

FILED
CLERK OF COURT

2026 JAN 22 PM 1:37

SUPERIOR COURT
OF GUAM *ma*

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF GUAM

PEOPLE OF GUAM,

CRIMINAL CASE NO. CM0082-25

vs.

DECISION AND ORDER

JYQWAN JYKREE ROOKS,

Defendant.

INTRODUCTION

This matter came before the Honorable Vernon P. Perez on October 24, 2025, for hearing on Defendant **JYQWAN JYKREE ROOKS** ("Defendant") Motion to Suppress Evidence. Present were Assistant Attorney General Dante CH Harootunian on behalf of the People of Guam ("the Government") and Defendant with counsel, Le Roi T. Enriquez. Having reviewed the pleadings, the arguments presented, and the record, the Court now issues the following Decision and Order.

BACKGROUND

Defendant is charged with one count of Driving While Impaired (BAC) (As a Misdemeanor) and one count of Reckless Driving While Impaired (As a Misdemeanor). (Magistrate's Compl., Mar. 2, 2025). On August 29, 2025, Defendant filed the instant Motion, moving to suppress all evidence because GPD did not have reasonable suspicion to initiate a traffic stop. On September 10, 2025, the Government filed its Opposition. On September 19, 2025, Defendant filed his Reply.

1 On October 24, 2025, the Court heard sworn testimony from Guam Police Department
2 (“GPD”) Officer Martin Oliva, Officer Rebecca Valencia, Ivan Shaquan Lewis, and Defendant.
3 The Court ascertained the following facts:

- 4 1. On the night of March 1, 2025, early morning of March 2, 2025, GPD responded to a
5 stalled vehicle along Route 14, Pale San Vitores Road, by DFS in Tumon.
- 6 2. Officer Oliva and Officer Diaz were in one vehicle and Officer Valencia was in
7 another vehicle driving behind Officer Oliva.
- 8 3. While driving on Route 14 towards DFS from Tumon Precinct, Officer Oliva noticed
9 another vehicle going the opposite direction almost encroach on his lane of travel.
- 10 4. Officer Oliva testified that the vehicle made corrective/evasive actions and did not hit
11 his vehicle.
- 12 5. Officer Valencia testified that the vehicle was motoring down the same lane she and
13 Officer Oliva were in (the inner north bound lane) and that the vehicle almost collided
14 with Officer Oliva’s patrol car in front of her.
- 15 6. Officer Valencia testified that Officer Oliva turned on his lights and sirens and honked
16 at the vehicle.
- 17 7. Officer Oliva proceeded to respond to the stalled vehicle near DFS and Officer
18 Valencia remained in the area to conduct a traffic stop.
- 19 8. Officer Valencia turned on her lights and sirens.
- 20 9. The vehicle continued motoring until it got to the driveway to enter the parking lot of
21 in between Green Lizard and the Gift Shop.
- 22 10. The operator of the vehicle was identified as Defendant.
- 23 11. Defendant and Mr. Lewis were at Club Zoh that night for a throwback event and left
24 around 2:00 a.m.
- 25 12. Mr. Lewis and Defendant work together in the same unit in the military.
- 26 13. Mr. Lewis testified that Defendant was the designated driver.
- 27 14. Because it was raining, Defendant offered a ride to two individuals who had parked
28 their car near Green Lizard. After Defendant exited the Dusit parking structure, he

1 Here, both officers testified that the vehicle operated by Defendant nearly collided with
2 Officer Oliva's patrol car, while traveling on Route 14. Officer Oliva testified that the vehicle
3 "almost encroached" into his lane, requiring corrective or evasive action. Officer Valencia
4 corroborated this observation, stating that the vehicle was motoring down the same inner
5 northbound lane and nearly struck Officer Oliva's patrol car. The Court finds that this provided
6 the officers with reasonable suspicion to believe that a traffic violation occurred. *See* 16 GCA §
7 3309. Defendant argues that the stop was prompted by a U-turn maneuver rather than lane
8 encroachment. Although Defendant and Mr. Lewis both testified that Defendant's driving was
9 "fine," Defendant admitted to drinking that night and for whatever reason, ended up being the
10 "designated driver" despite Mr. Lewis testifying that he did not drink anything himself. The Court
11 finds it plausible, as the Government sets forth in its Opposition, that Defendant may have been
12 attempting a legal U-turn, but due to his intoxicated state drifted too far over such that he was
13 facing south in the northbound lane thereby facing oncoming traffic, as observed by the officers.
14 The Court also notes that this occurred in the late night/early morning hours and it was raining.
15 Accordingly, the Court DENIES Defendant's Motion to Suppress.

16 CONCLUSION

17 For the foregoing reasons, the Court hereby DENIES Defendant's Motion to Suppress
18 Evidence.

19
20 **IT IS SO ORDERED** this 22nd day of January, 2026.

21
22 
23 HONORABLE VERNON P. PEREZ
24 Judge, Superior Court of Guam
25
26
27
28