


COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

SUFFOLK, ss.

SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT
FOR SUFFOLK COUNTY
NO: SJ-2017-347

COMMITTEE FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL SERVICES & others¹



vs.

ATTORNEY GENERAL & others²

Report of the Special Master

Judd J. Carhart, Special Master in this matter reports as follows:

1. On February 28, 2018, this Honorable Court appointed Judd J. Carhart as Special Master to assist Justice Gaziano in the dismissal of certain convictions that had been tainted by the conduct of Sonja Farak (Farak) in her capacity as a chemist at the State Drug Lab.

2. A working group, consisting of representatives from several District Attorneys' offices, the Attorney General's office, the Committee for Public Counsel Services, the American Civil Liberties Union of Massachusetts, the Massachusetts Probation Department, the Trial Court Administrative Office and the Information Technology Department of the Trial Court, the Superior, District, Boston Municipal and Juvenile Courts, was established in order to facilitate the dismissal of those cases subject to dismissal.

¹ Hampden County Lawyers for Justice, Inc., Herschelle Reaves, and Nicole Westcott.

² District Attorney for Berkshire County, District Attorney for Bristol County, District Attorney for the Cape and Islands, District Attorney for Essex County, District Attorney for Hampden County, District Attorney for Middlesex County, District Attorney for Norfolk County, District Attorney for the Northwestern District, District Attorney for Plymouth County, District Attorney for Suffolk County, and District Attorney for Worcester County.

3. Initially, this Court ordered that all cases in which Farak had signed the certificate of analysis be dismissed with prejudice. Concurrently, the Court ordered that a protocol, similar to that used in the case of Bridgeman v. District Attorney for the Suffolk District, 476 Mass. 298 (2017) (Bridgeman), be employed in order to effectuate the dismissals. (Docket Entry #130, 2/27/2018) (Farak I defendants)

4. Subsequently, this Court enlarged the class of defendants entitled to relief as a result of Farak's misconduct by defining those defendants as "Farak defendants, as defined by the Full Court, to include "all defendants who pleaded guilty to a drug charge, admitted to sufficient facts on a drug charge, or were found guilty of a drug charge, where (i) Farak signed the certificate of analysis (Farak I defendants), (ii) the conviction was based on methamphetamine and the drugs were tested during Farak's tenure at the Amherst lab, or (iii) the drugs were tested at the Amherst lab on or after January 1, 2009, and through January 18, 2013, regardless of who signed the certificate of analysis." This Court then ordered the dismissal of all convictions of "Farak defendants." (Docket Entry #226, 11/13/2018).

5. Later, on March 6, 2019, the Full Court held that so-called "Ruffin defendants," who pled guilty before receiving a signed drug certificate, are not exempt from the relief ordered by the Full Court in October 2019.

6. The working group employed a protocol similar to the one used in the Bridgeman case in order to identify and certify that those cases which should be dismissed were, in fact, dismissed. The group, pursuant to this Court's Order, established a list for both Farak I and Farak II cases in order to facilitate the dismissal of the appropriate cases.

- "Farak I," generally refers to defendants for whom Farak signed the certificate of analysis, for which the Respondent District Attorneys began generating lists

before the Full Court's decision in October 2018; and

- "Farak II," refers to all other "Farak defendants as defined by the Full Court's October 2018 decision and March 2019 ruling.

7. The Respondent District Attorneys generated lists of Farak I and Farak II defendants with charges that were ordered dismissed by the Full Court.

8. Various means of notification were employed, including newspaper and radio ads, social media and notification letters in an effort to notify all affected defendants of their rights. A notice letter, intended to notify all Farak defendants of their rights was prepared and approved by the Single Justice (Gaziano, J.). The notice letter was mailed to Farak I defendants in March 2019, and it was subsequently sent to Farak II defendants in May 2019. A copy of the notice letter is attached hereto and marked as Exhibit 1, and it also appears (in English and eight other languages) at <https://www.mass.gov/info-details/drug-lab-cases-information>.

9. Pursuant to the Full Court's decision, the Attorney General's Office is bearing the entire financial burden associated with notifying affected defendants. See Committee for Public Counsel Services v. Attorney General, 480 Mass. 700, 730 n. 13 (2018). The Attorney General's Office and counsel for the Petitioners have entered into an agreement as to notice, which is attached hereto and marked as Exhibit 2.

10. The Information Technology department (IT) of the Trial Court worked diligently to certify that all cases which were the subject of this Court's Order were, in fact, dismissed.

11. Despite the many different ways in which cases are docketed in the various courts of the Commonwealth, the IT department was able to identify and quantify those cases which were the subject of this Court's Order. A memorandum from James Morton of the Trial

Court, attached hereto as Exhibit 3, states that a total of 24,853 charges were submitted by the District Attorneys. The Trial Court's Judicial Information Services Department (JISD) ran a report of Farak I and Farak II dispositions in MassCourts showing that 24,075 charges were dismissed in 16,449 cases. Of the 778 charges submitted by the District Attorneys that were not captured in the JISD report:

- 192 charges were dismissed in sealed cases which had been manually updated.
- 151 charges did not result in dismissals because they correlated with charges that either were not a 94C offense or the charge number did not match a charge number in MassCourts; each of these charges was reviewed to ensure that no additional disposition update was necessary.
- 435 charges were not updated because the listed charge had previously been updated with a non-adverse disposition; it was then determined that 28 of those charges should have received either the Farak I or Farak II disposition, and those 28 charge dispositions were manually updated.

Accordingly, this process has confirmed the dismissal of 24,295 charges.³

12. The Probation Department ensured that all defendants' records were updated to reflect the dismissals. This was a time-consuming process, much of which had to be done by hand, that was nonetheless accomplished quickly and efficiently.

13. The Department of Criminal Justice Information Services also updated their protocols to ensure that all defendants' records accurately reflected the dismissals entered by the

³ These totals do not reflect charges that were vacated and dismissed with prejudice pursuant to a motion for new trial filed in individual cases, as opposed to this litigation.

Probation Department.

14. The difficulty in dismissing all Farak cases from the various District Courts was compounded by the fact that many District Courts use varying means of docketing cases, including manual notation of docket entries. A copy of a memorandum prepared by Attorney Zachary Hillman counsel for the District Court, which outlines the procedures used to effectuate the Court's Order is attached hereto and marked as Exhibit 4.


15. A proposed protocol, to be used by the Trial Court in anticipation of any future Farak cases, was prepared by the District Attorneys and the Trial Court and is attached hereto and marked as Exhibit 5A. A copy of the proposed notice, pursuant to the protocol, is attached hereto and marked as Exhibit 5B. The proposed notice of dismissal, to be used by the Trial Court in any future Farak cases, was prepared by the Trial Court in conjunction with the District Attorneys. Pursuant to the proposed protocol, if a District Attorney identifies a case that should have been included in the list for vacatur and dismissal, the District Attorney shall file a motion with the appropriate court in order to vacate and dismiss the relevant charges. The Trial Court will then issue notice pursuant to the protocol. A copy of all such pleadings will be served upon the appropriate Probation Department.

16. It is the opinion of the Special Master that all means of identifying and dismissing the relevant Farak cases have been made and that, to the extent possible, all Farak cases subject to the Court's Order have been dismissed.

17. It is also the opinion of the Special Master that that notice campaign, which included defendant-specific letters and paid advertisements in traditional and social media, has been an effective and appropriate means of notifying Farak defendants of their rights. One exception may be Farak defendants who have been deported; they have not been specifically

identified, and it is the Special Master's understanding that counsel for the Petitioners continue to investigate whether notice to these defendants is possible.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Judd J. Carhart", is written over the typed name and title. The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large loop at the end of the last name.

Judd J. Carhart
Special Master

EXHIBIT 1



SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02108

FIRST LAST
123 MAIN STREET
ANYTOWN, USA

February 28, 2019

Dear Mr./Ms. Last,

I am a judge on the Supreme Judicial Court, the highest court in Massachusetts. I am writing to tell you that the court has dismissed certain conviction(s) or other disposition(s) against you, and that the court has also dismissed the underlying charge(s). The dismissed convictions are shown on the attached page(s), listed by court, docket number, count, and charge.

Why is the court dismissing these convictions?

A chemist named Sonja Farak engaged in serious misconduct involving her work at a state drug lab. Your case includes one or more drug convictions affected by Ms. Farak. The court has now dismissed the conviction(s). This dismissal is final and permanent, which means you cannot be prosecuted again for any charge that has been dismissed.

What happens next?

Your criminal record has been updated to remove the conviction(s). The removal of a conviction may provide important benefits to you related to employment, housing, immigration, and more.

However, your record has not been sealed. You can find more information about sealing your record at www.masslegalhelp.org/cori.

In addition, you might have other charges in the same case that were not dismissed and that remain on your record. You may want to speak to a lawyer about whether these convictions can also be undone.

You might also have paid money because of these convictions, such as fines, court fees, probation fees, or restitution. You may want to speak to a lawyer about whether you are entitled to have any money returned to you.

If you have any questions about this letter, including how to get a lawyer to help you, you may contact the Committee for Public Counsel Services (the state public defender agency) by calling its confidential Drug Lab Case Hotline at **888-999-2881**, or by visiting its website: www.publiccounsel.net/dlclu. You may also find information on the court's website: www.mass.gov/courts/druglab.

Sincerely,

Frank M. Gaziano
Associate Justice



SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02108

FIRST LAST
123 MAIN STREET
ANYTOWN, USA

XXX de febrero, 2019

Estimado(a)

Soy juez del Tribunal Supremo de Justicia, el tribunal de mayor rango en Massachusetts. Escribo para decirle que el tribunal ha desestimado cierta(s) condena(s) (*convictions*) u otra(s) disposicion(es) que había contra usted, y que también ha desestimado las acusaciones incluidas. Las condenas desestimadas aparecen en la(s) página(s) anexa(s), organizadas por tribunal, número del caso, y por número y descripción de la acusación.

¿Por qué el tribunal ha desestimado estas condenas?

La química Sonja Farak cometió una grave falta de conducta profesional al realizar su trabajo en un laboratorio de drogas del estado. El caso de usted incluye una o más condenas de drogas que fueron afectadas por la Sra. Farak. El tribunal ya ha desestimado esta(s) condena(s). Esta desestimación es definitiva y permanente, lo cual quiere decir que usted no puede ser procesado(a) de nuevo por cualquier acusación que haya sido desestimada.

¿Qué sucederá ahora?

Su historial de antecedentes penales (*criminal record*) ha sido actualizado para eliminar la(s) condena(s). La eliminación de una condena puede traerle importantes ventajas en cuanto al empleo, vivienda, inmigración, etc.

Sin embargo, no se ha cerrado, o sea, "sellado", el acceso a su historial de antecedentes penales. Para más información de cómo sellar su historial, vea www.masslegalhelp.org/cori.

Además, puede haber otras acusaciones dentro del mismo caso que no fueron desestimadas y que siguen en su historial. Para averiguar si es posible eliminar estas condenas también, consulte a un abogado.

Usted a lo mejor pagó dinero debido a estas condenas, como por ejemplo en forma de multas, costos judiciales, costos de probatoria o de restitución. Consulte a un abogado para ver si tiene derecho a que le devuelvan alguna cantidad de dinero.

Para cualquier pregunta sobre esta carta, incluido cómo conseguir la ayuda de un abogado, póngase en contacto con el Committee for Public Counsel Services (Comité de Servicios de Defensores Públicos), la agencia estatal de defensores públicos, llamando a la Línea de Información sobre los Casos del Laboratorio de Drogas al **888-999-2881**, o visitando su sitio web: www.publiccounsel.net/dlcu. También puede encontrar información en el sitio web del tribunal: www.mass.gov/courts/druglab.

Atentamente,

Frank M. Gaziano
Juez Asociado

Notice

English: This is an official court document. If you cannot read it in English, please visit www.mass.gov/courts/druglab for a translated version, or have it translated.

Aviso

Español: este es un documento oficial del tribunal. Se incluye la traducción en español. La traducción también se encuentra disponible en www.mass.gov/courts/druglab.

Aviso

Português: este é um documento jurídico oficial. Se você não souber ler inglês, mande traduzir, ou então acesse www.mass.gov/courts/druglab para ler uma tradução.

Avi

Kreyol Ayisyen: Sa a se dokiman ofisyèl tribinal la. Si w pakab li'l an Kreyol, tanpri vizite www.mass.gov/courts/druglab pou yon kopi ki deja tradwi, oswa fè tradwi li.

Thông báo

Tiếng Việt: Đây là giấy tờ chính thức của tòa. Nếu bạn không thể đọc bằng tiếng Anh, vui lòng vào trang mạng www.mass.gov/courts/druglab để đọc bản dịch, hoặc nhờ người dịch sang tiếng Việt.

កំណត់សំគាល់

ខ្មែរ * ន ១០០:គឺជាឯកសារផ្លូវការរបស់តុលាការ។ នបើសាក-អុនកម អាចរា ភាសាអូស្ត្រាលីយ៉ា
នមកនៅ នមើលនៅ www.mass.gov/courts/druglab ន មើលអា ឯកសារជាភាសាខ្មែរ
ឬអុនកមណាមួយក៏ជួយបក ខ្របប្ល ។

Внимание

Русский: Это официальный судебный документ. Если Вы не можете прочитать его по-английски, найдите его перевод на www.mass.gov/courts/druglab или пусть Вам его переведут.

تنويه

هذه وثيقة رسمية صادرة بموجب المحكمة. إذا كنت لا تستطيع قراءتها باللغة الانكليزية يرجى زيارة الموقع الالكتروني التالي www.mass.gov/courts/druglab للحصول على نسخة مترجمة أو قم بإيجاد شخص ليترجمها لك.

EXHIBIT 2

**COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT**

Suffolk, SS

SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT FOR
SUFFOLK COUNTY
No. SJ-2017-347

COMMITTEE FOR PUBLIC COUNSEL SERVICES & others

v.

ATTORNEY GENERAL of MASSACHUSETTS & others

AGREEMENT ON NOTICE TO FARAK DEFENDANTS

On October 11, 2018, the Full Court held that individuals entitled to dismissals are those in whose case: (i) Farak signed the certificate of analysis ("Farak I defendants"); (ii) the conviction was based on methamphetamine and the drugs were tested during Farak's tenure at the Amherst lab; or (iii) the drugs were tested at the Amherst lab on or after January 1, 2009, and through January 18, 2013, regardless of who signed the certificate of analysis (together with (ii), "Farak II defendants"). See *Committee for Public Counsel Services v. Attorney General*, 480 Mass. 700, 729 (2018). On March 6, 2019, the Full Court ordered that so-called "Ruffin defendants," who pled guilty before receiving a signed drug certificate, are not exempt from this relief.

The Respondents, represented by the Attorney General's Office ("AGO"), and the Petitioners submit this agreement pertaining to providing notice to these Farak defendants.

1. The parties arranged for the Court to provide notice to Farak defendants through letters approved by the Single Justice. To that end, Respondents contracted with a vendor to mail individualized, case-specific notice letters to Farak defendants under Justice Gaziano's signature.

2. Initial notice letters for Farak I defendants were mailed in March 2019.

3. Initial letters for Farak II and *Ruffin* defendants were mailed in May 2019.

4. Respondents instructed the vendor to search for, and send the letters to, current addresses for the defendants (as distinct from last known addresses that might appear on court papers from years ago). Respondents also arranged for the vendor to undertake a subsequent mailing of individualized, case-specific notice letters to defendants whose initial letters were not delivered or returned as undeliverable.

5. Respondents also arranged, via coordination with the Department of Correction and the Probation Department, for individualized, case-specific notices to be sent to defendants who were incarcerated in Massachusetts at the time of the mailings.

6. In addition, attempts to notify Farak defendants were made through various forms of public notice: newspapers, radio,

and social media. Petitioners and the Respondents have also agreed to produce notecards and flier notices for distribution and posting at locations throughout the Commonwealth, focusing on areas of Western Massachusetts. The above mentioned materials include contact information for the Committee for Public Counsel Services ("CPCS") Drug Lab Crisis Litigation Unit.

7. CPCS has agreed to distribute these materials to appropriate locations in their communities. The AGO has agreed to distribute these materials to probation and courthouse clerk's offices in Western Massachusetts. They have also been posted in the prisons, through the Department of Correction, and the Attorney General's Office is taking steps to have them posted in the county jails, through the individual sheriff's departments.

8. Consistent with the Full Court's October 2018 decision, the AGO will "bear the entire financial burden associated with notifying those affected defendants that their cases have been dismissed." *CPCS*, 480 Mass. at 730 n.13.

9. The Petitioners and the Respondents memorialize the payment agreement as part of this Notice. The ACLU of Massachusetts, as counsel for petitioners Hampden County Lawyers for Justice, Herschelle Reaves, and Nicole Westcott have paid

the third parties with whom it has contracted for services relating to notice, except for the cost of notecard and flier notices, which has been assumed directly by the AGO. The AGO, in turn, has reimbursed ACLUM in the full dollar amount expended to all such vendors to effectuate notice, consistent with the Full Court's rulings. That reimbursement totals \$64,505.20.

10. As indicated below, the Special Master appointed by the Single Justice has reviewed and endorsed this agreement.

Respectfully submitted,

For the Respondents,

/s/ Thomas Caldwell

Thomas A. Caldwell, BBO 651977
Assistant Attorney General
for the Attorney General
One Ashburton Place
Boston, MA 02108
thomas.caldwell@state.ma

For Petitioners Hampden County Lawyers for
Justice, Herschelle Reaves, and Nicole
Westcott,

/s/ Matthew Segal

Matthew R. Segal, BBO 654489
American Civil Liberties Union
Foundation of Massachusetts, Inc.
211 Congress Street
Boston, MA 02110
msegal@aclum.org


For Petitioner Committee for
Public Counsel Services,

/s/ Rebecca Jacobstein

Rebecca Jacobstein, BBO 651048
Committee for Public Counsel Services
44 Bromfield Street
Boston, MA 02108
rjacobstein@publiccounsel.net

DATED: September 11, 2019

Endorsed by:



Special Master Judd J. Carhart
Associate Justice, Massachusetts Appeals Court (Ret.)

DATED: 9/19/17

EXHIBIT 3

MEMORANDUM

TO: Judd Carhart
FROM: James Morton
DATE: August 26, 2019
RE: Farak I and Farak II/Ruffin Charges and Cases

A final count of charges dismissed by order of Justice Gaziano is seen below and on the attached spreadsheet. Many of the individual charges were dismissed in MassCourts by an automated script that was developed by the Trial Court Judicial Information Services Department, and the associated paper dockets on those cases were updated manually. The autoscript was run on District Court cases, Boston Municipal Court cases and Juvenile Court cases. Those charges that were not updated by the automated script were dismissed in MassCourts by staff from the Superior Court, District Court, Boston Municipal Court and the Juvenile Court Departments using a manual process, and the associated paper dockets were also updated.

Farak I, Farak II and Ruffin Charges (August 13, 2019)

A total of 24,853 charges were submitted by the District Attorney's Offices for review by the Trial Court.

The total number of charges that were updated by the automated script are broken down below:

Farak I: 11,552
Farak II: 12,186
Farak – Ruffin: 1,115

24,075 + 778 Difference = 24,853

The script written by the Trial Court Judicial Information Services Department updated in MassCourts the charges that the District Attorneys' Offices identified as meeting the requirements to be dismissed per order of the Court, with the exception of Superior Court charges, as the Superior Court Department elected not to have the automated script applied to their cases. After the Judicial Information Services Department ran the automated script against the lists submitted by the District Attorney's Offices, a total of 24,075 charges were dismissed in MassCourts, and the paper dockets were updated accordingly. During this same time period, the Massachusetts Probation Department updated the individuals Criminal Offense Record Information and dismissed the charges that qualified under Justice Gaziano's order.

A total of 778 charges from the lists submitted by the District Attorney's Offices do not appear on a list of charges with a Farak I or Farak II disposition . After a careful review of these charges by the Trial Court, particularly Zachary Hillman, Administrative Office of the District Court with assistance from Susanne O'Neil, Norfolk County District Attorney's Office, an accounting of the 778 charges is below:

Sealed cases: 192

These charges were identified as charges that had previously been sealed, and as a result, were not captured by the automated script. The charges were subsequently updated manually and a review indicates that the correct docket entry has been made on the charges.

Charges not found in MassCourts using information provided by District Attorneys: 151

These charges were identified as charges that were not updated via the automated script for one of two reasons: (1) the charge identified on the District Attorneys' list was not a 94C offense; or (2) the charge number identified on the District Attorneys' list did not match an existing charge number in MassCourts. These cases were reviewed by court staff and were manually updated to ensure that the appropriate docket entry was made on the correct charge number.

Charges previously dismissed: 435

These charges had already been dismissed at the time the automated script was run. These charges were likely vacated and dismissed during earlier litigation, or were charges not identified by the District Attorneys that had been identified by the automated script when the script was run for the identified time period. The charges were not updated a second time, as the dispositions on the specified charges were already accurate.

Summary of Record Count Stats for Farak I, Farak II and Ruffin Charges Revised 8/20/2019

Category	Number of charges
A Total number of charges submitted by DAs	24,853
Number of charges on Farak I DA list	11,552
Number of charges on Farak II DA list	12,186
Number of charges on Farak-Ruffin DA list	1,115
B Total DA lists charges updated in MC with AM Lab disposition	24,075
C Difference	778
DA list missng internal case id. Couldn't be updated by script	192
Charges not found in MassCourts using information provided. Couldn't be updated by script.	**151
Charges found in MassCourts with AM Lab disposition	**435
C Courts disposed charges with AM Lab disposition but not attributed to DA list	294

*See exception worksheet 1 (778)

*See exception worksheet 1 (778)

*See exception worksheet 1 (778)

*See exception worksheet 2 (294)

**Revised on 8/20/2019, 41 charges moved from row#15 to row#14

**Revised on 8/20/2019, 41 charges moved from row#15 to row#14

EXHIBIT 4

TO: The Honorable Judd Carhart; Jim Morton

FROM: Zachary Hillman

DATE: July 5, 2019

RE: Status update regarding Farak I and Farak II lists

The following is a status update of those District Court charges on the Farak I and Farak II lists that were identified as subject to being vacated and dismissed pursuant to the Supreme Judicial Court's order. As of the drafting of this memorandum, the District Court has completed the vacating and dismissing of all cases identified by the District Attorneys' as subject to the Farak I and Farak II (and Ruffin) orders. This includes the updating of both the electronic MassCourts dockets as well as the paper dockets. According to the Judicial Information Service Department (JISD), a total of 8383 District Court charges on 6191 cases have been vacated and dismissed pursuant to the Farak I order, and 9442 District Court charges on 7424 cases have been vacated and dismissed pursuant to the Farak II (and Ruffin) order.

The total number of charges that were vacated and dismissed as identified above include those charges that were updated in MassCourts with the automatic update to the MassCourts docket as well as charges that were manually updated in MassCourts. Manual updates were made, for example, to sealed charges as well as to charges for which the automatic docket update could not be completed, such as where a charge on the District Attorneys' original list of charges that were subject to the Court's Farak I and Farak II orders had been misidentified (so called "exception" charges). In those instances, court staff provided a list of those exception charges for which the automatic docket update could not be completed to the District Attorneys' offices, which reviewed each exception charge and identified to the District Court those exception charges that were subject to the Supreme Judicial Court's order. The District Court then updated those charges accordingly.


EXHIBIT 5A

Proposed Process for Later Identified Charges

In the instance that a Farak charge or charges are identified that, for whatever reason, were not vacated and dismissed pursuant to the SJC's order, the District Attorney should notify the Clerk's Office and Probation Office in the court where the charges were disposed. Clerk's Office staff will enter the specific "Farak disposition" on the MassCourts docket and on the paper docket, where applicable. The Clerk's Office will mail a Notice of Dismissal to the defendant. A sample Notice of Dismissal is attached.

The Executive Office of the Trial Court will send a communication to Clerks' Offices with specific instructions on docketing and the generation of the Notice of Dismissal.

EXHIBIT 5B

<p align="center">Notice of Dismissal Amherst Laboratory</p>	<p align="center">DOCKET NUMBER 0000CR001234</p>	<p align="center">Trial Court of Massachusetts District Court</p> 									
<p>CASE NAME Commonwealth vs. Defendant</p>	<p>COURT NAME & ADDRESS District Court Street Address City, State, Zip Code Phone Number</p>										
<p>NAME AND ADDRESS OF DEFENDANT Name Street Address City, State, Zip Code</p>											
<p>POLICE DEPARTMENT OF OFFENSE POLICE DEPARTMENT</p>											
<p>TO THE PARTY IN THIS MATTER:</p> <p>The court has dismissed the conviction(s) listed below effective December 13, 2018.</p> <p>A chemist named Sonja Farak engaged in serious misconduct involving her work at the state drug lab. Your case includes one or more drug convictions affected by Ms Farak. The court has now dismissed the conviction(s). This dismissal is final and permanent, which means you cannot be prosecuted again for any charge that has been dismissed.</p> <p>Your criminal record has been updated to remove the conviction(s). The removal of a conviction may provide important benefits to you related to employment, housing immigration, and more. However, your record has not been sealed. You can find more information about sealing your record at www.masslegalhelp.org/cori.</p> <p>In addition, you might have other charges in the same case that have not been dismissed and that remain on your record. You may want to speak to a lawyer about whether these convictions can also be undone. You might also have paid money because of these convictions, such as fines, court fees, probation fees or restitution. You may want to speak to a lawyer about whether you are entitled to have any money returned to you.</p> <p>If you have any questions about this letter, including how to get a lawyer to help you, you may contact the Committee for Public Counsel Services (the state public defender agency) by calling 888-999-2881 or by visiting its website: www.publiccounsel.net. You may also find information on the court's website: www.mass.gov/courts/druglab.</p>											
<p>OFFENSE COUNTS</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Count</u></th> <th><u>Offense Description</u></th> <th><u>Date of Offense</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td align="center">1</td> <td>DRUG, POSSESS CLASS B c94C §34</td> <td align="center">01/01/2000</td> </tr> <tr> <td align="center">2</td> <td>DRUG, POSSESS CLASS C c94C §34</td> <td align="center">01/01/2000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			<u>Count</u>	<u>Offense Description</u>	<u>Date of Offense</u>	1	DRUG, POSSESS CLASS B c94C §34	01/01/2000	2	DRUG, POSSESS CLASS C c94C §34	01/01/2000
<u>Count</u>	<u>Offense Description</u>	<u>Date of Offense</u>									
1	DRUG, POSSESS CLASS B c94C §34	01/01/2000									
2	DRUG, POSSESS CLASS C c94C §34	01/01/2000									
<p>DATED DATE</p>	<p>CLERK-MAGISTRATE Clerk-Magistrate</p>										