

March 5, 2021

L. Campbell
Supervising Offender Rehabilitation Coordinator
New York State Division of Parole
P.O. Box 307
Beacon, NY 12508-0307

Re: People v. DOMINIC FRANZA Indictment No. 11987/1991 NYSID No. 06632501Q DIN: 92A3659

To the Members of the Board:

I am an Assistant District Attorney for the County of New York and was recently notified that this Board once again is considering the release of Dominic Franza. We again oppose any release of this defendant on parole. His release will be frightening to his victims, their relatives, to the law enforcement officers who were part of his prosecution, and to all members of our community. As outlined in three letters dated March 22, 2018, October 20, 2017, and October 8, 2015, our office has concerns about the release of Dominic Franza. It continues to be this Office's opinion that the release of this defendant poses a real threat to the safety of all involved.

As stated in our last communication to the Division of Parole, "[t]he defendant is a murderous individual who made repeated attempts to take the lives of his ex-wife and members of her family.

Moreover, after the defendant was convicted of these attempted murders and weapons charges, he threatened the prosecutors and police officers who handled the case." Based upon all the circumstances as further detailed below, it is our opinion that the defendant should not be paroled.

On March 11, 1992, the defendant was convicted following a jury trial of three counts of Attempted Murder in the Second degree (PL§110.00/125.25(1)) and one count of Criminal Possession of a weapon in the First Degree (PL§265.04). The defendant was later sentenced His Ex-wife lives in fear of the possibility that he might one day be released and try, once again to murder her.

to eight-and-a-third-to-twenty-five years in state prison on each of the attempted murder counts and three-to-nine years on the weapons charge. Each of these sentences were to be served consecutively. After serving over twenty-five years of his sentence, the defendant is eligible for release on parole. I am writing to give you some insight into the defendant and the facts of this case. These facts will help demonstrate the imminent danger this defendant poses should he ever be granted early release. To put it plainly, if the Board elects to release this defendant, it will be placing innocent lives in jeopardy.

In this case, defendant's acts of domestic violence and jealous rage culminated in a campaign of terror against his estranged wife, Myra Franza, whose only crime was attempting to leave him. The defendant employed violence, fear and intimidation and repeatedly threated to kill the victim and her family if she ever left him. Once she finally mustered the courage to do so, the defendant sent a hit man to Myra's mother's home, where she was staying. On July 17 1990, a man posing as a flower delivery man arrived at the home of Ms. Franza's mother, with whom she was staying. Claiming he had a delivery for Ms. Franza, the would-be assassin gained access to the residence. After speaking briefly with Myra's mother, he forced his way through the door to their apartment, armed with a handgun and a knife. He then shot Ms. Franza's mother five times, striking her in both arms, her upper chest, her wrist and her cheek. Gravely wounded, Ms. Franza's mother tried to protect her daughter by holding shut the door to the bathroom where Ms. Franza was taking a shower. Her efforts were unsuccessful, and as Ms. Franza opened the door she saw the gunman, who raised his weapon and shot her in the face. After falling to the floor and sensing the man standing over her, Ms. Franza played dead. The gunman then ran from the apartment. Miraculously, Ms. Franza and her mother survived their wounds. The police were notified and the investigation into this murder attempt began. The gunman was never identified or apprehended.

A few weeks later, on August 11th, 1990, a live pipe bomb was discovered outside the apartment of Ms. Franza's brother in upper Manhattan. The bomb squad was called and the device was successfully defused. In early February of 1991, two handwritten notes were delivered to the home of Ms. Fanza's parents. One of these letters was addressed to Ms. Franza and her mother, the other to Ms. Franza's brother. The letters threated the lives of Ms. Franza, her mother and her brother, as well as the lives of their family members in New York and Puerto Rico. The sender of these letters was listed as "Julio Ortiz" and the postage was paid, in part, by use of three-cent stamps. A short time later, a second pipe bomb was delivered, via Federal Express to the home of Ms. Franza's grandmother in Puerto Rico. That device, too, was successfully defused and never detonated.

Shortly after the discovery of the second bomb, the defendant was arrested and charged with the attempted murders of Ms. Franza and her mother. Search warrants were later executed on the defendant's home. The searches revealed gun powder, electrical tape, a green

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The terrifying details of the defendant's crimes have been restated, in several previous filings submitted by the People in response to defendant's numerous previous motions to set aside his conviction and challenge the constitutionality of his sentence. All of defendant's previous motions were found to be without merit and have been denied including his most recent motion filed in 2017.

marker, firecrackers, a pipe wrench, vice grip and several drill bits. Pipe end caps and nipples were also recovered from the basement of defendant's building. These materials were analyzed by ATF chemists. Several of the items were found to be consistent with the materials and markings on the two pipe bombs mentioned above.

Papers were also recovered from the defendant's home, one of which had the name "Julio Ortiz" on it. A sheet of three-cent stamps was also recovered. Papers with the defendant's handwriting were also seized, so they could be compared to a note tied to the flower box left at the time of the shooting and the threatening notes that were delivered thereafter. Following analysis of those materials, it was determined that the defendant wrote the note attached to the flowers the gunman left at the scene after shooting Ms. Franza and her mother. It was further determined that the stamps used to send the threatening letters described above came from the sheet of stamps recovered from the defendant's apartment. Further analysis of these materials showed that impressions in the defendant's handwriting had written out the name of Ms. Franza's brother along with his address, height, weight and the word 'shoot.'

Following a month-long trial and testimony from the victim, her family, police officers who investigated the case, and various forensic experts, the defendant was found guilty of three counts of attempted murder and one count of criminal possession of a weapon in the first degree. The defendant was subsequently sentenced to three consecutive terms of eight-and-a-third-to-twenty-five years (one for each count of attempted murder) and a fourth, consecutive term of three-to-nine years for the weapons charge. Defendant was remanded to the custody of the New York State Department of Corrections.

Even after his conviction, this defendant's threats and intimidation did not cease. A short time after the conclusion of the trial, the Assistant District Attorney who prosecuted the defendant received a phone call at his home. His wife and two young children were also home at the time. The assistant picked up the phone and heard a male voice screaming and shouting at him. He hung up the phone. A short time later his phone rang again. Fearful of reprisals and mindful of the unspeakable violence of which this defendant was capable, the ADA ran to lock his doors and check his home for intruders. He then gathered his wife and children and fled to the home a relative, where he stayed for approximately a week. The assistant notified the police and an investigation began. The assistant's phone records were reviewed in order to trace the origin of the threatening call. The records revealed that the call originated from a phone number at a New York State correctional facility and that the call was rerouted through a phone number belonging to this defendant's mother. From this investigation, it is clear that the defendant, while in state prison, orchestrated these threatening calls. This conduct alone should be sufficient to deny this defendant's parole and is again evidence that if released, he will continue to be a real and present danger to all parties involved in this case.

Our office has remained in contact with Ms. Franza since the conclusion of this case.

To this day she lives in constant fear of this defendant and the lengths to which he is willing to go to do her and her family harm. She contacted our office in a panic when she learned that this defendant would soon be eligible for parole.

Based on this defendant's previous brutal conduct and his calculated and ongoing efforts to orchestrate her killing and the murders of those she loves, her all-consuming fear is justified.

By the heinous and vicious acts that led to his instant convictions, this defendant has shown himself to be a threat to society. I am loath to imagine the lengths to which he might go to seek vengeance after over twenty-five years in custody. Based on his previous conduct, this defendant is clearly capable of unspeakable acts of violence. The threat he now poses to his victim, who survived his attempt to have her killed, cannot be understated. Moreover, by threatening the attorney who helped secure his conviction, this defendant has shown that that Ms. Franza is not the only one in danger. It is important to note that throughout his incarceration, the defendant has never acknowledged his complicity in these matters, has never come to terms with the fact that he is the individual who was involved in these terrifying acts, and professes only his complete innocence in this matter, although the evidence of his guilt is overwhelming.

We are still of the opinion that this defendant is a threat. His numerous efforts to kill his ex-wife and those close to her illustrate that his rage knows no bounds. If he is released, I fear for the safety of all those who cross his path. If he is released, I fear that innocent people may die. This defendant is not a worthy candidate for early release and I urge the Board to deny this and all subsequent applications for early release. For the sake of his victims and to ensure their safety and that of the public, he should serve his maximum sentence.

I ask that the parole board notify me of its decision concerning this defendant's release once the decision has been rendered.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa DelPizzo
Lisa Del Pizzo

Assistant District Attorney





January 2, 2019

L. Campbell
Supervising Offender Rehabilitation Coordinator
New York State Division of Parole
P.O. Box 307
Beacon, NY 12508-0307

Re: People v. DOMINIC FRANZA Indictment No. 11987/1991 NYSID No. 06632501Q DIN: 92A3659

To the Members of the Board:

I am an Assistant District Attorney for the County of New York and was recently notified that this Board once again is considering the release of Dominic Franza. His release will be frightening to his victims, their relatives, to the law enforcement officers who were part of his prosecution and to all members of our community. As outlined in three letters dated March 22, 2018, October 20, 2017, and October 8, 2015, our office addressed our concerns about the release of Dominic Franza. It continues to be this office's opinion that the release of this defendant poses a real threat to the safety of all involved. We strongly oppose his release – one can describe the defendant as a time bomb, ready to explode at any moment. The risk of injury is too great to justify his release.

As stated in our last communication to the Division of Parole, "[t]he defendant is a murderous individual who made repeated attempts to take the lives of his ex-wife and members of her family.

Moreover, after the defendant was convicted of these attempted murders and weapons charges, he threatened the prosecutors and police officers who handled the case." Based upon all the circumstances detailed below, it is our opinion that the defendant should not be paroled.

On March 11, 1992, this defendant was convicted following a jury trial of three counts of Attempted Murder in the Second degree (PL§110.00/125.25(1)) and one count of Criminal Possession of a weapon in the First Degree (PL§265.04). This defendant was later sentenced His Ex-wife lives in fear of the possibility that he might one day be released and try, once again to murder her.

to eight-and-a-third-to-twenty-five years in state prison on each of the attempted murder counts and three-to-nine years on the weapons charge. Each of these sentences were to be served consecutively. After serving over twenty-five years of his sentence, the defendant is eligible for release on parole. I am writing to give you some insight into the defendant and the facts of this case. These facts will help demonstrate the imminent danger this defendant poses should he ever be granted early release. To put it plainly, if the Board elects to release this defendant, it will be placing innocent lives in jeopardy.

In this case, defendant's acts of domestic violence and jealous rage culminated in a campaign of terror against his estranged wife, Myra Franza, whose only crime was attempting to leave him. The defendant employed violence, fear and intimidation and repeatedly threated to kill the victim and her family if she ever left him. Once she finally mustered the courage to do so, the defendant sent a hit man to the home of the victim's mother, where she was staying. On July 17th, 1990, a man posing as a flower delivery man arrived at the home of Ms. Franza's mother, with whom she was staying. Claiming he had a delivery for Ms. Franza, the wouldbe assassin gained access to the building. After speaking briefly with the victim's mother, he forced his way through the door to their apartment, armed with a handgun and a knife. He then shot Ms. Franza's mother five times, striking her in both arms, her upper chest, her wrist and her cheek. Gravely wounded, Ms. Franza's mother tried to protect her daughter by holding shut the door to the bathroom where Ms. Franza was taking a shower. Her efforts were unsuccessful, and as Ms. Franza opened the door she saw the gunman, who raised his weapon and shot her in the face. After falling to the floor and sensing the man standing over her, Ms. Franza played dead. The gunman then ran from the apartment. Miraculously, Ms. Franza and her mother survived their wounds. The police were notified and the investigation into this murder attempt began. The gunman was never identified or apprehended.

A few weeks later, on August 11th, 1990, a live pipe bomb was discovered outside the apartment of Ms. Franza's brother in upper Manhattan. The bomb squad was called and the device was successfully defused. In early February of 1991, two handwritten notes were delivered to the home of Ms. Fanza's parents. One of these letters was addressed to Ms. Franza and her mother, the other to Ms. Franza's brother. The letters threated the lives of Ms. Franza, her mother and her brother, as well as the lives of their family members in New York and Puerto Rico. The sender of these letters was listed as "Julio Ortiz" and the postage was paid, in part, by use of three-cent stamps. A short time later a second pipe bomb was delivered, via Federal Express to the home of Ms. Franza's grandmother in Puerto Rico. That device, too, was successfully defused and never detonated.

Shortly after the discovery of the second bomb, the defendant was arrested and charged with the attempted murders of Ms. Franza and her mother. Search warrants were later executed on the defendant's home. The searches revealed gun powder, electrical tape, a green

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The terrifying details of the defendant's crimes have been restated, in several previous filings submitted by the People in response to defendant's numerous previous motions to set aside his conviction and challenge the constitutionality of his sentence. All of defendant's previous motions were found to be without merit and have been denied including his most recent motion filed in 2017.

marker, firecrackers, a pipe wrench, vice grip and several drill bits. Pipe end caps and nipples were also recovered from the basement of defendant's building. These materials were analyzed by ATF chemists. Several of the items were found to be consistent with the materials and markings on the two pipe bombs mentioned above.

Papers were also recovered from the defendant's home, one of which had the name "Julio Ortiz" on it. A sheet of three-cent stamps was also recovered. Papers with the defendant's handwriting were also seized, so they could be compared to a note tied to the flower box left at the time of the shooting and the threatening notes that were delivered thereafter. Following analysis of those materials, it was determined that the defendant wrote the note attached to the flowers the gunman left at the scene after shooting Ms. Franza. It was further determined that the stamps used to send the threatening letters described above came from the sheet of stamps recovered from the defendant's apartment. Further analysis of these materials showed that impressions in the defendant's handwriting had written out the name of Ms. Franza's brother along with his address, height, weight and the word 'shoot.'

Following a month-long trial and testimony from the victim, her family, police officers who investigated the case and various forensic experts, the defendant was found guilty of three counts of attempted murder and one count of criminal possession of a weapon in the first degree. The defendant was subsequently sentenced to three consecutive terms of eight-and-a-third-to-twenty-five years (one for each count of attempted murder) and a fourth, consecutive term of three-to-nine years for the weapons charge. Defendant was remanded to the custody of the New York State Department of Corrections.

Even after his conviction, this defendant's threats and intimidation did not cease. A short time after the conclusion of the trial, the Assistant District Attorney who prosecuted the defendant received a phone call at his home. His wife and two young children were also home at the time. The assistant picked up the phone and heard a male voice screaming and shouting at him. He hung up the phone. A short time later his phone rang again. Fearful of reprisals and mindful of the unspeakable violence of which this defendant was capable, the ADA ran to lock his doors and check his home for intruders. He then gathered his wife and children and fled to the home a relative, where he stayed for approximately a week. The assistant notified the police and an investigation began. The assistant's phone records were reviewed in order to trace the origin of the threatening call. The records revealed that the call originated from a phone number at a New York State correctional facility and that the call was rerouted through a phone number belonging to this defendant's mother. From this investigation, it is clear that the defendant, while in state prison, orchestrated these threatening calls. This conduct alone should be sufficient to deny this defendant's parole and is again evidence that if released, he will continue to be a real and present danger to all parties involved in this case.

Our office has remained in contact with Ms. Franza since the conclusion of this case.

Based on his this defendant's previous,

To this day she lives in constant fear of this defendant and the lengths to which he is willing to go to do her and her family harm. She contacted our office in a panic when she learned that this defendant would soon be eligible for parole.

brutal conduct and his calculated and ongoing efforts to orchestrate her killing and the murders of those she loves, her all-consuming fear is justified.

By the heinous and vicious acts that led to his instant convictions, this defendant has shown himself to be a threat to society. I am loath to imagine the lengths to which he might go to seek vengeance after over twenty-five years in custody. Based on his previous conduct, this defendant is clearly capable of unspeakable acts of violence. The threat he now poses to his victim, who survived his attempt to have her killed, cannot be understated. Moreover, by threatening the attorney who helped secure his conviction, this defendant has shown that that Ms. Franza is not the only one in danger. It is important to note that throughout his incarceration, the defendant has never acknowledged his complicity in these matters, has never come to terms with the fact that he is the individual who was involved in these terrifying acts, and professes only his complete innocence in this matter, although the evidence of his guilt is overwhelming.

We are still of the opinion that this defendant is a brutal, devious, murderous lunatic. His numerous efforts to kill his ex-wife and those close to her illustrate that his rage knows no bounds. He is calculating, cold-blooded and has expressed no remorse for the heinous crimes he committed. If he is released, I fear for the safety of all those who cross his path. If he is released, I fear that innocent people may die. This defendant is not a worthy candidate for early release and I urge the Board to deny this and all subsequent applications for early release. For the sake of his victims and to ensure their safety and that of the public, he should serve his maximum sentence.

I ask that the parole board notify me of its decision concerning this defendant's release once the decision has been rendered.

Respectfully submitted,

Eugene Porcaro

Assistant District Attorney



February 8, 2019

L. Campbell
Supervising Offender Rehabilitation Coordinator
New York State Division of Parole
P.O. BOX 307
Beacon New York 12508-0307

Re: People v. Dominic Franza Indictment No. 11987/1991 NYSID No. 06632501Q DIN: 92A3659

Dear Ms. Campbell;

I am writing this supplemental response to express this office's strong opposition to the early release of the above named inmate. On January 2, 2019 our office responded to the Board concerning the brutal acts this inmate committed that resulted in a sentence of 27 to 84 years. I would like to now concentrate on this inmate's criminal activities while he was incarcerated for these crimes. I do this because what he did while in custody is significant as the Board decides whether he should be released. I do this because this inmate's criminal conduct while in custody was so threatening, so violent in nature, so intimidating that it caused the law enforcement officers involved in the prosecution of the inmate, as well as the victims and their families, such trauma that they were forced to alter their lives. The fear he orchestrated continues to this day. This is the reason why I write this supplemental response.

After reviewing this office's prior recommendation, I am sure that the Parole Board is aware that while in custody this inmate contacted the lead prosecutor at his home. The calls made to that prosecutor was forwarded through the telephone of the inmate's mother. The prosecutor remembered that there were two calls and that this inmate and a second inmate were screaming and threatening the prosecutor. The prosecutor feared for the lives of his family- he thought they would be killed. A second prosecutor remembers that the lead prosecutor at that time mentioned the

exact threats- "We are coming after you". The threats were so frightening at the time that the lead prosecutor immediately moved his family from his home. The second prosecutor also moved from his home. Since the inmate, after the initial attack on his wife and mother-in law, had delivered live pipe bombs to both his wife's brother and grandmother, precautions were taken to examine all mail sent to these law enforcement officers as well as the mail sent to the victim's family. These threats were so intimidating that their lives were completely disrupted.

To this day, the acts committed by this inmate while incarcerated have had a devastating effect on so many people. If the defendant, after his conviction, while incarcerated, was capable of this conduct, what will he do if released? For the safety of the victim and her family and all those who were involved with the prosecution of the inmate we urge the Parole Board deny his application for release. Our community must be protected.

It is our recommendation that he be incarcerated for the full length of his sentence.

Respectfully submitted,

Eugene Porcaro

Assistant District Attorney

212-335-9146



March 22, 2018

Fishkill Correctional Facility New York State Division of Parole Community Supervision 18 Strack Drive Beacon, NY 12508

> Re: People v. DOMINIC FRANZA Indictment No. 11987/1991 NYSID No. 06632501Q

To the Members of the Board:

I am an Assistant District Attorney for the County of New York, and I am again writing to you concerning Dominic Franza and his impending appearance before the Board of Parole. We again oppose any release of this defendant on parole. The defendant is a murderous individual who made repeated attempts to take the lives of his ex-wife and members of her family.

Moreover, after the defendant was convicted of these attempted murders and weapons charges, he threatened the prosecutors and police officers who handled the case. Based upon this defendant's vicious criminal conduct, the grave danger he poses to his victims and the general public, and all the circumstances detailed below, I urge the board to deny this defendant a grant of parole at this and any subsequent hearing.

On March 11, 1992, this defendant was convicted following a jury trial of three counts of Attempted Murder in the Second degree (PL§110.00/125.25(1)) and one count of Criminal Possession of a weapon in the First Degree (PL§265.04). This defendant was later sentenced to eight-and-a-third-to-twenty-five years in state prison on each of the attempted murder counts and three-to-nine years on the weapons charge. Each of these sentences were to be served consecutively. After serving over twenty-five years of his sentence, the defendant is eligible for releasé on parole. I am writing to give you some insight into the defendant and the facts of this case. These facts will help demonstrate the imminent danger this defendant His Ex-wife lives in fear of the possibility that he might one day be

released and try, once again to murder her.

poses should he ever be granted early release.<sup>1</sup> To put it plainly, if the Board elects to release this defendant, it will be placing innocent lives in jeopardy.

In this case, defendant's acts of domestic violence and jealous rage culminated in a campaign of terror against his estranged wife, Myra Franza, whose only crime was attempting to leave him. The defendant employed violence, fear and intimidation and repeatedly threated to kill the victim and her family if she ever left him. Once she finally mustered the courage to do so, the defendant sent a hit man to the home of the victim's mother, where she was staying. On July 17th, 1990, a man posing as a flower delivery man arrived at the home of Ms. Franza's mother, with whom she was staying. Claiming he had a delivery for Ms. Franza, the wouldbe assassin gained access to the building. After speaking briefly with the victim's mother, he forced his way through the door to their apartment, armed with a handgun and a knife. He then shot Ms. Franza's mother five times, striking her in both arms, her upper chest, her wrist and her cheek. Gravely wounded, Ms. Franza's mother tried to protect her daughter by holding shut the door to the bathroom where Ms. Franza was taking a shower. Her efforts were unsuccessful, and as Ms. Franza opened the door she saw the gunman, who raised his weapon and shot her in the face. After falling to the floor and sensing the man standing over her, Ms. Franza played dead. The gunman then ran from the apartment. Miraculously, Ms. Franza and her mother survived their wounds. The police were notified and the investigation into this murder attempt began. The gunman was never identified or apprehended.

A few weeks later, on August 11th, 1990, a live pipe bomb was discovered outside the apartment of Ms. Franza's brother in upper Manhattan. The bomb squad was called and the device was successfully defused. In early February of 1991, two handwritten notes were delivered to the home of Ms. Fanza's parents. One of these letters was addressed to Ms. Franza and her mother, the other to Ms. Franza's brother. The letters threated the lives of Ms. Franza, her mother and her brother, as well as the lives of their family members in New York and Puerto Rico. The sender of these letters was listed as "Julio Ortiz" and the postage was paid, in part, by use of three-cent stamps. A short time later a second pipe bomb was delivered, via Federal Express to the home of Ms. Franza's grandmother in Puerto Rico. That device, too, was successfully defused and never detonated.

Shortly after the discovery of the second bomb, the defendant was arrested and charged with the attempted murders of Ms. Franza and her mother. Search warrants were later executed on the defendant's home. The searches revealed gun powder, electrical tape, a green marker, firecrackers, a pipe wrench, vice grip and several drill bits. Pipe end caps and nipples were also recovered from the basement of defendant's building. These materials were analyzed by ATF chemists. Several of the items were found to be consistent with the materials and markings on the two pipe bombs mentioned above.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The terrifying details of the defendant's crimes have been restated, in several previous filings submitted by the People in response to defendant's numerous previous motions to set aside his conviction and challenge the constitutionality of his sentence. All of defendant's previous motions were found to be without merit and have been denied including his most recent motion filed in 2017.

Papers were also recovered from the defendant's home, one of which had the name "Julio Ortiz" on it. A sheet of three-cent stamps was also recovered. Papers with the defendant's handwriting were also seized, so they could be compared to a note tied to the flower box left at the time of the shooting and the threatening notes that were delivered thereafter. Following analysis of those materials, it was determined that the defendant wrote the note attached to the flowers the gunman left at the scene after shooting Ms. Franza. It was further determined that the stamps used to send the threatening letters described above came from the sheet of stamps recovered from the defendant's apartment. Further analysis of these materials showed that impressions in the defendant's handwriting had written out the name of Ms. Franza's brother along with his address, height, weight and the word 'shoot.'

Following a month-long trial and testimony from the victim, her family, police officers who investigated the case and various forensic experts, the defendant was found guilty of three counts of attempted murder and one count of criminal possession of a weapon in the first degree. The defendant was subsequently sentenced to three consecutive terms of eight-and-a-third-to-twenty-five years (one for each count of attempted murder) and a fourth, consecutive term of three-to-nine years for the weapons charge. Defendant was remanded to the custody of the New York State Department of Corrections.

Even after his conviction, this defendant's threats and intimidation did not cease. A short time after the conclusion of the trial, the Assistant District Attorney who prosecuted the defendant received a phone call at his home. His wife and two young children were also home at the time. The assistant picked up the phone and heard a male voice screaming and shouting at him. He hung up the phone. A short time later his phone rang again. Fearful of reprisals and mindful of the unspeakable violence of which this defendant was capable, the ADA ran to lock his doors and check his home for intruders. He then gathered his wife and children and fled to the home a relative, where he stayed for approximately a week. The assistant notified the police and an investigation began. The assistant's phone records were reviewed in order to trace the origin of the threatening call. The records revealed that the call originated from a phone number at a New York State correctional facility and that the call was rerouted through a phone number belonging to this defendant's mother. From this investigation, it is clear that the defendant, while in state prison, orchestrated these threatening calls. This conduct alone should be sufficient to deny this defendant's parole and is again evidence that if released, he will continue to be a real and present danger to all parties involved in this case.

Our office has remained in contact with Ms. Franza since the conclusion of this case.

Based on his this defendant's previous, brutal conduct and his calculated and ongoing efforts to orchestrate her killing and the murders of those she loves, her all-consuming fear is justified.

By the heinous and vicious acts that led to his instant convictions, this defendant has shown himself to be a threat to society. I am loath to imagine the lengths to which he might

To this day she lives in constant fear of this defendant and the lengths to which he is willing to go to do her and her family harm. She contacted our office in a panic when she learned that this defendant would soon be eligible for parole.

go to seek vengeance after over twenty-five years in custody. Based on his previous conduct, this defendant is clearly capable of unspeakable acts of violence. The threat he now poses to his victim, who survived his attempt to have her killed, cannot be understated. Moreover, by threatening the attorney who helped secure his conviction, this defendant has shown that that Ms. Franza is not the only one in danger. It is important to note that throughout his incarceration, the defendant has never acknowledged his complicity in these matters, has never come to terms with the fact that he is the individual who was involved in these terrifying acts, and professes only his complete innocence in this matter, although the evidence of his guilt is overwhelming.

In sum, this defendant is a brutal, devious, murderous lunatic. His numerous efforts to kill his ex-wife and those close to her illustrate that his rage knows no bounds. He is calculating, cold-blooded and has expressed no remorse for the heinous crimes he committed. If he is released, I fear for the safety of all those who cross his path. If he is released, I fear that innocent people may die. This defendant is not a worthy candidate for early release and I urge the Board to deny this and all subsequent applications for early release. For the sake of his victims and to ensure their safety (and that of the public), he should serve his maximum sentence.

I ask that the parole board notify me of its decision concerning this defendant's release once the decision has been rendered.

Respectfully submitted,

Eugene Porcaro

Assistant District Attorney



October 20, 2017

Fishkill Correctional Facility New York State Division of Parole Community Supervision 18 Strack Drive Beacon, NY 12508 OCT 24 2017

FISHKILL CORR. FACILITY

Re: People v. DOMINIC FRANZA Indictment No. 11987/1991 NYSID No. 06632501Q

To the Members of the Board:

I am an Assistant District Attorney for the County of New York, and I am writing to you concerning Dominic Franza and his impending appearance before the Board of Parole. The defendant is a murderous lunatic who made repeated attempts to take the lives of his exwife and members of her family.

Moreover, after the defendant was convicted of these attempted murders and weapons charges, he threatened the prosecutors who handled the case. Based upon this defendant's vicious criminal conduct, the grave danger he poses to his victims and the general public, and all the circumstances detailed below, I urge the board to deny this defendant a grant of parole at this and any subsequent hearing.

On March 11, 1992, this defendant was convicted following a jury trial of three counts of Attempted Murder in the Second degree (PL§110.00/125.25(1)) and one count of Criminal Possession of a weapon in the First Degree (PL§265.04). This defendant was later sentenced to eight-and-a-third-to-twenty-five years in state prison on each of the attempted murder counts and three-to-nine years on the weapons charge. Each of these sentences were to be served consecutively. After serving over twenty-five years of his sentence, the defendant is eligible for release on parole. I am writing to give you some insight into the defendant and the facts of this case. These facts will help demonstrate the imminent danger this defendant poses should he ever be granted early release. To put it plainly, if the Board elects to release this defendant, it will be placing innocent lives in jeopardy.

The terrifying details of the defendant's crimes have been restated, in several previous filings submitted by the People in response to defendant's numerous previous motions to set aside his conviction and challenge the His Ex-wife lives in fear of the possibility that he might one day be released and try, once again to murder her.

In this case, defendant's acts of domestic violence and jealous rage culminated in a campaign of terror against his estranged wife, Myra Franza, whose only crime was attempting to leave him. The defendant employed violence, fear and intimidation and repeatedly threated to kill the victim and her family if she ever left him. Once she finally mustered the courage to do so, the defendant sent a hit man to the home of the victim's mother, where she was staying. On July 17th, 1990, a man posing as a flower delivery man arrived at the home of Ms. Franza's mother, with whom she was staying. Claiming he had a delivery for Ms. Franza, the wouldbe assassin gained access to the building. After speaking briefly with the victim's mother, he forced his way through the door to their apartment, armed with a handgun and a knife. He then shot Ms. Franza's mother five times, striking her in both arms, her upper chest, her wrist and her cheek. Gravely wounded, Ms. Franza's mother tried to protect her daughter by holding shut the door to the bathroom where Ms. Franza was taking a shower. Her efforts were unsuccessful, and as Ms. Franza opened the door she saw the gunman, who raised his weapon and shot her in the face. After falling to the floor and sensing the man standing over her, Ms. Franza played dead. The gunman then ran from the apartment. Miraculously, Ms. Franza and her mother survived their wounds. The police were notified and the investigation into this murder attempt began. The gunman was never identified or apprehended.

A few weeks later, on August 11th, 1990, a live pipe bomb was discovered outside the apartment of Ms. Franza's brother in upper Manhattan. The bomb squad was called and the device was successfully defused. In early February of 1991, on the life of a third member of Ms. Franza's family, two handwritten notes were delivered to the home of Ms. Fanza's parents. One of these letters was addressed to Ms. Franza and her mother, the other to Ms. Franza's brother. The letters threated the lives of Ms. Franza, her mother and her brother, as well as the lives of their family members in New York and Puerto Rico. The sender of these letters was listed as "Julio Ortiz" and the postage was paid, in part, by use of three-cent stamps. A short time later a second pipe bomb was delivered, via Federal Express to the home of Ms. Franza's grandmother in Puerto Rico. That device, too, was successfully defused and never detonated.

Shortly after the discovery of the second bomb, the defendant was arrested and charged with the attempted murders of Ms. Franza and her mother. Search warrants were later executed on the defendant's home. The searches revealed gun powder, electrical tape, a green marker, firecrackers, a pipe wrench, vice grip and several drill bits. Pipe end caps and nipples were also recovered from the basement of defendant's building. These materials were analyzed by ATF chemists. Several of the items were found to be consistent with the materials and markings on the two pipe bombs mentioned above.

Papers were also recovered from the defendant's home, one of which had the name "Julio Ortiz" on it. A sheet of three-cent stamps was also recovered. Papers with the

constitutionality of his sentence. All of defendant's previous motions were found to be without merit and have been denied including his most recent motion filed in 2017.

defendant's handwriting were also seized, so they could be compared to a note tied to the flower box left at the time of the shooting and the threatening notes that were delivered thereafter. Following analysis of those materials, it was determined that the defendant wrote the note attached to the flowers the gunman left at the scene after shooting Ms. Franza. It was further determined that the stamps used to send the threatening letters described above came from the sheet of stamps recovered from the defendant's apartment. Further analysis of these materials showed that impressions in the defendant's handwriting had written out the name of Ms. Franza's brother along with his address, height, weight and the word 'shoot.'

Following a month-long trial and testimony from the victim, her family, police officers who investigated the case and various forensic experts, the defendant was found guilty of three counts of attempted murder and one count of criminal possession of a weapon in the first degree. The defendant was subsequently sentenced to three consecutive terms of eight-and-a-third-to-twenty-five years (one for each count of attempted murder) and a fourth, consecutive term of three-to-nine years for the weapons charge. Defendant was remanded to the custody of the New York State Department of Corrections.

Even after his conviction, this defendant's threats and intimidation did not cease. A short time after the conclusion of the trial, the Assistant District Attorney who prosecuted the defendant received a phone call at his home. His wife and two young children were also home at the time. The assistant picked up the phone and heard a male voice screaming and shouting at him. He hung up the phone. A short time later his phone rang again. Fearful of reprisals and mindful of the unspeakable violence of which this defendant was capable, the ADA ran to lock his doors and check his home for intruders. He then gathered his wife and children and fled to the home a relative, where he stayed for approximately a week. The assistant notified the police and an investigation began. The assistant's phone records were reviewed in order to trace the origin of the threatening call. The records revealed that the call originated from a phone number at a New York State correctional facility and that the call was rerouted through a phone number belonging to this defendant's mother.

Our office has remained in contact with Ms. Franza since the conclusion of this case.

Based on his this defendant's previous, brutal conduct and his calculated and ongoing efforts to orchestrate her killing and the murders of those she loves, her all-consuming fear is justified.

By the heinous and vicious acts that led to his instant convictions, this defendant has shown himself to be a threat to society. I am loath to imagine the lengths to which he might go to seek vengeance after over twenty-five years in custody. Based on his previous conduct, this defendant is clearly capable of unspeakable acts of violence. The threat he now poses to his victim, who survived his attempt to have her killed, cannot be understated. Moreover, by threatening the attorney who helped secure his conviction, this defendant has shown that that Ms. Franza is not the only one in danger.

To this day she lives in constant fear of this defendant and the lengths to which he is willing to go to do her and her family harm. She contacted our office in a panic when she learned that this defendant would soon be eligible for parole.

In sum, this defendant is a brutal, devious, murderous lunatic. His numerous efforts to kill his ex-wife and those close to her illustrate that his rage knows no bounds. He is calculating, cold-blooded and has expressed no remorse for the heinous crimes he committed. If he is released, I fear for the safety of all those who cross his path. If he is released, I fear that innocent people may die. This defendant is not a worthy candidate for early release and I urge the Board to deny this and all subsequent applications for early release. For the sake of his victims and to ensure their safety (and that of the public), he should serve his maximum sentence.

I ask that the parole board notify me of its decision concerning this defendant's release once the decision has been rendered.

Respectfully submitted,

Eugene Porcaro

Assistant District Attorney

### DISTRICT ATTORNEY

ONE HOGAN PLACE New York, N. Y. 10013 (212) 335-9000



October 8, 2015

Ms. Heather Scott New York State Division of Parole Community Supervision Red Schoolhouse Road, Box 445 Fishkill, NY 12524

> Re: People v. DOMINIC FRANZA Indictment No. 11987/1991 NYSID No. 06632501Q

Dear Ms. Scott:

I am an Assistant District Attorney for the County of New York, and I am writing to you concerning Dominic Franza and his impending appearance before the Parole Board. This defendant is a murderous lunatic who made repeated attempts to take the lives of his ex-wife and members of her family.

Moreover, after the defendant was convicted of attempted murder and weapon charges, he threatened the prosecutor who handled the case. Based upon this defendant's vicious criminal conduct, the grave danger he poses to his victims and the general public, and all the circumstances detailed below, I urge the Board to deny this defendant parole at this and any subsequent hearing.

On March 11, 1992, this defendant was convicted following a jury trial of three counts of Attempted Murder in the Second degree (PL§110.00/125.25(1)) and one count of Criminal Possession of a weapon in the First Degree (PL§265.04). This defendant was later sentenced to eight-and-a-third-to-twenty-five years in state prison on each of the attempted murder counts and three-to-nine years on the weapons charge. Each of these sentences were to be served consecutively. After serving over twenty years of his sentence, the defendant will soon become eligible for release on parole. I am writing to give you some insight into this defendant and the facts of this case. These facts will help demonstrate the imminent danger this defendant poses should he ever be granted early release.¹ To put it plainly, if the Board elects to release this defendant, it will be placing innocent lives in jeopardy.

The terrifying details of the defendant's crimes have been restated, in several previous filings submitted by the People in response to defendant's numerous previous motions to set aside his conviction and challenge the —His Fx-wife lives in fear of the possibility that he might one day be released and try, once again to murder her.

In this case, defendant's acts of domestic violence and jealous rage culminated in a campaign of terror against his estranged wife, Myra Franza, whose only crime was attempting to leave him. The defendant employed violence, fear and intimidation and repeatedly threatened to kill the victim and members of her family if she ever left him. Once she finally mustered the courage to do so, the defendant sent a hit man to the home of the victim's mother, where she was staying, to kill her.

On July 17th, 1990, a man posing as a flower delivery man arrived at the home of Ms. Franza's mother, with whom she was staying. Claiming he had a delivery for Ms. Franza, the would-be assassin gained access to the building. After speaking briefly with the victim's mother, he forced his way through the door to her apartment, armed with a handgun and a knife. He then shot Ms. Franza's mother five times, striking her in both arms, her upper chest, her wrist and her cheek. Gravely wounded, Ms. Franza's mother tried to protect her daughter by holding shut the door to the bathroom where Ms. Franza was taking a shower. Her efforts were unsuccessful, and, as Ms. Franza opened the door the gunman raised his weapon and shot her in the face. She felt the bullet exit her skull and she fell to the ground. Sensing the man standing over her, Ms. Franza played dead. The gunman then ran from the apartment. Miraculously, Ms. Franza and her mother survived their wounds. The police were notified and the investigation into this murder attempt began. The gunman was never identified or apprehended.

A few weeks later, on August 11th, 1990, a live pipe bomb was discovered outside the apartment of Ms. Franza's brother in upper Manhattan. The bomb squad was called and the device was successfully defused. In early February of 1991, two handwritten letters containing threatening notes were delivered to the home of Ms. Fanza's parents. One of these letters was addressed to Ms. Franza and her mother, the other to Ms. Franza's brother. The letters threatened the lives of Ms. Franza, her mother and her brother, as well as the lives of their family members in New York and Puerto Rico. The sender of these letters was listed as "Julio Ortiz" and the postage was paid, in part, by use of three-cent stamps. A short time later, a second pipe bomb was delivered, via Federal Express, to the home of Ms. Franza's grandmother in Puerto Rico. That device, too, was successfully defused and never detonated.

Shortly after the discovery of the second bomb, the defendant was arrested and charged with the attempted murders of Ms. Franza and her mother. Search warrants were later executed on the defendant's home. The searches revealed gun powder, electrical tape, a green marker, firecrackers, a pipe wrench, vice grip and several drill bits. Pipe end caps and nipples were also recovered from the basement of defendant's building. These materials were analyzed by chemists at the bureau of Alcohol Tobacco and Firearms (ATF). Several of the items were found to be consistent with the materials and markings on the two pipe bombs mentioned above.

constitutionality of his sentence. All of defendant's previous motions were found to be without merit and have been denied.

Papers were also recovered from the defendant's home, one of which had the name "Julio Ortiz" on it. A sheet of three-cent stamps was also recovered. Papers with the defendant's handwriting were also seized, so they could be compared to a note tied to the flower box left at the time of the shooting and the threatening notes that were delivered thereafter. Following analysis of those materials, it was determined that the defendant wrote the note attached to the flowers the gunman left at the scene after shooting Ms. Franza. It was further determined that the stamps used to send the threatening letters described above came from the sheet of stamps recovered from the defendant's apartment. Further analysis of these materials revealed a piece of paper with impressions on it. These impressions were analyzed and it was determined that the impressions were made a writing made in the defendant's handwriting. The defendant had written her brother's name and address, his physical description, the name of her brother's wife and the word 'shoot.'

Following a month-long trial and testimony from the victim, her family, police officers who investigated the case and various forensic experts, the defendant was found guilty of three counts of attempted murder and one count of criminal possession of a weapon in the first degree. The defendant was subsequently sentenced to three consecutive terms of eight-and-a-third-to-twenty-five years (one for each count of attempted murder) and a fourth, consecutive term of three-to-nine years for the weapons charge. Defendant was remanded to the custody of the New York State Department of Corrections.

Even after his conviction, while serving his sentence in State Prison, this defendant's threats and intimidation did not cease. A short time after the conclusion of the trial, the Assistant District Attorney who prosecuted the defendant received a phone call at his home. His wife and two young children were home with him at the time. The assistant picked up the phone and heard a male voice screaming and shouting at him. He hung up the phone. A short time later his phone rang again. Fearful of reprisals and mindful of the unspeakable violence of which this defendant was capable, the ADA ran to lock his doors and check his home for intruders. He then gathered his wife and children and fled to the home a relative, where he stayed for approximately a week. The assistant notified the police and an investigation began. The assistant's phone records were reviewed in order to trace the origin of the threatening call. The records revealed that the call originated from a phone number at a New York State correctional facility and that the call was rerouted through a phone number belonging to this defendant's mother.

Our office has remained in contact with Ms. Franza since the conclusion of this case.

Based on this defendant's previous, brutal conduct and his calculated and ongoing efforts to orchestrate her killing and the murders of those she loves, her all-consuming fear is justified.

To this day she lives in constant fear of this defendant and the lengths to which he is willing to go to do her and her family harm. She contacted our office in a panic when she learned that this defendant would soon be eligible for parole.

By the heinous and vicious acts that led to his instant convictions, this defendant has shown himself to be a threat to society. I am loath to imagine the lengths to which he might go to seek vengeance after over twenty years in custody. Based on his previous conduct, this defendant is clearly capable of unspeakable acts of violence. The threat he now poses to his victim, who survived his attempt to have her killed, cannot be understated. Moreover, by threatening the attorney who helped secure his conviction, this defendant has shown that Ms. Franza is not the only one in danger.

In sum, this defendant is a brutal, devious, murderous lunatic. His numerous efforts to kill his ex-wife and those close to her illustrate that his rage knows no bounds. He is calculating, cold-blooded and has expressed no remorse for the heinous crimes he committed. If he is released, I fear for the safety of all those who cross his path. If he is released, I fear that innocent people may die. This defendant is not a worthy candidate for early release and I urge the Board to deny this and any subsequent applications for early release. For the sake of his victims and to ensure their safety and that of the public, he should serve his maximum sentence.

I ask that the parole board notify me of its decision concerning this defendant's release once the decision has been rendered.

Respectfully submitted,

Eugene Porcaro

Bureau Chief, Trial Bureau 30 Assistant District Attorney