

LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT
DECLARATION OF ARREST REPORT

TCR1370108

☐ County Jail

☐ City Jail

☐ Adult

☐ Juvenile

Bureau: CI

ID# 8811333		EVENT # LLV250300020826		ARRESTEE'S NAME (LAST) GOODWIN		(FIRST) VICTORIA		(MIDDLE)		SSN# PII
RACE W	SEX F	DOB PII 1992	HGT 5'04"	WGT 118	HAIR BLN	EYES HAZ	POB UNKNOWN, CALIFORNIA			
ARRESTEE'S ADDRESS STREET PRVCY			BLDG/APT #		CITY		STATE		ZIP CODE	
OCCURRED DATE: 3/6/2025 TIME: 19:22		ARREST DATE: 3/6/2025 TIME: 21:30		LOCATION OF ARREST (NUMBER, STREET, CITY, STATE, ZIP CODE) PRVCY						
LOCATION OF CRIME (NUMBER, STREET, CITY, STATE, ZIP CODE) PRVCY										
CHARGES / OFFENSES CHI										
CONNECTING REPORTS (TYPE OR EVENT NUMBER) TCR/DOAR										

The undersigned makes the following declarations subject to the penalty of perjury and says: That I am a peace officer with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, Clark County, Nevada, being so employed for a period of approximately 17 year(s).

That I learned the following facts and circumstances which lead me to believe that the above named subject committed or was committing the offenses above at the location of PRVCY and that the offense(s) occurred at approximately 19:22 hours on the 6th day of March, 2025.

Details for Probable Cause:

On March 6, 2025, I, Detective LEP received a phone call from LEP who is a Detective and Criminal Investigator for the Office of Inspector General of the Florida Department of Corrections. Detective LEP explained he was calling in reference to CHI which involved an inmate in a prison in Florida, but he believed the victim and an additional suspect lived in Las Vegas.

Detective LEP further explained on October 3, 2024, Correction Officers at the Okeechobee Correctional Institution seized a CHI, OJ Motorola cellular phone (phone number LEP) from inmate Grant Amato (Inmate Number I-60540). CHI, OJ The cell phone was received by the Florida Department of Corrections cell phone lab on December 19, 2024, which is common, CHI, OJ is only collected from the correctional facilities when needed by the facility. The phone's content was downloaded, and Viapath Fusion Services Investigator LEP conducted a search of the content. Notably, Investigator LEP located text messages and Facebook messages between Amato and a female, who was later identified by your Affiant as Victoria Goodwin (nee Cadenas) which seemed to be CHI. Specifically, he wrote the following as part of his report which was provided to your Affiant on March 6, 2025:

10/2/2024 5:00:25 PM (Read Message In Its Entirety)

Analyst tagged a conversation between a female who goes by Victoria Candie and Inmate Amato. Inmate Amato and Mrs. Candie discuss how much they are in love and how her husband "FH" would not accept divorce, Mrs. Candie at one point states "I'm so anxious LOL, " "I just can't believe it's happening. Like what. The. Fuck., " "Like. How did I get to this point, " "Am I a bad person?, " "Because I chose to CHI Not divorce." Mrs. Candie informs Inmate Amato that her husband will be staying at the Best Western Plus

2565 Commerce Pkwy Barstow, CA 92311 and is with his "smoking buddy." She proceeds to send Inmate Amato a picture of the two of them along with a picture of a black Dodge Mini van being driven by her husband. During this time Inmate Amato has been in contact with an individual named LEP who will be taking care of the situation. Inmate Amato and Mrs. Candie also have \$11,515 set aside for LEP when the job is finished.

Wherefore, Declarant prays that a finding be made by a magistrate that probable cause exists to hold said person for preliminary hearing (if charges are a felony or gross misdemeanor) or for trial (if charges are misdemeanor).

Arresting Officer: LEP

CONTINUATION REPORT

SCOPE ID: 8811333 EVENT #: LLV250300020826

Page 2 of 3

10/3/2024 12:57:48 AM (Read Message In Its Entirety)

Analyst tagged a conversation between Inmate Amato and an individual called [REDACTED] "Inmate Amato tells [REDACTED] This is [REDACTED] Block that main number I had been texting you from. The [REDACTED] one. Using this one from now on and the [REDACTED] number. Okay? Block that other number though." Inmate Amato also informs [REDACTED] that he will distract the husband of Mrs. Candie with a phone call. He then informs [REDACTED] "He's asleep right now in the hotel room." [REDACTED] brother. I need to know what is going on. Can I get an update. Was it done?"

On March 4, 2025, is when the Office of Inspector General was notified of the plot. Detective [REDACTED] stated the phone was seized under OIG Event Number 24-21494 and the case was being investigated under OIG Event Number 25-05069. Through his investigation, he discovered Amato was texting with the phone number [REDACTED] and the Facebook names usernames were [REDACTED] and "Victoria Candie". Per Accurant, a law enforcement database that compiles open-source information, it lists phone number, [REDACTED] as Victoria Cadenas as the primary user dating from May 2019 to January 2025. It should be noted that Cadenas is the maiden name of Victoria Goodwin, per Accurant and Oregon DMV.

In the messages, Victoria asked, "Am I a bad person?" In which Amato told her she gave him his chances and told her she was not a bad person. He then asked why she thought she may be a bad person, and she replied, "Because I chose to [REDACTED] CHI [REDACTED] Not divorce."

Investigators identified her husband as Aaron Goodwin, date of birth [REDACTED] PII 1976. A records check showed Aaron and Victoria live at [REDACTED] PRVCY [REDACTED] Your Affiant searched LVMPD Calls for Service and learned an Assist Citizen call occurred on February 27, 2025, in which a [REDACTED] PRVCY [REDACTED] called stating she was friends with Victoria and has not heard from her in a few days. Officer Anthony Di Nofa P# 7496 responded and spoke with Aaron and Victoria. Both claimed they did not know [REDACTED] PRVCY [REDACTED] and Aaron believed a fan of his television show called the police. The call was closed without further incident. This call for service, which occurred seven days before this search warrant was authored causes your Affiant to believe Aaron and Victoria still reside in the residence.

Due to the size of the forensic download of Amato's phone, Detective [REDACTED] LEP [REDACTED] could not provide the complete download; however, he provided the Facebook and text messages. Additionally, Investigator [REDACTED] LEP [REDACTED] found messages between Amato and Victoria discussing payments to PayPal and possible payments through Zelle and CashApp. Amato asked Victoria for a \$2,500 PayPal payment to an account and then another payment after receiving confirmation. It should be noted that your Affiant has worked [REDACTED] CHI [REDACTED] cases previously, and half payment before and half [REDACTED] CHI [REDACTED] s typical. In further messages, it appears Victoria is providing Aaron's location, mentioning he was at the hotel, per his "Find My", which is a location sharing application. She also provided times he would be filming, when going to the hotel, and when smoking. Investigative Specialist Juanita Campos P# 8486 located social media posts from the Instagram account @AaronGoodwin on October 2, 2024. The photograph depicted in the post was readily identifiable within the Calico Ghost Town, located in California. This is near Barstow, California, this corroborates the locations Investigator [REDACTED] LEP [REDACTED] identified in his report to where Aaron was staying.

It should be noted the messages end on October 3, 2024, which is the same day Corrections Officers located the [REDACTED] CHI, OJ [REDACTED] cellphone of Amato. Furthermore, in the text messages, Victoria asked should she clear the messenger, which Amato told her to do it multiple ways. He also planned to start a new account to message her from.

On March 6, 2025, Detective [REDACTED] LEP [REDACTED] submitted an Administrative Subpoena for [REDACTED] PRVCY [REDACTED] Verizon Wireless responded with subscriber information which documented the phone number was associated with account number [REDACTED] PRVCY [REDACTED] The account owner was [REDACTED] PRVCY [REDACTED] and the contact for this number was Victoria Cadenas.

On March 6, 2025, a Search Warrant was served at the Goodwin residence at [REDACTED] PRVCY [REDACTED] PRVCY [REDACTED] During the service of the Search Warrant, Victoria exited the residence and conducted an interview with Detective [REDACTED] LEP [REDACTED] and Detective [REDACTED] LEP [REDACTED] The following is a summary of the interview. A full transcription of the interview will be available at a later date. Detective [REDACTED] LEP [REDACTED] read Victoria her Miranda Rights from the LVMPD Custodial Interrogation Card and she understood her rights. Victoria went on to explain she had become aware of Grant Amato through a true crime documentary and began writing to him. She described their relationship as pen pals which began in May of 2024 and ended in November of 2024. She stated most of their conversations were via text message and confirmed her phone number was [REDACTED] PRVCY [REDACTED]

Wherefore, Declarant prays that a finding be made by a magistrate that probable cause exists to hold said person for preliminary hearing (if charges are a felony or gross misdemeanor) or for trial (if charges are misdemeanor).

Arresting Officer: [REDACTED] LEP [REDACTED]

CONTINUATION REPORT

SCOPE ID: 8811333

EVENT #: LLV250300020826

Page 3 of 3

Victoria explained at the time of the text messages with Amato, she and Aaron were going through problems in their marriage. She further described being lonely and began connecting with Amato. Victoria was asked about her Facebook username, but she initially denied using Facebook. She was shown a text message from her asking if she should delete things from her messenger and she claimed she may have been talking about other social media applications. Victoria was asked if she used the name Victoria Candie and she stated she did previously but has not used the name in years. Victoria was alerted to messages sent from that account containing information she would know and admitted to remembering some of those messages. When asked about the messages which were about sending Amato money, she claimed she believed the money was for cell phones.

Victoria was eventually confronted about the texts [REDACTED] CHI [REDACTED] She denied wanting her [REDACTED] CHI [REDACTED] She described herself of sometimes daydreaming of being in a different situation, but she no longer felt that way. She also stated she did not remember sending those particular messages. Victoria expressed her feelings of wanting to be without Aaron and with Amato to Amato which she described as fantasy or daydreams.

Due to the messages provided from Detective LEP [REDACTED] provided messages which clearly [REDACTED] CHI [REDACTED]

CHI

She was booked into CCDC accordingly.

***** End *****

Wherefore, Declarant prays that a finding be made by a magistrate that probable cause exists to hold said person for preliminary hearing (if charges are a felony or gross misdemeanor) or for trial (if charges are misdemeanor).

Arresting Officer: [REDACTED] LEP

PII

Personal Identifying Information

The record(s) you seek contain personal identifying information.

NRS 239.001 provides that public records are open to inspection. However, NRS 239.010(1) expressly creates exemptions to the disclosure of records falling under various statutes, including NRS 239B.030. NRS 239B.030 makes “personal information” confidential. NRS 603A.040 defines “personal information” to include social security numbers, driver’s license numbers, account numbers, and the like.

Here, because the record(s) you seek contain confidential personal identifying information, they have been redacted.

PRVY

Privacy Interests

The record(s) you seek contain information the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of a person's privacy interests.

In *Reno Newspapers v. Sheriff*, 126 Nev. 211, 218, 234 P.3d 922, 927 (2010), the Nevada Supreme Court recognized that an individual's privacy must be balanced with the public's general right to open government, "especially because private and personal information may be recorded in government files"). Later, in *Clark County Sch. Dist. v. Las Vegas Review-Journal*, — Nev. —, 429 P.3d 313, 319-20 (2018), the Court adopted a balancing test in which the burden shifts to the requester of a record if the public agency demonstrates a "nontrivial personal privacy interest" including "intrusion[s] into a person's reasonable expectation of privacy, seclusion, or solitude." Privacy interests include information that may cause "embarrassment, shame, stigma, [or] harassment" or "endangerment, or similar harm." *Las Vegas Metro. Police Dep't v. Las Vegas Review-Journal*, 136 Nev. Ad. Op. 86, — P.3d — (2020). Medical information, personnel files, details about sexual orientation, and other information about a person's life give rise to privacy interests. *Clark County Office of the Coroner/Medical Examiner v. Las Vegas Review-Journal*, 136 Nev. Adv. Op. 5, — P.3d — (2020).

The Nevada Supreme Court equates the type of information that should be withheld under the Nevada Public Records Act with the common law tort of invasion of privacy. *Clark County Sch. Dist.*, *supra*, at 708, 549 P.3d at 320. "The tort of invasion of privacy embraces four different tort actions: '(a) unreasonable intrusion upon the seclusion of another; or (b) appropriation of the other's name or likeness; or (c) unreasonable publicity given to the other's

private life; or (d) publicity that unreasonably places the other in a false light before the public.” *Franchise Tax Bd. of Cal. v. Hyatt*, 133 Nev. 826, 842, 407 P.3d 717, 733 (2017), *overturned on other grounds by Franchise Tax Bd. v. Hyatt*, 139 S. Ct. 1485 (2019) *quoting* RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF TORTS § 652A (1977); *see also PETA v. Bobby Berolini, Ltd.*, 111 Nev. 615, 629, 895 P.2d 1269, 1278 (1995), *overruled on other grounds by City of Las Vegas Downtown Redev. Agency v. Hecht*, 113 Nev. 644, 650, 940 P.2d 134, 138 (1997).

Here, the record(s) you seek contain information the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of a person’s privacy interests. Therefore, they are confidential and must be withheld or redacted.

CHI

Records of Criminal History

The record(s) you seek contain criminal history information.

NRS 239.001 provides that public records are open to inspection. However, NRS 239.010(1) expressly creates exemptions to the disclosure of records falling under various statutes, including NRS 179A.070. Pursuant to NRS 179A.070, a “record of criminal history” is “information contained in records collected and maintained by agencies of criminal justice, the subject of which is a natural person, consisting of descriptions which identify the subject and notations of summons in a criminal action, warrants, arrests, citations for misdemeanors..., detentions, decisions of a district attorney or the Attorney General not to prosecute the subject, indictments, informations or other formal criminal charges and dispositions of charges....” NRS 179A.070(1).

Here, the record(s) you seek contain criminal history information. Therefore, they are confidential and must be withheld.

LEP

Law Enforcement Privilege

The record(s) you seek are law enforcement records that contain sensitive information.

A law enforcement agency may withhold records under the Nevada Public Records Act when its interest in nondisclosure clearly outweighs the public's presumed right to access. *Reno Newspapers, Inc. v. Gibbons*, 127 Nev. 873, 880, 266 P.3d 623, 628 (2011). There is a presumption that records are not confidential, that exceptions must be narrowly construed, that redactions are preferred over withholding, and that the purpose of the Nevada Public Records Act is to facilitate government transparency. However, Nevada law and public policy recognize the importance of maintaining the integrity of certain information possessed by law enforcement agencies. See, for example:

- NRS 179A.070 – 179A.100 (strictly regulating the dissemination of records of criminal history; in particular, there is no requirement to disseminate records of criminal history to the general public; moreover, records of criminal history are not public records pursuant to NRS 239.010(1) (listing statutes that are exempted from the Nevada Public Records Act, including NRS 179A.070).
- *Donrey v. Bradshaw*, 106 Nev. 630, 636, 798 P.2d 144, 148 (1990) (in a public records case, recognizing that law enforcement files could be confidential when pertaining to a “pending or anticipated criminal proceeding” or if there is a danger of “denying someone a fair trial” and concluding that records could be made public because there was “no pending or anticipated criminal proceeding; there [were] no confidential sources or investigative techniques to protect; there was no possibility of denying someone a fair trial; and there was no potential jeopardy to law enforcement personnel.” *Id.* at 636, 798 P.2d at 148.
- *Reno Newspapers v. Gibbons*, 127 Nev. 873, 878, 266 P.3d 623, 627 (2011). (recognizing that the balancing test first announced in *Donrey* had been modified by legislative changes to the Nevada Public Records Act, but nonetheless noting that the result in *Donrey* was “based on the facts that no criminal proceeding was pending or anticipated, no confidential sources or investigative techniques were contained in the report, there was no possibility of denying anyone a fair trial, and disclosure did not jeopardize law enforcement personnel”).
- NRS 49.335 – 49.355 (making the identity of informants who provide information to law enforcement confidential until they testify).
- *Las Vegas Metro. Police Dep't v. Anderson (In re 12067 Oakland Hills, Las Vegas)*, 134 Nev. 799, 806, 435 P.3d 672, 678 (Nev. Ct. App. 2018) (noting that, generally, the

police do not need to return evidence seized from its owner if the “property [is] related to an ongoing criminal investigation”).

- Att. Gen. Op. 83-3 (recognizing the “legitimate public policy interests in maintaining confidentiality of criminal investigation records and criminal reports”). AGO 83-3 further provides: “The legitimate public policy interests in maintaining confidentiality of criminal investigation records and criminal reports includes the protection of the elements of an investigation of a crime from premature disclosures, the avoidance of prejudice to the later trial of the defendant from harmful pretrial publicity, the protection of the privacy of persons who are arrested from the stigma of being singled out as a criminal suspect, and the protection of the identity of informants.”
- NEV. CONST., art. I, § 8A (Marsy’s Law, constitutionalizing victims’ rights to privacy, safety, and a diligent pursuit of justice).
- NRS 174.235 (making the disclosure of police files and evidence collected subject to strict discovery rules in open criminal prosecutions); see also *Tennessean v. Metro. Gov’t of Nashville & Davidson Cty.*, 485 S.W.3d 857 (Tenn. 2016) (interpreting criminal rule of procedure similar to NRS 174.235 and holding that discovery of materials gathered by state for use in criminal prosecution may be obtained by defendant pursuant to rules of discovery, not by newspaper through a public records request); *Wilson v. Layne*, 526 U.S. 603, 119 S. Ct. 1692 (1999) (holding that when balancing a person’s Fourth Amendment right to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, probable cause may justify a police entry and seizure but it does not justify the media’s entry and/or seizure).
- NRS 179.045(4) (making search warrant applications, which regularly contain detailed facts gathered in open criminal investigations, confidential upon a showing of good cause).
- *In re Search Warrants Regarding Seizure of Documents*, 2023 WL 2861201 (Nev. Ct. App. 2023) (unpublished) (holding that good cause existed to keep search warrant application under seal because dissemination would threaten the integrity of an active and ongoing criminal investigation).
- NRS 172.245. Evidence and information obtained by grand juries during their investigations are confidential. The purposes of confidentiality include: (1) To prevent the escape of those whose indictment may be contemplated. (2) To insure the utmost freedom to the grand jury in its deliberations and to prevent persons subject to indictment, or their friends, from importuning the grand jurors. (3) To prevent subornation of perjury or tampering with the witnesses who may testify before the grand jury and later appear at the trial of those indicted by it. (4) To encourage free and untrammelled disclosures by persons who have information with respect to the commission of crimes. (5) To protect an innocent accused, who is exonerated, from disclosure of the fact that he has been under investigation. *Shelby v. Sixth Judicial Dist. Court*, 82 Nev. 204, 210, 414 P.2d 942, 945 (1966).
- *Houston v. County of Maricopa*, — F.4th —, 2024 U.S. App. LEXIS 22564, 2024 WL 4048897 (9th Cir. Sep. 5, 2024) (holding that dissemination of a pretrial detainees’ booking photo to the public is generally unconstitutional under the substantive due process clause of the 14th Amendment because it constitutes punishment without due process).

Given the totality of the law governing the disclosure of information in the possession of law enforcement, the following non-exclusive factors are considered in evaluating whether law enforcement interests in confidentiality clearly outweigh the public's presumed interest in access:

- Whether premature disclosure of information about the open investigation may allow individuals to ascertain that they are or were the subject of the investigation, as well as the focus of the investigation. This may lead an individual to alter behavior, conceal evidence of wrongdoing, delete or destroy evidence, or attempt to influence witnesses or adjust communication methods or content to avoid further collection of evidence or to avoid apprehension.
- Whether premature disclosure of information may provide bad actors with the ability to falsify or misrepresent information, such as encounters, activities, or associations that pose evidence. This may impact testimony and representations of future witnesses and/or suspects, which would disable or hinder the ability to fully evaluate such evidence and, therefore, obstruct enforcement, implementation, and application of the law.
- Whether protecting the integrity of the investigation better enables detectives and prosecutors to evaluate the credibility of any information that may come in the future. If a future witness were to know what other witnesses have said, or what other evidence has revealed, the future witness' statements will not be as reliable.
- Whether witnesses and informants have provided information that, if disclosed, could create danger or at least embarrassment to them.
- Whether any privacy interests and/or constitutional rights of any victims, witnesses, or subjects would be impacted by disclosure.
- Whether premature disclosure would have a chilling effect on future witnesses coming forward to provide information in this or other cases.
- Whether law enforcement officers have acted in an undercover capacity, or whether any witnesses have provided information as confidential informants.
- Whether premature disclosure poses a risk to any future prosecution. Criminal defendants have significant constitutional rights, like the right to receive exculpatory and impeachment material and the right to a fair trial. A criminal defendant should generally obtain information against them before the public or any third party.
- Whether disclosure would reveal confidential techniques or tactics that would risk enabling subjects to circumvent the law in the future.

In this case, after a careful examination of all factors, there are law enforcement interests in nondisclosure that clearly outweigh the public's presumed interest in access. Therefore, the records and/or the information in the records you seek are confidential, at least at this time, and must be redacted.

OJ

Other Jurisdiction's Record

LVMPD is not the custodian of record for the records you seek.

NRS 239.001 provides that public records are open to inspection. However, NRS 239.010(1) expressly creates exemptions to the disclosure of records falling under various statutes, including NRS 179A.070, which defines "records of criminal history." Pursuant to NRS 179A.070(2)(j), "[r]ecords which originated in an agency other than an agency of criminal justice in this State" are excluded from the definition and thus confidential.

The record you seek is not within LVMPD's custody and control. Rather, the record is within the custody and control of a different governmental entity. In particular, and pursuant to NRS 239.0107(1)(b), please contact the State of Florida.