

Dan Dow
District Attorney
State Bar #237986
County of San Luis Obispo
County Government Center, Room 450
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
Telephone: (805) 781-5800

Attorney for the People of the State of California

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,)	CASE NO. 23F-09163-A
)	
Plaintiff,)	PEOPLE'S SENTENCING
)	MEMORANDUM
vs.)	
)	
)	
CHARLES VINCENT HOJABOOM)	
)	Date: December 15, 2025
Defendant.)	Time: 8:30 a.m.
)	Dept.: 8

STATEMENT OF FACTS

On August 27, 2025, defendant pled no contest to all charges in the Information in this matter. Furthermore, with respect to Count 1, the defendant admitted he personally used a deadly or dangerous weapon within the meaning of Penal Code section 969F(a). Finally, the defendant admitted the following factors in aggravation:

- Rule 4.421(a)(1): The crime involved great violence, great bodily harm, threat of great bodily harm, or other acts disclosing a high degree of cruelty, viciousness, or callousness;
- Rule 4.421(a)(2): The defendant was armed with or used a weapon at the time of the commission of the crime;
- Rule 4.421(a)(8): The manner in which the crime was carried out indicates planning, sophistication, or professionalism; and

- Rule 4.421(b)(1): The defendant has engaged in violent conduct that indicates a serious danger to society.

The defendant's pleas and admissions were not the result of a negotiated disposition between the Parties. Rather, the defendant pled open to the Court based on the Court's indicated sentence of a lid of seven years and six months in the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. The Court calculated this lid based on an indication of imposing low term of three years for Count 4 as the principal term, with potentially consecutive time to be imposed on remaining counts subject to the limitations of Penal Code section 654.

SENTENCING STRUCTURE

It is the People's understanding the Court intends to designate Count 4 as the principal term in this case. The chart below depicts the People's understanding of the how the Court calculated a lid of seven years and six months based on the charges in this matter.

<u>Count</u>	<u>Charge</u>	<u>Exposure</u>
1	PC § 246.3(a)	PC § 654 to Count 2
2	PC § 626.9(h)	1 year consecutive
3	PC § 626.9(h)	1 year consecutive
4	PC § 246	3 years
5	PC § 626.9(h)	PC § 654 to Count 4
6	PC § 626.9(h)	1 year consecutive
7	VC § 626.9(h)	1 year consecutive
8	PC § 594(b)(2)	6 months consecutive
Total:		7 years, 6 months

ARGUMENT

A. The General Objectives of Sentencing Dictate Defendant Should be Sentenced to the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation for the Maximum Indicated Term

1 On multiple occasions during the pendency of this case, the People have argued the
2 defendant poses an overwhelming risk to public safety. In a motion to increase bail filed on
3 December 11, 2023, for example, the People wrote, in relevant part:

4
5 “. . . the defendants’ repeated and blatant disregard for any semblance of
6 reasonable firearm safety, while clearly aware of the extreme and deadly risks
their conduct posed, causes the People grave concern for public safety.”

7 Thereafter, in comments the People submitted to Probation for the purposes of a
8 pre-plea report in this matter, the People wrote:

9 “By turning various portions of the Cal Poly Campus into unsanctioned shooting
10 ranges – including his own dorm room – Mr. Hojaboom repeatedly demonstrated
11 a conscious, callous, and sinister disregard for the safety of fellow Cal Poly
12 students and the community at large. Accordingly, the People strongly believe
the defendant poses an overwhelming public safety risk which cannot be
sufficiently mitigated by supervision in the community at this time.

13 The People’s concerns are informed not only by the defendant’s charged
14 conduct, and the cache of weapons and ammunition he amassed on a college
15 campus, but by the defendant’s incredibly disturbing conduct since his arrest on
16 November 11, 2023. Since that date, and before he was remanded back into
17 custody on December 12, 2023, the defendant not only purchased parts to
construct an AR-15 assault rifle – including a buttstock after he was served with a
Gun Violence Restraining Order – but repeatedly sought information online which
casts a deeply troubling new light on the defendant’s already terrifying conduct.

18 In particular, the defendant’s online search history from November 13, 2023, to
19 December 11, 2023, recently obtained via search warrant, included queries
20 related to:

- 21 1) Surreptitiously manufacturing firearms (ie, “can you 3d print an ar15
22 lower”, “3d printed glock 19”, “3d printed ar15 lower”, “3d printed ar15 30
23 round magazine”, “san Lorenzo 3d printer” [note: the defendant is from
San Lorenzo, CA], and “carving ar15 lower from a block of aluminum”);
- 24 2) Suicide (ie, “is it better to stab myself or shoot myself”, “should I kill
25 myself”, and “quick ways to die”);
- 26 3) Fleeing the country (ie, “fleeing to china”, “what do I need if I am on the
27 run”, “if I jump bail to go to china what will happen”, “does Russia accept
28 American defectors”, “what should I do if I am in the country and don’t
speak the language” [note: in a jail call from the defendant to his father, on
December 27, 2023, the defendant asked his father to send him books to
help him learn Tagalog, Japanese, Chinese, Cantonese, Spanish, and
Dutch], “Hong Kong extradition”, “does the Philippines have an extradition

treaty with the us”, “how do fugitives make money”, and, the day before he was remanded into custody ,“how do people run and make a new identity”);

- 4) Mass shooters and murderers (ie, “baruch Goldstein” [a terrorist who murdered 29 Palestinians in 1994], “Robert Card” [an Army reservist who murdered 18 people in Lewiston, Maine, in October, 2023], “dc snipers car diagram” [in clear reference to the “Beltway Sniper” who, in 2002, used a modified vehicle to discreetly carry out multiple assassinations]; and “Nashville shooter manifesto” [in March, 2023, Alden Hale killed three children, and three adults, at a school in Nashville, TN]); and,
- 5) Court security (five days before the defendant’s initial appearance date in Department 3, the defendant searched: “court room security”, and “are you checked for weapons in court”).

Simply stated, the shocking degree of indifference to human life the defendant showed in this case, viewed in the context of: 1) his stockpiling of weapons and ammunition on a college campus; 2) his clear attempt to build an assault rifle even after his arrest, and after being served with a Gun Violence Restraining Order; and 3) his post-arrest online searches which show a fascination with weapons, mass shooters, and how best to flee the country to avoid prosecution, the People firmly believe the defendant would pose an incredible risk to public safety if released into the community. Therefore, the People believe the only way to ensure public safety is for this defendant to be sentenced to a significant term in state prison should he be convicted in this case.”

The passage of time has not changed the People’s position, or alleviated the People’s concerns as stated above. The People continue to respectfully submit that in order to fulfill the general objectives of sentencing – perhaps the most important of which is protecting society – the Court should impose a significant prison sentence in this matter. During such a sentence, the People are hopeful the defendant will avail himself of rehabilitative services in anticipation of his reentry to society.

B. The Court Should Impose Consecutive Sentences

Rule 4.425(a) contains a non-exhaustive list of factors the Court should consider when choosing to impose concurrent or consecutive sentences. Specifically, the Court should determine whether:

- (1) The crimes and their objectives were predominantly independent of each other;
- (2) The crimes involved separate acts of violence or threats of violence; or

1 (3) The crimes were committed at different times or separate places, rather than being
2 committed so closely in time and place as to indicate a single period of aberrant behavior.

3 Here, the defendant's crimes occurred on four separate offense dates over the course of
4 several months. Moreover, while three counts not subject to Penal Code section 654 (counts
5 6, 7, and 8, respectively), occurred on one date, counts 6 and 7 pertain to separate loaded
6 firearms the defendant unlawfully possessed, and Count 8 pertains to conduct distinct from the
7 mere possession of weapons. Accordingly, the People believe time for all counts which are
8 not subject to the limitations of Penal Code section 654 should be imposed consecutive to
9 each other.

10 **CONCLUSION**

11 For the above-stated reasons, the People respectfully urge this Court to sentence the
12 defendant to the maximum indicated term of 7 years and six months in the Department of
13 Corrections and Rehabilitation.

14
15 Dated: December 10, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

16 Dan Dow
17 District Attorney

18 
19

20 By: Ben Blumenthal
21 Deputy District Attorney
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1
2 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

3 Code of Civil Procedure §1031a; CRC Rule 2006(d)

4 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO

5 I am and at all times herein mentioned as a citizen of the United States and a resident of the
6 County of San Luis Obispo over the age of 18 years and not a party to the within entitled action. My
business address is Court House Annex, 4th Floor, San Luis Obispo, California 93408.

7 On December 10, 2025, I served the foregoing document(s) described as:

8 **SENTENCING MEMORANDUM**

(*People v. Charles Vincent Hojaboom* , Case No. 23F-09163-A)

9 on the interested parties in this action by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope and
10 addressed as follows:

SCOTT TAYLOR, ATTORNEY AT LAW


11 [] BY MAIL: I caused such envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid to be placed
12 in the U.S. Mail at San Luis Obispo, California. I am "readily familiar" with the firm's
13 practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it
14 is deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that same day in the ordinary course of
15 business or the next business day if the document is submitted for processing after 3:00
p.m. I am aware that upon motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if the
postal cancellation date of postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit
for mailing affidavit.

16 [] BY PERSONAL SERVICE: [] I delivered such envelope by hand to the office of the addressee(s)
17 noted above during normal business hours. [] I delivered such envelope by hand to the "will-call" box of
18 addressee(s) located outside of Room 385 of the County Government Center, San Luis Obispo, California.

19 [] BY FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION: By use of facsimile telephone number 805.781.4307, I caused
20 such document(s) to be transmitted to the addressee(s) facsimile number noted below. The facsimile
21 machine I used complies with Rule 1003(3) and the transmission was reported as complete without error.
Pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 2005(i), I caused the machine to print a transmission record of
the facsimile transmission, a copy of which is attached to this declaration. **Fax:**

22 [xx] BY EMAIL TRANSMISSION: By use of San Luis Obispo County issued email, I caused such
23 document(s) to be transmitted to the addressee(s) email account noted below. The County issued
computer used complies with Rule 2.251 and the transmission was reported as complete without error.
Email: scott@taylordefensefirm.com

24 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and
25 correct and that this declaration was executed on December 10, 2025, at San Luis Obispo, California.

26 

Amber Weart, Legal Clerk III