

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION WITHOUT THE  
APPROVAL OF THE APPELLATE DIVISION**

This opinion shall not "constitute precedent or be binding upon any court."  
Although it is posted on the internet, this opinion is binding only on the  
parties in the case and its use in other cases is limited. R. 1:36-3.

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY  
APPELLATE DIVISION  
DOCKET NO. A-4356-16T4

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,

Plaintiff-Respondent,

v.

RICKKWAN A. COPPAGE, a/k/a  
RICKWAN COPPAGE,

Defendant-Appellant.

---

Submitted April 10, 2018 – Decided April 18, 2018

Before Judges Fasciale and Moynihan.

On appeal from Superior Court of New Jersey,  
Law Division, Salem County, Indictment No.  
16-11-0540.

Joseph E. Krakora, Public Defender, attorney  
for appellant (Stefan Van Jura, Deputy Public  
Defender, of counsel and on the brief).

Gurbir S. Grewal, Attorney General, attorney  
for respondent (Sarah C. Hunt, Deputy Attorney  
General, of counsel and on the brief).

PER CURIAM

Defendant appeals from his conviction for second-degree  
unlawful possession of a handgun, N.J.S.A. 2C:39-5(b)(1).

A police officer observed a Chevrolet Impala run through a red traffic light. The officer and his partner stopped the vehicle, approached it, and observed defendant – whom the officer recognized from previous encounters – in the front passenger seat. The officer observed defendant looking down at his waist and repeatedly touching his waistband, where the officer noticed a "slight bulge." The officer asked another officer to remove defendant from the vehicle and escort him to the rear of the vehicle, which he did. The officer asked defendant if he had a weapon in his possession, and he denied that he did. The officer informed defendant that he was not arresting defendant, but was going to frisk him for weapons. The officer frisked defendant and found a handgun in his waistband.

On appeal, defendant argues:

THE HANDGUN MUST BE SUPPRESSED BECAUSE THE POLICE HAD ONLY A "HUNCH" THAT DEFENDANT WAS ARMED AND DANGEROUS, NOT THE REASONABLE AND ARTICULABLE SUSPICION REQUIRED TO JUSTIFY THE WARRANTLESS INTRUSION ON DEFENDANT'S PRIVACY.

Defendant essentially maintains that the officer conducted an illegal Terry<sup>1</sup> frisk without a reasonable and articulable suspicion that defendant was armed. As a result, he argues the judge erred by denying his motion to suppress. We conclude that

---

<sup>1</sup> Terry v. Ohio, 392 U.S. 1 (1968).

defendant's argument is without sufficient merit to warrant discussion in a written opinion. R. 2:11-3(e)(2). We affirm for the reasons set forth by Judge Benjamin C. Telsey in his thorough and well-reasoned oral decision.

Affirmed.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the original on file in my office.



CLERK OF THE APPELLATE DIVISION