

**Bristol County District Attorney's Office
C. Samuel Sutter
District Attorney**

**Press Release
May 27, 2010**

District Attorney Sam Sutter announced today that Keith Lake, 33, of New Bedford, was ordered held without bail during his Superior Court arraignment this morning. Mr. Lake is scheduled to appear back in court on June 3rd for a dangerousness hearing, during which a judge will determine whether he should continue to be held without bail for 90 days while the Commonwealth prepares for trial.

Mr. Lake is charged with a 16-count indictment which includes charges of home invasion, armed assault with intent to murder, armed assault in a dwelling, assault and battery with a dangerous weapon, aggravated assault and battery in violation of a restraining order, malicious injury to property over \$250, assault and battery with a dangerous weapon, threats (4 counts), larceny over \$250, resisting arrest, failure to stop for police, operating a motor vehicle to endanger and placing annoying phone calls.

The 16 indictments are all connected to three separate incidents during the past two months, culminating with the stabbing of his ex-girlfriend in her New Bedford apartment on April 26th. Assistant District Attorney Marni Peck is prosecuting the case on behalf of Sutter's office.

District Attorney Sutter issued the following statement after this morning's arraignment:

"I strongly believe that when Keith Lake was arrested on April 25th for malicious destruction of property over \$250 and assault and battery---in view of his two different pending criminal cases, his lengthy criminal record, his history of incarceration and his status as a level two sex offender---he should not have been released from custody. He should have been held so that the prosecution, on the next day, would have had the opportunity to ask that his bail be revoked and he be held without bail.

I feel there are too many instances where my prosecutors are being denied the opportunity to ask judges for dangerousness hearings or for bail revocation because defendants are being released from custody and told to appear in court on the next business day.

Right now there is a divergence---a disconnect---between the criteria the clerks are using to determine whether to release or not release a defendant, and the predicate offenses listed in the dangerousness statute as grounds to request a person be held without bail.

The entire situation would be rectified if the clerks simply add the offenses listed as predicate offenses for dangerousness hearings to their criteria for determining whether to hold the arrestee without bail or to set bail. If a defendant is charged with a crime for which a prosecutor could ask for a dangerousness hearing, then the clerks should hold the defendant in custody."