

Memo

To: Clerk's Office
From: Judge Bleich (Ad Hoc)
Subject: No. 50,525-CA
State of Louisiana v. Glenn Ford
Date: April 18, 2016

This memorandum is to advise all companies responsible for publishing opinions from the Second Circuit Court of Appeal, State of Louisiana, that the attached opinion, No. 50,525-CA, *State of Louisiana v. Glenn Ford*, replaces the previous opinion rendered on April 13, 2016, in its entirety, with the following corrections.

On page 10, line 10: Footnote 6 has been added as follows:

A reasonable inference is that the Louisiana legislature specifically rejected the language "lesser and included" in its adoption of La. R.S. 15:572.8. "Lesser and included" is only statutorily referenced in La. C. Cr. P. art. 815 (2), which is superseded by La. C. Cr. P. art. 814. A. 1.

In the instant case, had the legislature enacted the "lesser and included" wording without other definition, instead adopting the language "any crime," Ford would have been automatically eligible for compensation even after being involved in multiple crimes connected with and surrounding the murder. If the verbiage "lesser and included" is substituted for "any crime" in La. R.S. 15:572.8, without a newly clarified and more precise definition, in this type of case, automatic financial liability will be imposed upon Louisiana without the opportunity to defend against such.

On page 22, line 17: A "Summary" has been added before the "Conclusion" as follows:

Summary

No reasonable conclusion can be reached that Ford's involvement in the circumstances surrounding the brutal murder of Mr. Rozeman was incidental, minor, or insignificant. This is clear from the evidence at the compensation hearing which Ford did not explain or refute. Ford was intricately involved in every facet of this case with the exceptions of entering the house and pulling the trigger.

Ford helped orchestrate the robbery which led to the murder. Although motive need not be proved, Ford was angry at Mr. Rozeman for not providing him money he had requested earlier the week of the murder.

Ford created the opportunity for entry into Mr. Rozeman's home. Despite Mr. Rozeman's employer-employee relationship with and trust of Ford, this trust was misplaced. Ford orchestrated the opportunity for an unauthorized entry into Mr. Rozeman's home, which had been meticulously secured.

Before and during the murder/robbery, Ford operated as the sinister guardian of the killers. Ford then financially benefitted from the robbery, cashing in on the sale of Mr. Rozeman's property. Continuing in his criminality, Ford made every effort to dispose of the probable murder weapon and conceal the identity of the trigger man.

Any conclusion that Ford was not integrally involved in the circumstances leading to Mr. Rozeman's brutal death is baseless. Such a conclusion defies facts, evidence and logic. Ford's demand for compensation clearly and perversely violates the letter, intent and spirit of the will of the Louisiana legislature.

These corrections do not in any manner change the substance of the opinion.