

STATE OF MAINE

v.

ADAM M. HAFFORD

Submitted on Briefs March 26, 2002
Decided April 17, 2002

Panel: SAUFLEY, C.J., and CLIFFORD, RUDMAN, DANA, ALEXANDER,
CALKINS and LEVY, JJ.

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

Adam M. Hafford appeals from the judgment entered in the Superior Court (Aroostook County, *Pierson, J.*) following a jury verdict finding him guilty of one count of burglary, Class C, in violation of 17-A M.R.S.A. § 401(1) (1983),¹ and one count of theft by unauthorized taking or transfer, Class C, in violation of 17-A M.R.S.A. § 353(1) (1983).² Hafford argues that there was insufficient evidence to support the verdict and that the court erred in: (1) denying his motion to prohibit evidence because of an alleged discovery violation; (2) admitting videotape surveillance evidence; and (3) denying his motion for a new trial based on jurors possibly having observed him in a

1. Section 401(1) provides that “[a] person is guilty of burglary if he enters or surreptitiously remains in a structure, knowing that he is not licensed or privileged to do so, with the intent to commit a crime therein.” 17-A M.R.S.A. § 401(1).

2. Section 353(1) provides that “[a] person is guilty of theft if he obtains or exercises unauthorized control over the property of another with intent to deprive him thereof.” 17-A M.R.S.A. § 353(1). Pursuant to 17-A M.R.S.A. § 362(3)(A) (Supp. 2000), theft is a Class C offense if the value of property taken exceeds \$2000. Subsequently, P.L. 2001, ch. 389 § 3 reduced the base amount for a Class C theft to \$1000.

holding area. Hafford also argues that his right to a speedy trial was violated. We find no error or abuse of discretion in the trial court proceedings because: (1) the evidence, including Hafford's admissions, was sufficient to support the verdict; (2) the court did not abuse its discretion in admitting the contested evidence; (3) any concern about juror observations, though known to Hafford, was not timely disclosed to the court; and (4) Hafford was tried approximately six months after filing his motion for a speedy trial, and might have been tried sooner but for investigatory work which he requested.

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed.

Attorneys for State:

Neale T. Adams, Esq.
Carrie L. Linthicum, Asst. Dist. Attorney
27 Riverside Drive
Presque Isle, ME 04769-2730

Attorney for defendant:

James M. Dunleavy, Esq.
Dunleavy Law Offices, P.A.
P O Box 33
Presque Isle, ME 04769