


VIRGINIA:

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

V.

O R D E R

This  2018, came the Attorney for the Commonwealth and the defendant,  (DOB: , who stands indicted for one felony and one misdemeanor, to-wit: Count 1: Possession with the Intent to Distribute Schedule I/II Drug and Count 2: Possession of Marijuana-First Offense, who appeared in Court according to the conditions of his recognizance, and came also Kimberly Stover, his attorney.

Whereupon, the Court reconvened. The Court and Jury heard evidence presented by the defendant, in its entirety. At the conclusion of the evidence, the Commonwealth then rebutted the defendant's case. At the conclusion of the Commonwealth's rebuttal case the defendant moved the Court to strike the Commonwealth's evidence, which motion was denied by the Court. Both the Commonwealth and the defendant presented closing arguments.

After hearing the evidence, the instructions of the Court and argument of counsel, the final alternate juror was released by the Court. The jurors were sent to the jury room to consider their verdict.

Whereupon, the jury continued to deliberate. They subsequently returned their verdict in open court, in the following words:

"We, the Jury, find the defendant,  NOT GUILTY of Unlawful Possession of Marijuana, as charge in the Indictment:"

DATE:  2018

FOREPERSON: 



Whereupon, the Jury reconvened for further deliberation on Count One.

Whereupon, the jury reported to the Court that they were unable to reach a verdict on Count One of the case. The Court further advised the jury and they were sent to deliberate once more. The jury returned and was still unable to reach a verdict. The Commonwealth motion for a mistrial on Count One of the case, said motion was granted. The Court declared a mistrial on Count One of the case and the jury was released.

The Court ordered that this case be continued to  2018, at 10:00am, for set date on Count One of the case.

The Court certifies that at all times during the trial of this case the defendant was personally present and his attorney were likewise personally present and capably represented the defendant.

And the defendant is allowed to depart according to the conditions of his recognizance.


James C. Clark, Judge

Entered:  2018