of the Statute. Consequently, Vann's indecent liberties offenses are not ACCA violent felonies.

U.S. SUPREME COURT TO ADDRESS CIRCUIT COURT SPLIT OVER WHETHER FSA APPLIES TO THOSE WHO COMMITTED CRIMES BUT WERE NOT SENTENCED YET.

Hill v. U.S. (11-5721) & Dorsey v. U.S. (11-5683) - 12/5/11 - As indicated on the Supreme Court order list released this morning, the Justice have taken up a pair of cases, Hill v. United States, 11-5721, and Dorsey v. United States, 11-5683 to address the circuit split over whether the new Fair Sentencing Act new mandatory minimums for crack offenses apply to defendants who committed crimes but were not yet sentenced when the FSA became law. Kudos to the Court and huzzah!

Though I will have more on these cases in the weeks and months ahead, I sure hope for the sake of lots of defendants that lawyers have been effectively preserving this issue in cases that have been

in the pipeline all this while. This issue is now on track to be conclusively resolved by June, and perhaps even sooner (though not a moment too soon).

ROLE OF THE DISTRICT COURT IN FEDERAL SENTENCING

As a republic composed of both state and federal governments, the United States has established principles of comity. The concept of comity represents a system in which there is sensitivity to the legitimate interests of both State and National Governments, and in which the National Government, anxious though it may be to vindicate and protect federal rights and federal interests, always endeavors to do so in ways that will not unduly interfere with the legitimate activities of the States. Younger v. Harris, 401 U.S. 37, 44, 91 S. Ct. 746, 27 L. Ed. 2d 669 (1971).

In the sentencing context, defendants' sentences under the Sentencing Guidelines are partially determined by offender's criminal history. Specifically, a defendant can receive criminal history points, thus increasing his sentencing range, based upon the defendant's probationary status. See U.S.S.G. §4A1.1(d). However, who is to determine probationary status, the state court who issued the probation or the federal court reviewing the probationary status for purposes of issuing a harsher federal sentence?

This issue was brought to the fore in United States v. Yepez, 652 F.3d 1182 (9th Cir. 2011). Therein, the district court refused to defer to a

state court ruling terminating a defendant's probationary status, when said status was ruled terminated one day prior to the defendant's commission of a prior crime. On appeal, the Court of Appeals reversed the district court's decision, finding that defense should have been given the state court regarding the defendant's probationary status. The Court of Appeals stated that by crediting state trial court terminations of ongoing probationary terms, federal courts respect the fundamental "[p]rinciples of comity and federalism [that] counsel against substituting our judgment for that of the state courts" which are actually supervising the individuals on probation. Id.(citing Taylor v. Maddox, 366 F.3d 992, 999 (9th Cir. 2004); see also United States v. Alba-Flores, 577 F.3d 1104, 1112 (9th Cir. 2009) (Kozinski, C.J., dissenting)("[t]he federal system relies heavily on state courts in sentencing defendants and it's wrong and pernicious to call these judgments into question because the state judges may have taken into account the effects on federal sentencing. State judges are often mindful of the federal implications of their sentences, as well they should be.")).

The role of district courts in sentencing crack cocaine offenders has also been given greater clarity recently. In United States v. Priester, 646 F.3d 950 (6th Cir. 2011), a defendant was sentenced for involvement with crack cocaine, with the district court unaware of its ability to vary categorically from the crack cocaine Guidelines as permitted under Spears v. United States, 555 U.S. 261, 265-66, 129 S. Ct. 840, 172 L. Ed. 2d 596 (2009) (per curiam).

The Court in Priester re-emphasized that sentencing is to be accomplished under the principles of reasonableness as put forth in 18 U.S.C. §3553, not blind adherence to the Guidelines.

District courts have also been granted wide latitude, at least in the Seventh Circuit, regarding the ability to avoid imposition of the career offender enhancement under U.S.S.G. §4B1.1. In *Narvaez v. United States*, 2011 U.S. App. LEXIS 2443 (7th Cir. 12/21/11), the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals reviewed a sentence wherein a defendant had been sentenced as a career offender based upon two prior escape convictions involving failure to return to confinement, violations of Wisconsin Statute §946.42(3)(a). The circuit court found that the decisions issued in *Begay v. United States*, 553 U.S. 137 (2008), and *Chambers v. United States*, 555 U.S. 122, 129 S. Ct. 687 (2009) should apply retroactively to the defendant's case. The *Begay* and *Chambers* decisions focused and narrowed the definition of "violent felony" for purposes of a career offender enhancement, limiting the classification of prior offenses as violent felonies to those offenses involving "purposeful, violent, and aggressive conduct" or those that are "roughly similar, in kind as well as in degree of risk posed, to the examples" listed in the Armed Career Criminal Act. *Begay*, 553 U.S. at 143; see also *Chambers*, 129 S. Ct. at 691, 693. The defendant's prior escape convictions in *Narvaez* did not

match with the definition of being a violent felony as put forth in *Begay* and *Chambers*. As such, the career offender enhancement was improper and constituted a miscarriage of justice, resulting in a re-sentencing without the career offender enhancement.

It is imperative that defendants seek the relief that they are entitled to as soon as possible. As with all issues involved in a criminal case, NLPA has been at the forefront in protecting defendants' rights, from the time of indictment until all avenues of relief have been pursued. Due to its long tradition of criminal research, NLPA is in a position to assist with the preparation of the necessary research to obtain a fair sentence. Should you have concerns that you are entitled to a lesser sentence, contact NLPA immediately, and we will help your counsel in your fight for justice!

INTERESTED IN HIRING NLPA?

Do you have pressing deadlines? - Give us a due date and you can relax. Have a brief due? - Call us for a free preliminary consultation so we can determine a cost estimate. NLPA can provide anything from a research memorandum to a file-ready brief - whichever you may need. If you're considering hiring someone to assist with your criminal proceedings, NLPA offers realistic fees that may suit you in your pursuit of finding top-notch yet affordable legal research &

consulting assistance. We believe you will find our fees to be extremely competitive compared to other legal research firms in the country. We also have several alternative options for paying our fees.

NLPA can accept payment via cashier's check or money order through the mail.

We also can accept credit/debit card payments over the telephone as well as electronic check (check by phone) payments over the telephone.

For most services provided NLPA also offers payment plans as well. With a minimum down payment you could soon be financing your legal fees.

Therefore, if you are interested in discussing the financing options available to you for your specific matter, please contact us. NLPA assists in virtually every stage of criminal proceedings from pretrial to post-conviction and also assists in immigration matters. For additional information on the services offered by National Legal Professional Associates please contact our office.

This newsletter is designed to introduce you to NLPA. As NLPA is not a law firm, professional services are only provided to licensed counsel in all areas that involve the practice of law. NLPA has created this publication to provide you with authoritative and accurate information concerning the subject matter covered. However, this publication was not necessarily prepared by persons licensed to practice law in a particular jurisdiction. This publication is not meant to be a substitute for legal or other professional advice, which NLPA is not rendering herein. NLPA cannot provide legal advice, representation, research or guidance to those who need legal help

COPYRIGHT © 2012 NATIONAL LEGAL
PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATES

About NLPA

NLPA is a research and consulting firm, owned and staffed by attorneys, and dedicated to the professional mission of providing counsel, research, and related work product to members of the Bar. Our ownership structure includes attorneys licensed to practice before many local, state, and federal courts; however, NLPA is not a law firm and provides no "front line" legal services. On the other hand, we are much more than your typical paralegal service as our work is prepared by attorneys. Our sole purpose is to provide research and consulting assistance by lawyers, for lawyers . . . and their clients. With cutting-edge computer research capabilities, an experienced and top quality staff, and more than the past two decades' experience, NLPA is well-positioned to provide the types of assistance members of the Bar need. You are important to us and we hope we can commence and maintain a long-term relationship with you. Please know that we are here to assist in all your needs. NLPA is a BBB Accredited Business with an "A" rating. If you would like to know more about the services we offer, please contact us at:

National Legal Professional Associates
11331 Grooms Road, Suite 1000
Cincinnati, OH 45242
Tel.: (513) 247-0082 * Fax: (513) 247-9580
E-Mail: contactus@nlpa.com * Website: www.NLPA.com

NLPA: WE LISTEN, WE CARE, WE GET RESULTS!

National Legal Professional Associates
11331 Grooms Road, Suite 1000
Cincinnati, OH 45242