

1 JACKIE LACEY  
District Attorney of Los Angeles County  
2 By: CYNTHIA BARNES; State Bar No. 187385  
Deputy District Attorney  
3 MAJOR CRIMES DIVISION  
4 211 WEST TEMPLE STREET, SUITE 1100  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012  
5 (213) 257-2250  
cbarnes@da.lacounty.gov

6 Attorney for Plaintiff

7  
8 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**  
**FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

9  
10 PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 EDWARD BUCK,

14 Defendant.

Case No. BA481154

**MEMORANDUM CONCERNING  
BAIL DEVIATION; STATEMENT OF  
FACTS; POINTS AND  
AUTHORITIES; AND SUPPORTING  
EXHIBITS**

15 **TO THE DEFENDANT EDWARD BUCK:**

16 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that the People request the Court to issue the following  
17 order(s) concerning defendant's bail:

- 18
- 19 (X) Order to set bail to \$4,000,000 pursuant to California Penal Code § 1269c  
et seq.
- 20
- 21 (X) Order to place a hold on the release of the defendant from custody until  
22 the court is satisfied that no portion of the proffered bail was feloniously  
23 obtained, pursuant to California Penal Code § 1275.1.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1           This motion will be based on this notice of motion and motion, the files and pleadings in  
2 the above-entitled matter, the attached points and authorities, attached exhibits, and on such other  
3 and further evidence and argument as may be introduced at the hearing of this motion.

4  
5 Dated this 17<sup>TH</sup> day of September, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

6 JACKIE LACEY  
7 District Attorney of Los Angeles County

8 By:

9 CYNTHIA BARNES  
10 Deputy District Attorney  
11 Attorney for Plaintiff  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**STATEMENT OF FACTS**

1  
2 Defendant Edward Buck is a violent, dangerous sexual predator. He mainly preys on men  
3 made vulnerable by addiction and homelessness. Using the bait of narcotics, money, and shelter,  
4 the defendant lures these vulnerable victims to his home. From his home, in a position of power,  
5 Buck manipulates his victims into participating in his sexual fetishes. These fetishes include  
6 supplying and personally administering dangerously large doses of narcotics to his victims.  
7  
8 Buck's aggressive and malevolent behavior led to the death of two men in Buck's apartment,  
9 Gemmel Moore and Timothy Dean. Not deterred by the senseless deaths of Moore and Dean, the  
10 defendant nearly killed a third victim last week. The defendant's predatory acts and conscious  
11 disregard for human life must be stopped.

12 On July 27, 2017, Gemmel Moore was found dead of an apparent methamphetamine  
13 overdose in Edward Buck's apartment. (Exhibit 1) Narcotics paraphernalia, including 24  
14 hypodermic needles, five glass narcotics smoking pipes, methamphetamine, and sex toys were  
15 located in the apartment. (Exhibit 1) The needles and drugs were found in a tool box. (Exhibit 1)

17 Despite the tragic death of Gemmel Moore, defendant Buck continued with his  
18 dangerous, predatory behavior. On January 7, 2019, Timothy Dean was found dead of an  
19 apparent methamphetamine overdose in Edward Buck's apartment. (Exhibit 2) As with the  
20 Moore death, narcotics paraphernalia and sex toys were located in the apartment. (Exhibit 2)

21 Still not deterred despite two deaths in his apartment, Buck persisted in his malevolent  
22 behavior. On or about September 4, 2019, Buck personally and deliberately administered a  
23 dangerously large dose of methamphetamine to Joe Doe. (Exhibit 3) Concerned he was suffering  
24 from a methamphetamine overdose, Doe left the apartment to get medical attention. (Exhibit 3)  
25 Joe Doe returned to Buck's apartment on September 11, 2019. (Exhibit 3) On that date,  
26 shockingly, Buck again personally and intentionally injected two dangerously large doses of  
27  
28

1 methamphetamine into Doe. (Exhibit 3) Doe again developed the symptoms of  
2 methamphetamine overdose. (Exhibit 3) Buck refused to render aid to Doe, but rather thwarted  
3 Doe's attempts to get help. (Exhibit 3) Doe eventually fled the apartment and called 911 from a  
4 nearby gas station. (Exhibit 3) Doe was transported to a nearby hospital for treatment.

5 In addition to these three incidents, defendant Buck has engaged in and continues to  
6 engage in the exact same behavior, namely preying on vulnerable men and injecting them with  
7 dangerously large doses of methamphetamine. The full scope of his consistent malicious  
8 behavior is unknown. However, during the investigation into these incidents, the Los Angeles  
9 County Sheriff's Department found hundreds of photographs, taken in Defendant Buck's  
10 residence, of men in compromising positions. (Exhibit 4) It is only a matter of time before  
11 another one of these vulnerable young men dies of an overdose.

12 As stated above, defendant Buck is clearly a predator with no regard for human life. His  
13 behavior is malicious and beyond reckless. His fetish led to the grooming and eventual death of  
14 Gemmel Moore. Undeterred, defendant Buck then engaged in the exact same behavior with  
15 Timothy Dean, leading to his untimely death. Shockingly, defendant Buck continued his path of  
16 destruction, nearly causing another fatal incident. His deadly behavior has not stopped. The  
17 People are respectfully requesting this court set bail at \$4,000,000 to either deter the defendant  
18 from his predatory behavior, or keep him in custody to prevent yet another senseless death.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

2 The factors and circumstances that a judge or magistrate must always consider in setting  
3 bail for a given defendant are set forth in both the California Constitution and the Penal Code.  
4 Those considerations are (1) the protection of the public; (2) the seriousness of the offense  
5 charged; (3) the previous criminal record of the defendant; and (4) the probability that the  
6 defendant will appear at a trial or hearing on the case. Cal. Const. Art. I, § 28(f)(3); Penal Code §  
7 1275(a)(1). Both the legislature and the citizens of California have explicitly and repeatedly  
8 mandated that “[t]he public safety shall be the primary consideration.”<sup>1</sup> Cal. Const. Art. I, §  
9 28 (f)(3); Penal Code § 1275(a)(1) (emphasis added).  
10

11 These factors are “not necessarily exhaustive.” *In re Alberto* (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th  
12 421, 430. Examples of such non-codified, albeit judicially endorsed and relevant circumstances  
13 including the moral turpitude of the offense committed by the defendant. *Id.* at 430-431 (citing  
14 with approval cases addressing these and other circumstances). Further, the code sections  
15 pertaining to the analogous situation where a judge determines whether a defendant should be  
16 released on his or her own recognizance provided further guidance. For example,  
17 Penal Code § 1270.1(c) requires that, in making the determination to release a detained person,  
18 the potential danger posed by the defendant includes the specific consideration of “threats that  
19 have been made by the detained person and any past acts of violence.”

20 In addressing each of the relevant circumstances, the charges and allegations against the  
21 defendant are presumed true. *See Ex parte Ruef* (1908) 7 Cal.App.750.

22 In *Galen v. County of Los Angeles*, defendant Galen filed a lawsuit against the Los  
23 Angeles County District Attorney’s office claiming excessive bail. Galen was arrested on a

24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 <sup>1</sup> Although there was formerly some dispute over the propriety of the explicit emphasis on public safety in both Penal  
26 Code section 1275 and former Article I, section 28(e) of the California Constitution, this issue has been definitively  
27 settled. In passing Proposition 9 through the initiative process, California’s citizens have affirmatively endorsed the  
28 requirement that, “[t]he public safety shall be the primary consideration” in setting the amount of bail and enshrined  
it in what is now Article I, section 28(f)(3) of the California Constitution; i.e., the subdivision entitled “Public Safety  
Bail.”

1 domestic violence charge and given \$50,000 bail, per schedule. *Galen v. County of Los Angeles*  
2 (2006) 468 F.3d 563. A bail deviation request was filed and the court commissioner raised the  
3 bail to \$1,000,000. Galen argued that the \$1,000,000 bail was 2000% more than the \$50,000  
4 suggested in the bail schedule. The 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit found that the \$1,000,000 bail was not excessive.

5 *Id.* The court stated, in relevant part:

6 Galen's contentions that his bail was excessive simply because it was 2000 percent  
7 higher than the default amount for section 273.5 violations, and greater than the default  
8 amount for other, more serious crimes, are likewise unavailing. Excessiveness cannot be  
9 determined by a general mathematical formula, but rather turns on the correlation  
10 between the state interests a judicial officer seeks to protect and the nature and magnitude  
11 of the bail conditions imposed in a particular case.

12 *Id.* at 573. (See *Salerno* at 754.)

13  
14 A. *In Re Humphrey* (2018) 19 Cal.App.5<sup>th</sup> 1006

15 As articulated by the court in the recent case of *In re Humphrey* (2018) 19 Cal.App.5<sup>th</sup>  
16 1006, when setting bail, a court must inquire into the defendant's ability to pay the amount of  
17 bail ordered because that finding "is critical...to guard against improper detention based only on  
18 financial resources." *Humphrey* at 30. Penal Code § 1270.1 requires a court to consider a  
19 defendant's ability to post bond as a factor when determining bail. However, it is defendant's  
20 burden to show his inability to afford the bond. (Penal Code § 1270.1 (c) [the court shall also  
21 consider any evidence offered by the detained person regarding...his or her ability to post bond].)  
22 Further, *Humphrey* did not define "ability to pay" nor did it require that bail must be set in an  
23 amount that a defendant can pay. As stated by the court, in relevant part:

24 If the court concludes that an amount of bail the defendant is unable to pay is required to  
25 ensure his or her future court appearances, it may impose that amount only upon a  
26 determination by clear and convincing evidence that no less restrictive alternative will  
27 satisfy that purpose.

1 *Humphrey* at 31.

2           Regardless of a defendant's ability to pay, judges have discretion to order preventive  
3 detention in certain circumstances when the court makes the requisite findings. Cal. Const. Art. 1  
4 §§ 12 and 28(f)(3); *Humphrey* at 3; Pretrial Detention Reform Workgroup, Recommendations to  
5 the Chief Justice, Oct. 2017, at 52 ("In the limited number of cases where no condition or  
6 combination of conditions can assure public safety, judges must have the authority to detain  
7 individuals in custody to protect the public, victims, and witnesses.) Specifically, a trial court  
8 may still detain an individual after inquiring of the defendant's ability to pay a bond amount and  
9 making findings on the record that either (1) the defendant has the financial ability to pay but  
10 failed to pay the amount of bail the court finds reasonably necessary to ensure his or her  
11 appearance at further court proceedings; or (2) the defendant is unable to pay that amount and no  
12 less restrictive conditions of release would be sufficient to reasonably assure such appearance; or  
13 (3) no less restrictive nonfinancial conditions of release would be sufficient to protect the victim  
14 and the community. *Humphrey* at 17.

15           When setting bail in an amount that deviates from the bail schedule, express findings and  
16 statements of decisions are required. Cal. Const. Art. I, § 28 (f)(3); Penal Code § 1270.1 (d). In  
17 the same vein, *Humphrey* cautioned against generalized statements such as "substantial flight  
18 risk," "danger to society," "some risk to society," or generalizations of future criminality, as they  
19 would be insufficient. (*Humphrey* at 32-33, quoting *In re Pipinos* (1982) 33 Cal.3d 189.) Thus,  
20 when setting, reducing, or denying bail, the court must state specific individualized facts and  
21 circumstances to support its order.



I.  
**BAIL SHOULD BE SET AT FOUR MILLION DOLLARS OR MORE TO  
ENSURE THE SAFETY OF THE PUBLIC AND THE ATTENDANCE  
OF THE DEFENDANT AT TRIAL**

A. Bail Should Be Set At \$4,000,000 To Protect the Public from Defendant Buck

Public safety is both the primary and overarching factor for a court to consider in setting bail. Cal. Const. Art. I, § 28(f)(3); Penal Code § 1275(a)(1); *see People v. Indiana Lumbermans Mutual Insurance Company* (2011) 192 Cal.App.4th 929, 936 (“the purpose of (Penal Code) § 1275 is to ensure public safety.”) An increased bail amount best serves this goal by increasing the potential repercussions for future violations and thus serving as a deterrent.

This court is in the unique position of not only having the ability to stop this terrifying saga of predatory behavior, but this court is also legally mandated to set a bail amount high enough to ensure that either defendant Buck stops his criminal activity, or he remains in custody. Accordingly, the People are requesting this court set bail in the amount of \$4,000,000.

B. Seriousness of the Crimes Charged

In the present case, Buck is charged with one count of felony battery causing serious injury, and two narcotics related charges. For the purpose of the bail hearing, the allegations of the criminal complaint (and by analogy the arrest report for pre-complaint setting of bail) are presumed to be true. *See Ex parte Ruef* (1908) 7 Cal.App. 750. Accordingly, in considering an appropriate dollar amount for bail, this court must presume that defendant Buck committed the charged crimes.

C. Previous Criminal Record and Acts of Violence by Defendant Buck

Defendant Edward Buck is a violent, dangerous sexual predator. Clearly, in considering his previous criminal record and acts of violence, this court must set bail at an amount high enough to stop this recurrent criminal behavior. Buck’s aggressive and malicious behavior led to the death of two men in Buck’s apartment, Gemmel Moore and Timothy Dean. Not deterred by



1 the senseless deaths of Moore and Dean, the defendant nearly killed a third victim last week. The  
2 defendant's predatory acts and willful disregard for human life must be stopped before another  
3 life is lost.

4  
5 D. Bail Should Be Set At \$4,000,000 To Ensure Defendant Buck Will Appear for Trial

6 Although public safety is the primary consideration, ensuring the defendant's attendance  
7 at trial is also an important factor to consider when setting bail. The defendant has an unknown  
8 amount of funds and no ties to the Los Angeles area. He is not only facing the current filed  
9 charges, but he is also still a suspect in the deaths of Gemmel Moore and Timothy Dean. Further,  
10 the defendant is facing civil liability in a lawsuit filed by the family of Gemmel Moore.  
11 Accordingly, this court must set a bail amount high enough to ensure defendant Buck will in fact  
12 return to court to stand trial on this case.

13 Based on the above, the People respectfully request the defendant's bail be set at  
14 \$4,000,000.

1  
2 **II.**  
3 **THE COURT SHOULD PLACE A HOLD ON THE DEFENDANT**  
4 **TO ENSURE THAT NO PORTION OF THE BOND**  
5 **CONSIDERATION WAS FELONIOUSLY OBTAINED**

6 As discussed above, the primary consideration by the court in setting bail is public safety.  
7 A secondary, but also important consideration, is ensuring that a defendant will appear in court.  
8 Once the court has determined an appropriate bail amount, the court must then ensure the bond  
9 does in fact serve to deter the defendant from further criminal activity and ensure his appearance.  
10 Any security providing collateral for the bond must be from a legal and legitimate source that  
11 will motivate the defendant to comply with the terms of bail. If the surety behind the bond is not  
12 significant to the defendant, or if it is obtained by felonious means, then a criminal defendant  
13 will be more likely to continue his criminal behavior, and be less likely to appear in court.

14 Penal Code § 1275.1 reads, in relevant part:

- 15 (a) Bail, pursuant to this chapter, shall not be accepted unless a  
16 judge or magistrate finds that no portion of the consideration,  
17 pledge, security, deposit, or indemnification paid, given, made,  
18 or promised for its execution was feloniously obtained.
- 19 (b) A hold on the release of a defendant from custody shall only  
20 be ordered by a magistrate or judge if any of the following  
21 occurs:
- 22 (1) A peace officer, as defined in Section 830, files a  
23 declaration executed under penalty of perjury setting  
24 forth probable cause to believe that the source of any  
25 consideration, pledge, security, deposit, or  
26 indemnification paid, given, made or promised for its  
27 execution was feloniously obtained.
- 28 ...
- (3) The magistrate or judge has probable cause to believe  
that the source of any consideration, pledge, security,  
deposit, or indemnification paid, given, made, or  
promised for its execution was feloniously obtained.
- (c) Once a magistrate or judge has determined that probable cause  
exists, as provided in subdivision (b), a defendant bears the  
burden by a preponderance of the evidence to show that no part

1 of any consideration, pledge, security, deposit, or  
2 indemnification paid, given, made, or promised for its  
3 execution was obtained by felonious means.

4 The responsibility of the court to ensure the integrity of the bond is firmly established in both  
5 state and federal law. As stated by the 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit:

6 "The mere proffering of a corporate surety bond in the amount set at bail does not  
7 deprive the Court to inquire into areas which might bear on whether the defendant  
8 will make future court appearances if released on bond. The Court has the right  
9 and duty to satisfy itself that there is more than just a financial assurance that a  
10 bailed defendant will appear in court when required . . . . The source of the  
11 security providing the collateral for the bond can provide valuable information  
12 regarding the motivation for a defendant to appear. If the bond were secured by  
13 the property of defendant's relatives, or close friends, the court could, logically,  
14 conclude that the possibility of financial harm to those individuals might motivate  
15 a defendant to appear. On the other hand, if the security comes from an  
16 illegitimate source, and is merely a 'business' expense for a dealer in contraband,  
17 there is a paucity of moral force compelling a defendant to reappear. Indeed, such  
18 a source would be more consistent with a possible fulfillment of a pledge to a  
19 defendant of purchased freedom if caught."

20 *United States v. Ellis De Marchena* (1971) 330 F.Supp. 1223, 1226.

21 Defendant Buck is not employed. He has no known source of income, yet he is able to  
22 fund his lifestyle of preying on vulnerable men. He is engaged in frequent narcotics activity, and  
23 he may be funding his lifestyle with narcotics trafficking.

24 Accordingly, this court should place a hold on defendant Buck, pursuant to  
25 Penal Code § 1275.1. With the hold, if the defendant is able to post bond, the defendant must  
26 then show that no part of the bond consideration was feloniously obtained.  
27  
28

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**III.**  
**CONCLUSION**

For the reasons listed above, the People are respectfully requesting this court set bail in the amount of \$4,000,000 and place a hold on the defendant pending evidence of the source of bail.

Dated this 17th day of September, 2019

Respectfully submitted,  
JACKIE LACEY  
District Attorney of Los Angeles County

By:  
CYNTHIA BARNES  
Deputy District Attorney  
Attorney for Plaintiff

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**  
6 **FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

7 PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 01 EDWARD BUCK,

11 Defendant.

Case No. BA481154

**[PROPOSED] ORDER PROHIBITING  
ACCEPTANCE OF PROFERRED  
BAIL**

12  
13 **TO THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT, OR ANY**  
14 **OTHER LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY HAVING CUSTODY OF DEFENDANT-**  
15 **PRISONER, EDWARD BUCK:**

16 GOOD CAUSE HAVING BEEN SHOWN, IT IS ORDERED that, in the event  
17 bail is proffered for the above-described defendant-prisoner, such bail shall not be accepted for  
18 this defendant-prisoner nor shall this defendant-prisoner be released from custody unless and  
19 until this Court or any other competent court has conducted a hearing pursuant to  
20 Penal Code § 1275.1 and has issued an order requiring the acceptance of bail and the release of  
21 the defendant-prisoner.

22  
23 DATED:

24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 THE HONORABLE  
26 JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT  
27 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  
28 STATE OF CALIFORNIA