## ORDER ON MOTION

\_\_\_\_\_

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY

APPELLATE DIVISION

DOCKET NO.: AM-000216-24T1 MOTION NO.: M-002248-24

BEFORE: PART G

JUDGES: JESSICA R. MAYER

PATRICK DEALMEIDA

MOTION FILED: 12/26/2024 BY: STATE OF NEW JERSEY

ANSWER

V

STATE OF NEW JERSEY

TYBEAR MILES

FILED: 01/02/2025 BY: TYBEAR MILES

SUBMITTED TO COURT: January 13, 2025

## **ORDER**

-----

THIS MATTER HAVING BEEN DULY PRESENTED TO THE COURT, IT IS, ON THIS 13th day of January, 2025, HEREBY ORDERED AS FOLLOWS:

MOTION BY APPELLANT/STATE OF NEW JERSEY

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL DENIED

## SUPPLEMENTAL:

The trial court is afforded substantial deference in its ongoing management of discovery or other pretrial matters. <u>Payton v. N.J. Tpk. Auth.</u>, 148 N.J. 524, 559 (1997). The court rules provide a criminal defendant with broad pretrial discovery. <u>State v. Scoles</u>, 214 N.J. 236, 251-52 (2013).

Additionally, the issue raised in the State's motion was addressed in <u>State v. Arteaga</u>, 476 N.J. Super. 36 (App. Div. 2023) (holding a defendant entitled to discovery in matters where the State uses or relies on facial recognition technology (FRT)). The State does not

dispute it used FRT in this case. Therefore, <u>Arteaga</u> applies and the judge did not abuse his discretion in compelling the State to produce the relevant FRT related discovery.

FOR THE COURT:

JESSICA R. MAYER, P.J.A.D.

Jess Mayer

22-06-00798-I HUDSON ORDER - REGULAR MOTION CS