

THE SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT OF THE STATE OF MAINE
SITTING AS THE LAW COURT

LAW COURT DOCKET NO. Pen-26-4

STATE OF MAINE
Appellee

v.

DARRELL SPROUL
Appellant

ON APPEAL from the Penobscot County
Unified Criminal Docket

BRIEF OF APPELLANT and
APPENDIX

Rory A. McNamara # 5609
DRAKE LAW LLC
P.O. Box 143
York, ME 03909
(207) 475-7810

ATTORNEY FOR DARRELL SPROUL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Statement of the Case	5
I. After observing suspicious driving, police stopped defendant's vehicle.....	5
II. Police conducted a roadside investigation.	5
III. Police conducted a breath-test.	6
Issue Presented for Review	8
Argument.....	9
The State committed obvious error by eliciting testimony and arguing about the investigating officers' personal opinion that probable cause existed to arrest defendant.	9
A. Summary of the argument	9
B. Preservation and standard of review.....	9
C. Analysis	9
1. It was plainly erroneous for the State to elicit testimony and argue about the officers' opinion about probable cause.....	9
2. The State's error affected substantial rights and defendant's conviction should be reversed.	15
Conclusion.....	16
Certificate of Filing & Service	16
<i>Appendix</i>	<i>A1</i>

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Commonwealth v. Canty</i> , 998 N.E.2d 322 (Mass. 2013)	9
<i>Commonwealth v. Sapoznik</i> , 549 N.E.2d 116 (Mass. Ct. App. 1990)	10
<i>Howard-Walker v. People</i> , 443 P.3d 1007 (Colo. 2019).....	9
<i>Ochana v. Flores</i> , 347 F.3d 266 (7th Cir. 2003).....	9
<i>Ruiz v. Commonwealth</i> , 471 S.W.3d 675 (Ky. 2015)	9, 10
<i>State v. Fournier</i> , 2019 ME 28, 203 A.3d 801	10, 15
<i>State v. Moulton</i> , 2026 ME 6, ___ A.3d ___	8
<i>United States v. Flores-de-Jesus</i> , 569 F.3d 8 (1st Cir. 2009).....	10
<i>United States v. Gutierrez</i> , 995 F.2d 169 (9th Cir. 1993).....	11
<i>United States v. Noel</i> , 581 F.3d 490 (7th Cir. 2009)	9
<i>United States v. Washington</i> , 2017 WL 3642112, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 136220 (N.D. Ill. 2017)	8

Statutes

29-A M.R.S. § 2411(1-A)(A).....	4
---------------------------------	---

Rules

Advisers' Note to former M.R. Evid. 701 (Feb. 2, 1976).....	10
M.R. U. Cim. P. 51	8
M.R. U. Crim. P. 52(b)	8

Scholarship

Deon J. Nossel, <i>The Admissibility of Ultimate Issue Expert Testimony by Law Enforcement Officers in Criminal Trials</i> , 93 COLUMB. L. REV. 231 (Jan. 1993)	9
---	---

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

After a brief jury trial, defendant was convicted of operating under the influence of intoxicants. *See* 29-A M.R.S. § 2411(1-A)(A) (Class D).¹ The Penobscot County Unified Criminal Docket (Matson, J.) thereafter fined defendant \$500 and imposed a 150-day license-suspension. This appeal follows.

I. After observing suspicious driving, police stopped defendant's vehicle.

Around 9 on a June evening, a police officer observed a vehicle exit the parking lot at Brewster's Fine Food & Drink in Brewer. Tr. 42-43. The officer's attention was drawn to the manner in which the vehicle maneuvered "very slowly" from the lot into Wilson Street/Route 1-A. Tr. 43. Proceeding down the road at an estimated 15 mph in a 25-mph zone, "the vehicle hit the brakes hard several times." Tr. 44, 46. For a brief "second", it was partially in the turn- rather than travel-lane. Tr. 44-45. As the vehicle navigated the turn onto I-395, no directional-light was illuminated. Tr. 47.

The officer stopped the vehicle. Tr. 47. The jurors were shown the officer's dash-camera recording to evaluate these events for themselves. *See* SX 1-A.

II. Police conducted a roadside investigation.

The driver – identified as defendant, at trial – admitted that he had consumed one alcoholic beverage at Brewster's. SX 1-B ca. 3:05. Roadside,

¹ Though § 2411 has been amended since the date of the alleged violation, Subsection 1-A, Paragraph A has not changed. *See* P.L. 2025, ch. 173, § 20 & ch. 431, § 27 (effective Sept. 24, 2025).

the officer testified, she “could smell the odor of intoxicating beverages coming from his vehicle.” Tr. 60, 62. The officer radioed for backup. Tr. 60.

After the backup-officer arrived on scene, he and the lead-officer put defendant through some field-sobriety tests. SX 1-B ca. 11:00. According to the lead-officer, the horizontal-gaze-nystagmus test yielded six of six possible “clues.” Tr. 64-70. The lack-of-convergence test resulted in two “cues.”² The relevance of these findings, though, was reduced in light of the fact that defendant has glaucoma. SX 1-B ca. 11:20.

After abandoning the walk-and-turn test – defendant kept joking that he was “old³ and fat” – the officers put defendant through the one-leg stand. Tr. 72-73. Defendant “completed it to the best of his ability.” Tr. 73. On the finger-to-nose test, defendant had mixed results. Tr. 74-76.

The officers arrested defendant. Tr. 76-77. The jurors were shown the officer’s body-camera recording to evaluate these events for themselves. *See* SX 1-B.

III. Police conducted a breath-test.

The lead-officer took defendant to Holden Police Department, to conduct an Intoxilyzer test. Tr. 78-79.

Proper operation of the machine requires a 15-minute wait-period to ensure that any alcohol present in a subject’s mouth does not erroneously “cause the results to be skewed or read higher than what is actually in [the

² Whereas a “clue” may result only from a standardized field-sobriety test, a “cue” may result from nonstandardized tests. Tr. 71-72.

³ Defendant was “in his mid 70s.” Tr. 37.

subject's] system.” Tr. 80-81. However, during the “first 15 minutes”, defendant coughed and belched. Tr. 82. The officer told him that the wait-period would need to restart as a result. Tr. 82. After that explanation, defendant began, in the officer's opinion, “purposely swallowing air and creating a burping noise. And he did that over, and over, and over, after being asked not to do that.” Tr. 82-83.

Believing that the burping was not “bringing up anything from the stomach” but, rather, was “in the esophagus,” the officer proceeded with the breath-test. Tr. 84. The results indicated that, per 210 liters of breath, defendant's breath contained .10 grams of alcohol. Tr. 85; SX 2.

Defendant reserves discussion of additional details for the argument below.

ISSUE PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

Did the State commit obvious error by eliciting testimony and arguing about the investigating officers' personal opinion that probable cause existed to arrest defendant?

ARGUMENT

The State committed obvious error by eliciting testimony and arguing about the investigating officers' personal opinion that probable cause existed to arrest defendant.

A. Summary of the argument

It is irrelevant whether the investigating officers believed there was probable cause to arrest defendant. Such testimony is both an improper personal opinion and a form of vouching. Here, the State both repeatedly elicited such testimony and referenced the officers' personal opinion in its closing argument.

B. Preservation and standard of review

No contemporaneous objection preserved this argument. *See* M.R. U. Cim. P. 51. Thus, it is reviewed for obvious error. M.R. U. Crim. P. 52(b); *State v. Moulton*, 2026 ME 6, ¶¶ 14, 27, ___ A.3d ___. Obvious error is error that is plain, affects substantial rights, and which the Court ought to remedy for the sake of fairness and integrity of the court system, or its public reputation. *Id.* ¶ 27.

C. Analysis

- 1. It was plainly erroneous for the State to elicit testimony and argue about the officers' opinion about probable cause.**

“Experts under Rule 702 are routinely excluded from offering opinions about the existence of probable cause....” *United States v. Washington*, 2017 WL 3642112 * 9, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 136220 * 26 (N.D. Ill. 2017) (collecting cases). Likewise: “Probable cause is a legal determination, and ‘lay testimony offering a legal conclusion is inadmissible because it is not

helpful to the jury.” *Id.*, quoting *United States v. Noel*, 581 F.3d 490, 496 (7th Cir. 2009). There are real dangers with police-witness opinion-testimony about probable cause: It “suggest[s] to the jury that” because an experienced, trained officer “believed there was probable cause to arrest”, then “maybe they should too.” *Howard-Walker v. People*, 443 P.3d 1007, 1014 (Colo. 2019).

Probable cause, of course, is immaterial to the jury’s deliberations. *Cf. Ruiz v. Commonwealth*, 471 S.W.3d 675, 684 (Ky. 2015) (“[T]he officer’s belief that ‘probable cause’ existed is absolutely irrelevant. Upon retrial, Officer Havens should not be permitted to testify as to his personal finding of ‘probable cause.’”). While an officer rightfully testifies about her “personal knowledge of facts,” her “subjective beliefs are not relevant.” *Ochana v. Flores*, 347 F.3d 266 (7th Cir. 2003). Thus, whereas it is permissible for an officer who conducted an OUI investigation to testify about her observations – including a defendant’s apparent intoxication – gleaned during that investigation, she “may not opine” on “whether the defendant’s consumption of alcohol diminished his ability to operate a motor vehicle safely.”⁴ *Commonwealth v. Canty*, 998 N.E.2d 322, 330 (Mass. 2013). That is effectively an opinion about guilt – the jury’s exclusive province. *Id.* at 543-44; see Deon J. Nossel, *The Admissibility of Ultimate Issue Expert Testimony by Law Enforcement Officers in Criminal Trials*, 93 COLUMB. L. REV. 231, 243 (Jan. 1993) (“At issue, rather, is the admissibility of testimony

⁴ Yet, here, the State elicited how an officer’s “purpose” is “to evaluate whether a person is safe to drive.” Tr. 15.

that does not stop at offering factual knowledge in areas beyond the experience of most jurors, but instead takes the further step of suggesting the conclusions that jurors should draw from the evidence.”); Advisers’ Note to former M.R. Evid. 701 (Feb. 2, 1976) (“The opinion or inference of a witness is not ‘helpful’ under this provision if relating what he observed would put the jury in the position to come to its own conclusion. Hence such an opinion would be rejected.”).⁵

Improper opinion testimony and irrelevance, moreover, are not the only problems. Testimony about probable cause lends itself to vouching. *Cf. Commonwealth v. Sapoznik*, 549 N.E.2d 116, 122-23 (Mass. Ct. App. 1990) (testimony and argument about search-warrant approval: “In effect, the prosecutor used a magistrate to vouch for the credibility of the police officers.”); *Ruiz*, 471 S.W.3d at 684 (officer’s “testimony could be readily understood to mean that he personally believed Linda’s account.”). When law enforcement officers, in particular, straddle the line between lay- and expert-witness, “the jury may unduly credit the opinion testimony of an investigating officer based on a perception that the expert was privy to facts about the defendant not presented at trial.” *United States v. Flores-de-Jesus*, 569 F.3d 8, 21 (1st Cir. 2009) (quotation marks omitted). Law enforcement officers’ testimony “often carries an aura of special reliability and

⁵ Indeed, this Court has previously recognized that an officer’s testimony about why he did *not* arrest a defendant – when offered by that defendant – is inadmissible. *State v. Fournier*, 2019 ME 28, ¶¶ 21-23, 203 A.3d 801. Surely, the State is not permitted to do what defendants cannot.

trustworthiness.” *United States v. Gutierrez*, 995 F.2d 169, 172 (9th Cir. 1993) (citation omitted).

Back to our case, the State repeatedly highlighted the lead-officer’s opinions and thought-processes about probable cause:

Q. Why would you conduct more than the three standard tests that normally are done?

A. Because more clues and cues are better. Bolsters in my head the probable cause to take him to jail.

Tr. 63.

Q. [W]hen you’re making your decision about whether somebody is safe to drive, whether you take them in for a test, all sorts of decisions, given a situation like this, how much of a role did the – the walk and turn test play or how that – how that test went – how much of a role did that play in your overall decision?

A. I mean, every test plays a role, but it’s the combination of all the tests and the observations that make the determination if there’s probable cause for the arrest.

Tr. 74.

Q. How significant a role was that – did [the finger-to-nose] test play?

A. It was significant. I don't think it was – I can't say if it was any more significant than any other test, but it added, or it bolstered my – my probable cause to arrest him.

Tr. 76

Q. Was there any particular reason why you – you would or would not do more field sobriety testing at that time?

A. There are other tests that you can administer, but I felt as though, based off my observations of all those other tests that I had met my threshold that I felt comfortable with arresting him on.

Tr. 77.

Each of these exchanges, especially when viewed in their overall context, evince the officer's unambiguous opinion that there was probable cause that defendant is guilty. That is an officer's personal opinion that defendant is guilty.⁶ It is irrelevant and highly prejudicial, coming from the lead-investigator who was sitting with the State's attorney at counsel's table. *See* Tr. 9.

In its closing, the State underscored its officers' roadside opinions, repeatedly reminding jurors of their personal thought-processes:

⁶ OUI is a strict-liability offense, and the only issue at trial was impairment. *See* Tr. 159 (defense counsel making this argument). Clearly, an officer's decision to arrest is indicative of her opinion that the defendant is probably guilty.

But [the field-sobriety tests] all serve the same purpose, which is to gather information, **make a determination** as to whether to proceed to the next step of having the person take a breath test, which is, you know, happening in this case.

Tr. 153 (emphasis added).

But ultimately, the officers involved **concluded that there was enough concern** to have Mr. Sproul take a breath test, and that you saw the result of 0.10.

Tr. 154 (emphasis added).

So again, **the decisions that officers have to make in the field**, on the side of the road, is what is the totality of the circumstances here. Based on driving, based on the smell of alcohol, based on admission to consumption, based on how things look at field sobriety. Do we proceed to a breath test? And as you heard, [the lead-officer] did that. **The officer made that decision** and again, the end result of that was a .10 test.

Tr. 161 (emphasis added). It primed jurors, by reminding them that the lead-officer's "investigation" was meant "**to determine** if Mr. Sproul was safe to drive or if he was operating under the influence of alcohol." Tr. 153.

Respectfully, there is no permissible basis for doing so. It is irrelevant what the officers thought and believed. The only implication is that their opinions were offered – repeatedly – and argued – repeatedly – because they

lend an imprimatur of authority and expertise. In short, the State bolstered its evidence of impaired driving by repeatedly highlighting its officers' personal opinion that defendant was probably guilty.

2. The State's error affected substantial rights and defendant's conviction should be reversed.

This was a lightning-quick trial: approximately 130 transcript-pages' of evidence. Yet, the State repeatedly drew upon the impermissible theme. The two officers whose opinions the State kept referencing were the *only* two witnesses at trial. Again, the prejudice was highlighted by the State's closing argument, which drew rather heavily on the officers' legal opinions.

The potential for jurors to defer to police opinion testimony was heightened because of the stress the State placed on the officers' training and expertise in OUI detection. *See* Tr. 12-13, 40-41. The officers here are ARIDE-certified – an advanced “training to evaluate OUI cases.” *Id.* One, the State elicited, has conducted “hundreds” of OUI-investigations. Tr. 18.

It is true, in addition to the officers' belief that defendant was guilty, the State also introduced evidence of a .10 test-result. Such is not overwhelming evidence, however. Given the fact that defendant burped “over, and over, and over”, the test-result warrants only low confidence, at best. Without the officers' legal-opinion testimony, the State's case came down to a handful of roadside, nighttime observations of an “old and fat” man going home after a long day.

This Court should not hesitate to vacate. There is no doubt that witnesses are not permitted to offer legal conclusions, especially ones

indicating their personal opinion about guilt. Fairness depends on this principle. And, given this Court's refusal to permit defendants from offering evidence suggesting a police officer's opinion that he *lacked* probable cause to arrest a defendant, *Fournier*, 2019 ME 28, ¶¶ 21-23, the reputation of Maine courts will suffer if, on the other hand, the State is allowed to do the converse whenever it suits it.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, this Court should vacate defendant's conviction.

Respectfully submitted,

April 14, 2026

/s/ Rory A. McNamara

Rory A. McNamara, #5609
DRAKE LAW LLC
P.O. Box 143
York, ME 03909
207-475-7810

ATTORNEY FOR DARRELL SPROUL

CERTIFICATES OF FILING & SERVICE

I have filed this brief and appendix, and served opposing counsel, as listed on the service list, in compliance with M.R. App. P. 1D(c) & 1E.

/s/ Rory A. McNamara

THE SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT OF THE STATE OF MAINE
SITTING AS THE LAW COURT

LAW COURT DOCKET NO. Pen-26-4

STATE OF MAINE
Appellee

v.

DARRELL SPROUL
Appellant

ON APPEAL from the Penobscot County
Unified Criminal Docket

APPENDIX

Rory A. McNamara # 5609
DRAKE LAW LLC
P.O. Box 143
York, ME 03909
(207) 475-7810

ATTORNEY FOR DARRELL SPROUL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

All docket entries (M.R.App.P. 8(d)(2))

Docket record of Feb. 25, 2026A3

Rulings, decisions, actions on appeal (M.R.App.P. 8(d)(3))

Judgment and commitment, order on payment of fines, & notice of
suspension of Dec. 22, 2025A10

Initiating documents (M.R.App.P. 8(d)(4))

Uniform Summons and Complaint of June 21, 2024A17

Complaint of Aug. 2, 2024.....A18

STATE OF MAINE
v.
DARRELL L SPROUL
[REDACTED]
HAMPDEN ME 04444

CRIMINAL DOCKET
PENOBSCOT, ss.
Docket No PENCD-CR-2024-02405

DOCKET RECORD

DOB: [REDACTED]

State's Attorney: ALICE CLIFFORD

Pro Se.

Filing Document: CRIMINAL COMPLAINT
Filing Date: 08/02/2024

Major Case Type: MISDEMEANOR (CLASS D,E)

Charge(s)

1 OUI (ALCOHOL)
Seq 12942 29-A 2411(1-A) (A)
ROSE / BRE

06/21/2024 BREWER
Class D

Docket Events:

08/05/2024 FILING DOCUMENT - CRIMINAL COMPLAINT FILED ON 08/02/2024

08/05/2024 Charge(s): 1
HEARING - ARRAIGNMENT SCHEDULE OTHER COURT ON 08/22/2024 at 08:30 a.m.

BANSC

08/13/2024 OTHER FILING - ENTRY OF APPEARANCE FILED ON 07/19/2024

Attorney: KAYLA ALVES

08/13/2024 Party(s): DARRELL L SPROUL
ATTORNEY - RETAINED ENTERED ON 07/19/2024

Attorney: KAYLA ALVES

08/16/2024 Charge(s): 1
HEARING - ARRAIGNMENT WAIVED ON 08/16/2024

Attorney: KAYLA ALVES

08/16/2024 Charge(s): 1
PLEA - NOT GUILTY ENTERED BY COUNSEL ON 08/16/2024

Attorney: KAYLA ALVES

08/16/2024 HEARING - DISPOSITIONAL CONFERENCE SCHEDULE OTHER COURT ON 11/12/2024 at 01:00 p.m. in Room No.
3

BANSC

08/16/2024 HEARING - DISPOSITIONAL CONFERENCE NOTICE SENT ELECTRONICALLY ON 08/16/2024

11/12/2024 HEARING - DISPOSITIONAL CONFERENCE HELD ON 11/12/2024

MICHAEL ROBERTS , JUDGE

Attorney: KAYLA ALVES

DA: JOANNE LEWIS

201 CHAMBERS

CR_200, Rev. 07/15

Page 1 of 7

Printed on: 02/25/2026

11/12/2024 HEARING - DISPOSITIONAL CONFERENCE SCHEDULE OTHER COURT ON 12/09/2024 at 01:00 p.m. in Room No. 3

BANSC
CHAMBERS

NOTICE GIVEN IN

12/09/2024 HEARING - DISPOSITIONAL CONFERENCE HELD ON 12/09/2024
SEAN OCIEPKA , JUDGE
Attorney: KAYLA ALVES
DA: ALICE CLIFFORD
202 CHAMBERS

12/09/2024 HEARING - DISPOSITIONAL CONFERENCE SCHEDULE OTHER COURT ON 02/04/2025 at 01:00 p.m. in Room No. 3

BANSC
CHAMBERS

NOTICE GIVEN IN

01/28/2025 MOTION - OTHER MOTION FILED BY DEFENDANT ON 01/27/2025

Attorney: KAYLA ALVES
TO APPEAR VIA ZOOM 2/4

01/30/2025 MOTION - OTHER MOTION GRANTED ON 01/28/2025
ANN MURRAY , JUSTICE
TO APPEAR VIA ZOOM 2/4

02/04/2025 HEARING - DISPOSITIONAL CONFERENCE HELD ON 02/04/2025
JON HADDOW , JUDGE
Attorney: KAYLA ALVES
DA: ALICE CLIFFORD
202 . CHAMBERS

02/04/2025 TRIAL - DOCKET CALL SCHEDULE OTHER COURT ON 04/10/2025 at 08:29 a.m. in Room No. 12

BANSC
CHAMBERS

NOTICE GIVEN IN

04/03/2025 MOTION - MOTION TO CONTINUE FILED BY DEFENDANT ON 04/02/2025

Attorney: KAYLA ALVES
APRIL DOCKET

04/03/2025 LETTER - REQUEST FOR PROTECTION FILED ON 04/02/2025

Attorney: KAYLA ALVES

04/07/2025 MOTION - MOTION TO CONTINUE GRANTED ON 04/04/2025
BRUCE MALLONEE , JUSTICE
COPY TO PARTIES/COUNSEL

04/07/2025 TRIAL - DOCKET CALL CONTINUED ON 04/04/2025
BRUCE MALLONEE , JUSTICE
GRANTED MTC

04/07/2025 TRIAL - DOCKET CALL SCHEDULE OTHER COURT ON 05/05/2025 at 08:30 a.m. in Room No. 12

BANSC

04/07/2025 TRIAL - DOCKET CALL NOTICE SENT ELECTRONICALLY ON 04/07/2025

05/09/2025 TRIAL - DOCKET CALL HELD ON 05/05/2025
ANN MURRAY , JUSTICE
Attorney: KAYLA ALVES
DA: ALICE CLIFFORD

202/9:21:30

05/09/2025 TRIAL - DOCKET CALL SCHEDULE OTHER COURT ON 07/10/2025 at 08:30 a.m. in Room No. 12

BANSC

05/09/2025 TRIAL - DOCKET CALL NOTICE SENT ELECTRONICALLY ON 05/09/2025

07/10/2025 TRIAL - DOCKET CALL HELD ON 07/10/2025

ANN MURRAY , JUSTICE

Attorney: SHAMARA BAILEY

DA: CHRISTOPHER SMITH

Defendant Present in Court

202/11:12:24

C.SMITH OBO

CLIFFORD. BAILEY OBO K. ALVES

07/18/2025 TRIAL - DOCKET CALL SCHEDULE OTHER COURT ON 08/07/2025 at 08:30 a.m. in Room No. 12

BANSC

07/18/2025 TRIAL - DOCKET CALL NOTICE SENT ELECTRONICALLY ON 07/18/2025

07/25/2025 LETTER - REQUEST FOR PROTECTION FILED ON 07/23/2025

Attorney: KAYLA ALVES

07/25/2025 MOTION - OTHER MOTION FILED BY DEFENDANT ON 07/23/2025

Attorney: KAYLA ALVES

TO APPEAR VIA ZOOM 8/7/25

07/29/2025 MOTION - OTHER MOTION GRANTED ON 07/28/2025

ANN MURRAY , JUSTICE

TO APPEAR VIA ZOOM 8/7/25

08/05/2025 MOTION - MOTION TO CONTINUE FILED BY DEFENDANT ON 08/04/2025

Attorney: KAYLA ALVES

AUGUST DOCKET CALL

08/06/2025 MOTION - MOTION TO CONTINUE GRANTED ON 08/06/2025

BRUCE MALLONEE , JUSTICE

COPY TO PARTIES/COUNSEL

08/06/2025 TRIAL - DOCKET CALL CONTINUED ON 08/06/2025

08/15/2025 TRIAL - DOCKET CALL SCHEDULE OTHER COURT ON 10/09/2025 at 08:30 a.m. in Room No. 12

BANSC

08/15/2025 TRIAL - DOCKET CALL NOTICE SENT ELECTRONICALLY ON 08/15/2025

09/26/2025 LETTER - REQUEST FOR PROTECTION FILED ON 09/25/2025

Attorney: KAYLA ALVES

09/26/2025 MOTION - OTHER MOTION FILED BY DEFENDANT ON 09/18/2025

Attorney: KAYLA ALVES

TO APPEAR VIA ZOOM 10/9/25

09/26/2025 MOTION - OTHER MOTION GRANTED ON 09/22/2025

BRUCE MALLONEE , JUSTICE

TO APPEAR VIA ZOOM 10/9/25

10/09/2025 TRIAL - DOCKET CALL HELD ON 10/09/2025
ANN MURRAY , JUSTICE
Attorney: KAYLA ALVES
DA: ALICE CLIFFORD
202/CHAMBERS
VIA TELEPHONE

ATTORNEY ALVES

10/15/2025 TRIAL - DOCKET CALL SCHEDULE OTHER COURT ON 11/06/2025 at 08:30 a.m. in Room No. 12

BANSC

10/15/2025 TRIAL - DOCKET CALL NOTICE SENT ELECTRONICALLY ON 10/15/2025

10/21/2025 MOTION - OTHER MOTION FILED BY DEFENDANT ON 10/17/2025

Attorney: KAYLA ALVES
TO EXCUSE DEFENDANTS APPEARANCE AT COURT 11/6/25

10/27/2025 MOTION - OTHER MOTION GRANTED ON 10/24/2025
BRUCE MALLONEE , JUSTICE

TO EXCUSE DEFENDANTS APPEARANCE AT COURT 11/6/25

11/04/2025 LETTER - REQUEST FOR PROTECTION FILED ON 11/04/2025

Attorney: KAYLA ALVES

11/12/2025 TRIAL - DOCKET CALL CONTINUED ON 11/06/2025
ANN MURRAY , JUSTICE
Attorney: ROOSEVELT BISHOP
DA: CHELSEA LYND
202/11:53:07

11/12/2025 ORDER - COURT ORDER ENTERED ON 11/06/2025
ANN MURRAY , JUSTICE
THIS MATTER IS CONTINUED FROM THE NOVEMBER TRIAL DOCKET TO DECEMBER.

11/12/2025 TRIAL - DOCKET CALL SCHEDULE OTHER COURT ON 12/04/2025 at 08:30 a.m. in Room No. 12

BANSC
COURT

NOTICE IN OPEN

11/25/2025 MOTION - OTHER MOTION FILED BY DEFENDANT ON 11/25/2025

Attorney: KAYLA ALVES
TO APPEAR VIA ZOOM 12/4/25

11/25/2025 MOTION - OTHER MOTION FILED BY DEFENDANT ON 11/25/2025

Attorney: KAYLA ALVES
TO EXCUSE DEFENDANTS APPEARANCE AT COURT

11/25/2025 LETTER - REQUEST FOR PROTECTION FILED ON 11/25/2025

Attorney: KAYLA ALVES

12/04/2025 TRIAL - DOCKET CALL HELD ON 12/04/2025
BRUCE MALLONEE , JUSTICE
Attorney: KAYLA ALVES
202/8:37:25
ZOOM

ATTORNEY VIA

12/04/2025 TRIAL - JURY TRIAL SCHEDULE OTHER COURT ON 12/05/2025 at 08:30 a.m. in Room No. 99

BANSC

12/10/2025 TRIAL - JURY TRIAL SELECTED ON 12/05/2025
CR_200, Rev. 07/15

BRUCE MALLONEE , JUSTICE

Attorney: KAYLA ALVES

DA: CHELSEA LYNDS

Reporter: MAUREEN WHITEHOUSE

Defendant Present in Court

202 / JURY SWORN IN. WRITTEN QUESTIONAIRES DONE. GENERAL VOIR DIRE DONE. JURY SELECTED FROM CLEAN OUI QUESTIONAIRES. JURY SELECTED. FOREPERSON ASSIGNED. MATTER CONT FOR TRIAL.

12/10/2025 OTHER FILING - WITNESS LIST FILED BY STATE ON 12/05/2025

DA: CHELSEA LYNDS

12/10/2025 TRIAL - JURY TRIAL SCHEDULE OTHER COURT ON 12/22/2025 at 08:30 a.m. in Room No. 99

BANSC

12/22/2025 Charge(s): 1

MOTION - MOTION FOR JUDGMENT OF ACQUITTAL MADE ORALLY BY DEF ON 12/22/2025

Attorney: KAYLA ALVES

12/22/2025 Charge(s): 1

MOTION - MOTION FOR JUDGMENT OF ACQUITTAL DENIED ON 12/22/2025

HARRIS MATTSON , JUDGE

COPY TO PARTIES/COUNSEL

12/22/2025 MOTION - MOTION FOR SANCTIONS MADE ORALLY BY DEF ON 12/22/2025

Attorney: KAYLA ALVES

ORAL MOTION FOR DISCOVERY SANCTIONS

12/22/2025 MOTION - MOTION FOR SANCTIONS DENIED ON 12/22/2025

HARRIS MATTSON , JUDGE

12/22/2025 TRIAL - JURY TRIAL HELD ON 12/22/2025

HARRIS MATTSON , JUDGE

Attorney: KAYLA ALVES

DA: CHRISTOPHER SMITH

202/CTA/JURORS SWORN IN, JURY INSTRUCTIONS ON TRIAL PROCEDURES BY JUDGE, STATE'S OPENING STATEMENT, DEFENSE OPENING STATEMENT, STATE'S WITNESS #1, DX, CX, RDX, WITNESS EXCUSED, STATE'S WITNESS #2, DX, JURORS EXCUSED AND JUDGE RECESS, JUDGE ENTERS & JURORS BROUGHT IN, DX RESUMES, CX, RDX, RCX, WITNESS EXCUSED, DISCOVERY ISSUE, DEFENSE ORAL MOTION FOR JUDGMENT OF ACQUITTAL, DEFENSE ORAL MOTION FOR DISCOVERY SANCTIONS, MOTIONS DENIED, STATE'S WITNESS #1 DX, CX, JURY INSTRUCTIONS, JURORS EXCUSED

12/22/2025 Charge(s): 1

FINDING - GUILTY ENTERED BY COURT ON 12/22/2025

12/22/2025 Charge(s): 1

RULING - ORIGINAL ORDERED ON 12/22/2025

HARRIS MATTSON , JUDGE

It is adjudged that the defendant is guilty of 1 OUI (ALCOHOL) 29-A 2411(1-A) (A) Class D as charged and convicted.

It is ordered that the defendant's motor vehicle operator's license or permit to operate, right to operate and right to apply for and obtain a license is suspended for a period of 150 day(s) effective 12/23/2025 at 16:00.

Charge #1: It is ordered that the defendant forfeit and pay the sum of \$ 500.00 as a fine to the clerk of the court, plus applicable surcharges and assessments.

10% GOV'T OPERATION SURCHARGE FUND \$ 50.00

CR_200, Rev. 07/15

Page 5 of 7

Printed on: 02/25/2026

\$ 40 VICTIMS COMPENSATION FUND
100% GENERAL FUND \$ 500.00
\$ 30 DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FINES
1% COUNTY JAIL \$ 5.00
5% GENERAL FUND ADDL 5% SURCHARGE \$ 25.00
3% MAINE CRIMINAL JUSTICE ACADEMY 2006 \$ 15.00
1% MSP COMPUTER CRIMES \$ 5.00
\$ 15 COURT MANAGEMENT SYS FEE FINE
\$ 5 VICTIMS PROPERTY COMP FUND
TOTAL DUE:\$ 740.00.

12/22/2025 Charge(s): 1

RULING - ORIGINAL ISSUED ON 12/22/2025

DEFENDANT ACKNOWLEDGES RECEIPT

12/23/2025 OTHER FILING - FINE PAYMENT SCHEDULE ORDERED ON 12/23/2025

INSTALLMENT PYMTS: 0;DAILY: F;WEEKLY: F;BI-WEEKLY: F;MONTHLY: F;BI-MONTHLY: F;PYMT BEGIN:
AT 0;PYMT IN FULL: 20260105 AT 0;THRU PPO: F;PYMT DUE AMT: 690;PMT DUE: 20260105 AT
0;OTHER:

12/23/2025 MOTION - OTHER MOTION GRANTED ON 11/26/2025

ANN MURRAY , JUSTICE
TO APPEAR VIA ZOOM 12/4/25

12/23/2025 MOTION - OTHER MOTION GRANTED ON 11/26/2025

ANN MURRAY , JUSTICE
TO EXCUSE DEFENDANTS APPEARANCE AT COURT

12/23/2025 TRIAL - JURY TRIAL HELD ON 12/22/2025

HARRIS MATTSON , JUDGE
Attorney: CHELSEA LYNDIS
DA: CHRISTOPHER SMITH
Defendant Present in Court

12/23/2025 Charge(s): 1

ABSTRACT - BMV ISSUED ON 12/23/2025

12/30/2025 Charge(s): 1

APPEAL - NOTICE OF APPEAL FILED ON 12/29/2025

Attorney: KAYLA ALVES

12/30/2025 ORDER - TRANSCRIPT ORDER ENTERED ON 12/29/2025

Attorney: KAYLA ALVES

12/30/2025 MOTION - MOTION FOR WITHDRAWAL OF CNSL FILED BY COUNSEL ON 12/29/2025

Attorney: KAYLA ALVES

01/02/2026 MOTION - MOTION FOR WITHDRAWAL OF CNSL GRANTED ON 12/31/2025

JON HADDOW , JUDGE
COPIES TO PARTIES/COUNSEL

01/02/2026 Charge(s): 1

APPEAL - NOTICE OF APPEAL SENT TO REPORTER/ER ON 01/02/2026

01/02/2026 Charge(s): 1

APPEAL - NOTICE OF APPEAL SENT TO LAW COURT ON 01/02/2026

01/02/2026 Party(s): DARRELL L SPROUL
ATTORNEY - WITHDRAWN ORDERED ON 12/31/2025

Attorney: KAYLA ALVES

01/06/2026 OTHER FILING - OTHER DOCUMENT FILED ON 01/06/2026

PAPER TRANSCRIPT REQUEST COMPLETED AND FORWARDED TO OTO - KAZ CHILDS CTA

02/04/2026 Charge(s): 1
RULING - AUDIT REPORT LATE FEE ASSESSED ON 02/04/2026

LATE FEE OF \$50 WAS ASSESSED ON \$500.

02/25/2026 OTHER FILING - OTHER DOCUMENT FILED ON 02/25/2026

NOTICE OF DOCKETING IN THE LAW COURT

PEN-26-4

02/25/2026 Charge(s): 1
APPEAL - RECORD ON APPEAL DUE IN LAW COURT ON 02/02/2027

02/25/2026 Charge(s): 1
APPEAL - RECORD ON APPEAL SENT TO LAW COURT ON 02/25/2026

FINE PAYMENT SCHEDULE

Execution/payment stayed to pay in full by 01/05/2026 or warrant to issue.

A TRUE COPY

ATTEST: _____
Clerk

MAINE JUDICIAL BRANCH

UNIFIED CRIMINAL DOCKET
 County: PENOBSCOT
 Location (Town): BANGOR
 Docket No.: PENCD-CR-2024-02405

STATE OF MAINE

JUDGMENT AND COMMITMENT

v.

DARRELL L SPROUL

Date (mm/dd/yyyy): 12/22/25

DOB (mm/dd/yyyy): [REDACTED]

Offense(s) charged:
OUI (ALCOHOL)

Class: D DOV: 06/21/2024 Seq #: 12942 Title: 29-A / 2411 / 1-A / A

Plea(s): ☒ Guilty ☐ Nolo ☐ Not Guilty

Charge: 1

Charged by:

☐ indictment

☐ information

☒ complaint

Offense(s) convicted:

☒ **OUI (ALCOHOL)**

Class: D DOV: 06/21/2024 Seq #: 12942 Title: 29-A / 2411 / 1-A / A

Charge: 1

Convicted on:

☐ plea

☒ jury verdict

☐ court finding

It is adjudged that the defendant is guilty of the offenses as shown above and convicted.

☐ It is adjudged that the defendant be hereby committed to the sheriff of the within named county or the defendant's authorized representative who shall without needless delay remove the defendant to:

☐ The custody of the Commissioner of the Department of Corrections, at a facility designated by the Commissioner, to be punished by imprisonment for a term of _____

☐ A County jail to be punished by imprisonment for a term of _____

☐ This sentence to be served ☐ consecutively to ☐ concurrently with _____

☐ Alternative Sentence may be served at _____

☐ Execution stayed to on or before (mm/dd/yyyy): _____ at _____ ☐ a.m. ☐ p.m.

PLEASE NOTE: Your sentence does not include any assurance about the location of the facility where you will be housed during your commitment.

☐ It is ordered that all (☐ but) _____ of the sentence ☐ as it relates to confinement ☐ as it relates to the _____ be suspended and the defendant be placed on a period of

☐ probation ☐ supervised release ☐ administrative release for a term of _____ ☐ years ☐ months

upon conditions attached hereto and incorporated by reference herein. ☐ Said probation or supervised release to commence ☐ (mm/dd/yyyy) _____ ☐ upon completion of the unsuspended term of imprisonment. ☐ Said administrative release to commence immediately.

☐ The defendant shall serve the initial portion of the foregoing sentence at a County jail.

ADA Notice: The Maine Judicial Branch complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). If you need a reasonable accommodation, contact the Court Access Coordinator, accessability@courts.maine.gov, or a court clerk.

Language Services: For language assistance and interpreters, contact a court clerk or interpreters@courts.maine.gov.

☒ It is ordered that the defendant forfeit and pay the sum of \$ 500 as a fine to the clerk of the court, plus applicable surcharges and assessments. ☐ All but \$ _____ suspended. The total amount due, including surcharges and assessments is \$ _____. This amount is payable immediately or in accordance with the Order on Payment of Fines incorporated by reference herein.

☐ It is ordered that the defendant forfeit and pay the sum of \$ _____ as restitution for the benefit of _____ (17-A M.R.S. § 2003).

☐ Restitution is joint and several with _____ pursuant to 17-A M.R.S. § 2010.

☐ Restitution is to be paid through the office of the prosecuting attorney, except that during any period of commitment to the Department of Corrections and/or any period of probation imposed by this sentence, restitution is to be paid to the Department of Corrections.

☐ A separate order for income withholding has been entered pursuant to 17-A M.R.S. § 2007 incorporated by reference herein.

☐ Execution/payment stayed to pay in full by (mm/dd/yyyy) _____.

☐ Installment payments of \$ _____ to be made ☐ weekly ☐ biweekly ☐ monthly or warrant to issue.

☐ Restitution is to be paid to the Department of Corrections on a schedule to be determined by the Department.

☐ It is ordered that the defendant forfeit the money and/or property described below to the State of Maine _____ (15 M.R.S. § 5826), as a result of the conviction or adjudication on count(s) _____. Notice to be sent to any third parties in accordance with 15 M.R.S. § 5826(5). The State will submit a final order of disposition of property as set forth in 15 M.R.S. § 5826(6).

☒ It is ordered pursuant to applicable statutes, that the defendant's motor vehicle operator's license or permit to operate, right to operate a motor vehicle and right to apply for and obtain a license and/or the defendant's right to register a motor vehicle is suspended in accordance with notice of suspension incorporated herein, as to count(s) 1. 29-A M.R.S. § 2411(5) and 29-A M.R.S. § 2416 150 days → stayed 12/23/25 at 4pm

☐ If defendant is convicted of a charge under 29-A M.R.S. § 2411(5)(B),(C), or (D), it is hereby ordered pursuant to 29-A M.R.S. § 2411(5)(F), that the defendant shall participate in the alcohol and drug program of the Department of Health and Human Services.

☐ The Court finds that the defendant has completed an alcohol or other drug treatment program subsequent to the date of the offense, and the requirement of participation in the alcohol and drug program of the Department of Health and Human Services is hereby waived. 29-A M.R.S. § 2411(5)(F).

☐ It is ordered that the defendant perform _____ hours of court-approved community service work to be completed by (mm/dd/yyyy) _____ for the benefit of _____.
If proof of community service is not filed with the court by the above date, defendant MUST appear at (court address) _____ on (mm/dd/yyyy) _____ at _____ ☐ a.m. ☐ p.m.

☐ It is ordered that the defendant pay \$ _____ for each day served in the county jail, to the treasurer of the above named county. (up to \$80/day) (17-A M.R.S. § 1751)

☐ Execution/payment stayed to pay in full by (mm/dd/yyyy) _____ or warrant to issue.

☐ It is ordered that the defendant forfeit to the state the firearm used by the defendant during the commission of the offense(s) shown above. (17-A M.R.S. § 1504).

ADA Notice: The Maine Judicial Branch complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). If you need a reasonable accommodation, contact the Court Access Coordinator, accessability@courts.maine.gov, or a court clerk.

Language Services: For language assistance and interpreters, contact a court clerk or interpreters@courts.maine.gov.

MAINE JUDICIAL BRANCH

☐ It is ordered that the defendant is prohibited from owning, possessing or having under the defendant's control a firearm. (15 M.R.S. § 393)

☐ Other: _____

☐ It is ordered that the defendant be unconditionally discharged. (17-A M.R.S. § 1502, 2051)

If the defendant has been convicted of an applicable offense listed in 25 M.R.S. § 1574, then the defendant shall submit to having a DNA sample drawn at any time following the commencement of any term of imprisonment or at any time following commencement of the probation period as directed by the probation officer.

PLEASE NOTE: It is a violation of state law, and may be a violation of federal law, for the defendant to own, possess, or have under their control a firearm if that prohibition has been entered as part of this judgment or any other court order or is prohibited by statute.

It is further ordered that the clerk deliver a certified copy of this judgment and commitment to the sheriff of the above-named county or the defendant's authorized representative and that the copy serve as the commitment of the defendant. Reasons for imposing consecutive sentences are contained in the court record or in attachments hereto.

All pending motions, other than motions relating to payment of restitution, fines, fees, and counsel fees are hereby declared moot (except _____).

A TRUE COPY, ATTEST: _____
Clerk

X _____
☒ Judge ☐ Justice

I understand the sentence imposed herein and acknowledge receipt of a copy of this Judgment and Commitment.

I hereby acknowledge that the disclosure of my Social Security number on the Social Security Disclosure Form is mandatory under 36 M.R.S. § 185. My Social Security number will be used to facilitate the collection of any fine that has been imposed upon me in this action if that fine remains unpaid as of the time I am due a State of Maine income tax refund. My Social Security number also may be used to facilitate the collection of money I may owe the State of Maine as a result of having had an attorney appointed to represent me. Collection of any fine or reimbursement of money, which I owe to the State of Maine, will be accomplished by offsetting money I owe to the State against my State of Maine income tax refund or against any lottery winnings I may receive under 36 M.R.S. § 185-A.

SS Number Disclosure Required on separate form.

Date (mm/dd/yyyy):

12/22/2025

X

Signature of Defendant

Mailing Address:

[REDACTED]
HAMPTON, ME 04144

ADA Notice: The Maine Judicial Branch complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). If you need a reasonable accommodation, contact the Court Access Coordinator, accessability@courts.maine.gov, or a court clerk.

Language Services: For language assistance and interpreters, contact a court clerk or interpreters@courts.maine.gov.

MAINE JUDICIAL BRANCH

Residential Address: _____

ADA Notice: The Maine Judicial Branch complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). If you need a reasonable accommodation, contact the Court Access Coordinator, accessability@courts.maine.gov, or a court clerk.

Language Services: For language assistance and interpreters, contact a court clerk or interpreters@courts.maine.gov.

www.courts.maine.gov

PENCD-CR-2024-02405

STATE OF MAINE

Location: Bangor
Docket No: CR-24-2405

STATE OF MAINE

v.

Darrell Sproul
DefendantORDER ON PAYMENT
OF FINES14 M.R.S. § 3141(4), 3142
17-A M.R.S. § 1303(1), 1304(3)

You are ORDERED to pay your fine(s) and related surcharges as follows:


Total Amount Due: \$ 500. Amount Due Today: _____

You must make your additional payments as follows:

Your first payment of \$ _____ is due on _____ at _____ (a.m.)(p.m.). You must then make additional payments in the same amount thereafter, until paid in full, as follows:


A. Weekly. Every ☐ Mon ☐ Tues ☐ Wed ☐ Thurs ☐ FriB. Bi-Weekly. Every other ☐ Mon ☐ Tues ☐ Wed ☐ Thurs ☐ FriC. Monthly. On the _____ day of each month. If the date falls on a day when court is not open, payment is due on the next business day.OR Payment of fine in full due on 1/5/26 at _____ (a.m.)(p.m.)**WARNING**

If at any time you are unable to make a timely payment on the date it is due, you must come to Court on or before the date that payment is due to explain why you cannot make the payment and request an extension of time to make the payment. The Court may grant you an extension or you may be required to return on another day for another hearing. If you fail to make your payment(s) as ordered by the Court and you fail to obtain an extension from the Court, **an arrest warrant may be issued for your arrest, you may be defaulted, you may be held in contempt, and the court may suspend any license, certification, registration, permit, approval, or similar document issued to you by the State of Maine without further notice.** These include, but are not limited to, your driver's license, your vehicle registration, your license to hunt, fish, or trap, and your license to engage in a profession, occupation, business, or identifying licenses issued by the Commissioner of Marine Resources and Commissioner of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife. Once suspended, these licenses each carry separate individual reinstatement fees that will have to be paid in addition to the fine owed to the court before the license or other certification will be reinstated. Also, a separate additional late fee will be applied to each overdue fine and you may be subject to an additional fine. Keep this document in a safe place until your fine is paid in full. **You must keep the Court informed of any change in your address.**

Date: 12/22/25
Judge/Justice**SS Number Disclosure Required on separate form**

I acknowledge that disclosure of my Social Security Number is **mandatory** pursuant to 36 M.R.S. §5276-A, and that my social security number can be used by the Court to collect any fine that remains unpaid by taking my State of Maine or Federal income tax refund and applying it towards any outstanding fines.

I have read the above order, understand it, and acknowledge receipt of a copy.

Date: 12/22/25Defendant's Signature Physical Address: Mailing Address: SAME

LATE PAYMENT OF FINES NOTICE
EFFECTIVE 01/01/2004

All fines imposed as of 1/1/04 are subject to a late fee if the fine is not paid by the date it is due. If the payment is not paid on the due date, a late payment fee will be assessed, in addition to the amount due on each fine, as follows:

For original fines less than or equal to \$100.00, the late payment fee is	\$25.00
For original fines greater than \$100.00 and less than or equal to \$500.00, the late payment fee is	\$50.00
For original fines greater than \$500.00, the late payment fee is	\$100.00

The amount due on any late payment fee will be determined based on the amount of the fine specified on the face of the judgment, without regard to increases from surcharges or decreases from partial payments. Where part of the fine is suspended, the amount due will be determined based on the remaining, unsuspended portion of the fine.

WARNING

PAYMENT MUST BE RECEIVED AT THE COURT ON THE DATE THAT THE FINE PAYMENT IS DUE – PLEASE TAKE THIS INTO CONSIDERATION WHEN MAILING YOUR FINE PAYMENTS. BECAUSE THESE FEES ARE ASSESSED AUTOMATICALLY BY THE JUDICIAL BRANCH’S COMPUTER NETWORK, THERE WILL BE NO EXCEPTIONS TO THIS RULE.

SURCHARGES

Maine law requires that certain surcharges be added to the amount of every fine. Please contact the Clerk’s office if you have any questions about the surcharges.

PAYMENT OPTIONS

Payments to the Court may be made in any of the following ways:

1. By mail via check or money order in US funds made payable to Treasurer, State of Maine. Please include the docket number on your check or money order.
2. In person at the Court listed on this Order between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. You may pay in person by cash, check, money order, or credit card (MasterCard, Visa, or Discover).
3. By credit card (MasterCard, Visa, or Discover). Payments may be made by calling toll free: 1-866-729-8499.
4. On line. Go to <http://www.maine.gov/courtfines>

STATE OF MAINE

- ☒ UNIFIED CRIMINAL DOCKET
☐ SUPERIOR COURT
☐ DISTRICT COURT

County: Penobscot
Location: Bangor
Docket No: PENCB-CR-24-2405

STATE OF MAINE

NOTICE OF SUSPENSION

29-A M.R.S. § 2434

v.

Darrell Sproul
Defendant

Date of Birth 8/31/1950

You are hereby notified that:

1. Your right to operate motor vehicles in Maine,
 2. Your right to apply for or obtain a Maine license to operate motor vehicles, and
 3. Your Maine motor vehicle operator's license or permit,
- are SUSPENDED for a period of 150 days.

This suspension is:

- ☐ effective immediately.
- ☐ stayed until _____ (a.m.)(p.m.) today (not to exceed 4 hours) upon reasonable cause shown.
- ☒ stayed until 12/23/2025 at 4:00 PM (a.m.)(p.m.) (not to exceed 7 days) upon the demonstration, e.g. production of restoration letter, that the defendant's license was previously restored by the Secretary of State following an administrative suspension under 29-A M.R.S. § 2453 or § 2453-A for operating under the influence based on the same facts and circumstances giving rise to this court-ordered suspension.
- ☐ effective beginning after the period of incarceration is served pursuant to 17-A M.R.S. § 1103(6).

The Secretary of State may impose an additional period of suspension and extend any period of suspension in accordance with law.

☐ You are further notified that your right to register a motor vehicle is SUSPENDED. Furthermore, the registration certificates and plates issued to you by the State of Maine are SUSPENDED. You are ORDERED to return the suspended registration certificates and plates to the Secretary of State forthwith.

You are hereby ORDERED to:

- ☐ immediately turn your license over to the court.
- ☐ surrender your license to the court by _____ at _____ (a.m./p.m.) (not to exceed 96 hours) upon reasonable cause shown and the defendant's failure to possess the license at the time of sentencing.
- ☐ Defendant represents to the court that the defendant has already surrendered his/her license to the Secretary of State.

Failure to surrender your license will result in 2 additional days of suspension added to your suspension for each day you fail to surrender your license.

Date: 12/22/25



Judge / Justice

I understand the suspension(s) imposed and acknowledge receipt of the Notice of Suspension.

Date: _____

Defendant

White - Court Copy / Yellow - Motor Vehicle Copy / Pink - Defendant Copy

2895390

24-045400

MAINE COURT

ATN/CTN

☐ District ☐ Supr

5238318

Docket No.

UNIFORM SUMMONS AND COMPLAINT

☒ CRIMINAL: ☐ ARREST ☐ BAIL \$ _____
☐ CIVIL VIOLATION ☐ FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE ☐ MARINE RESOURCES
☐ TRAFFIC VIOLATION ☐ FOREST SERVICE

State of Maine / Municipality of Brewer v.SproutDarrellL

Last

First

Middle

(Defendant)

Mailing address:

City/Town Hampden State ME Zip 04444

OPERATOR	LICENSE NUMBER <u>9840035</u>					STATE <u>ME</u>	DATE OF BIRTH <u>8/31/80</u>
	HAIR <u>Gr</u>	EYES <u>Bl</u>	HEIGHT <u>5'11"</u>	WEIGHT <u>200</u>	SEX <u>M</u>	RACE <u>W</u>	AGE <u>73</u>
VEHICLE ☐ C.M.V. >26,000LBS. ☐ HAZ. MAT. ☐ BUS > 15 PASSENGERS			REGISTRATION NUMBER <u>677TL</u>				STATE <u>ME</u>
			COLOR <u>Red</u>	YEAR <u>2011</u>	MAKE <u>Cadi</u>	BODY <u>Esc.</u>	
U.S. DOT #		OFFENSE COMMITTED <u>ONLY ABOUT</u>	MONTH <u>6</u>	DAY <u>21</u>	YEAR <u>24</u>	AT	TIME <u>2140</u>
AT	RT / ST / PL <u>Parkway South</u>			CITY / TOWN <u>Brewer</u>			

☐ Speeding: Alleged _____ mph, Legal _____ mph.VIOLATION (Title 29-A Section / Ordinance 2411) Class DSequence No. 012942 Domestic Violence ☐OUT (operating under the influence)Officer's name, printed Rose MikaylaDate of service: 6/21/24 Mikayla Rose First Last MI

Officer's signature

Dept Brewer Troop _____ OFF. NO. 223

YOU ARE HEREBY ORDERED TO APPEAR BEFORE THE COURT LOCATED AT:

78 Exchange Street Bangor ME 04401

STREET ADDRESS CITY / TOWN ZIP

08/22/2024 0830 A.M./P.M. (207) 561-2300

DATE TIME COURT TELEPHONE NO.

☒ I promise to appear in the Court at the place, date, and time described above.Signature Darrell L Sprout Date 8/1/24

STREET ADDRESS CITY / TOWN STATE ZIP

(MAILING ADDRESS IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE.)

Your signature does not constitute an admission or plea of guilty to the above violation(s). However, refusal to sign after having been ordered to do so by a law enforcement is a separate Class E crime for which you may be arrested.

The undersign states that he/she has probable cause to believe and does believe that the person named above committed the violation set forth herein.

Signature _____ Dept. _____

Sworn to before me on _____ (Dep.) Clerk

FOR WAIVER DISPOSITION ONLY

Date _____ Guilty / Offense committed

\$ _____ Fine Amt.

Fine Amt.

\$ _____

☐ Paid

STATE OF MAINE
PENOBSCOT, ss

PENOBSCOT COURT
LOCATION: BANGOR
DOCKET NO:

STATE OF MAINE

PENOB-CP-2024-2405
COMPLAINT

v.

DARRELL L. SPROUL

DOB: [REDACTED]

SIN: ME0062537
[REDACTED]

Hampden, ME 04444

G: Male Ht: 5'11" Wt: 170 H: Gray

E: Blue R: White

COUNT 1: CRIMINAL OUI

The undersigned officer, being duly sworn, states upon information and belief that:

COUNT 1:

29-A M.R.S. §2411(1-A)(A)

Seq No: 12942

CRIMINAL OUI

CLASS D

ATNCTN 523831B001

On or about June 21, 2024, in Brewer, Penobscot County, Maine, **DARRELL L. SPROUL**, did operate a motor vehicle while under the influence of intoxicants or while having an alcohol level of 0.08 grams or more of alcohol per 100 milliliters of blood or 210 liters of breath.

DATED: 8/2/24

Archie Jones
COMPLAINANT

Sworn to before me, 8-2-24

Christina B.
Asst. Clerk/Judge/Justice

OFFICER: Mikayla Rose

DEPT: Brewer Police Department (Inc: 24-045400)

ARRAIGNMENT: August 22, 2024

No Jail Requested

BANGOR COURTS
2/24 AM 10:35

PROS: Alice Clifford, ADA JW#: 24-3128 (BLUE TEAM)