

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION WITHOUT THE  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-0694-23**

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,

Plaintiff-Respondent,

v.

PHILLIP A. DIXON,

Defendant-Appellant.

---

Submitted December 9, 2024 – Decided January 3, 2025

Before Judges Berdote Byrne and Jacobs.

On appeal from the Superior Court of New Jersey, Law  
Division, Camden County, Indictment No. 85-06-1145.

Phillip A. Dixon, appellant pro se.

Matthew J. Platkin, Attorney General, attorney for  
respondent (Regina M. Oberholzer, Deputy Attorney  
General, of counsel and on the letter brief).

PER CURIAM

Self-represented defendant Phillip Dixon appeals from the denial of his motion to correct an illegal sentence. Finding no merit, once again, to his arguments, we affirm.

Defendant was convicted of murdering a thirteen-year-old girl, aggravated criminal sexual contact, and other offenses in 1985. The initial sentencing court, finding depravity, torture, and aggravated battery were involved, sentenced him to death. In 1991, the Supreme Court vacated the death sentence and remanded the convictions for resentencing. State v. Dixon, 125 N.J. 223 (1991).

Defendant was then sentenced in November 1991 to life in prison, plus five years, subject to a thirty-two-and-one-half year period of parole ineligibility.<sup>1</sup> Defendant did not appeal this second sentence, but filed a petition for post-conviction relief, which was denied in 1997. We affirmed, see State v. Dixon, No. A-7031-96 (App. Div. Feb. 25, 2000), and the Supreme Court denied certification, see State v. Dixon, 165 N.J. 528 (2000).

In 2018, defendant filed a motion for a new trial and to correct an illegal sentence, which was denied. We affirmed the denial of those motions in 2019, see State v. Dixon, A-5246-17 (App. Div. May 22, 2019), where we concluded

---

<sup>1</sup> The record is unclear as to whether defendant has completed his term of incarceration.

defendant's illegal sentence arguments did not warrant sufficient merit for further discussion pursuant to Rule 2:11-3(e)(2). The Supreme Court denied certification. See State v. Dixon, 240 N.J. 88 (2019).

Undeterred, defendant filed this present appeal of the denial of his motion to correct an illegal sentence. We decline to address the alleged illegal sentence substantively, and instead rely upon the cogent opinion of the Honorable Edward J. McBride, and our 2019 opinion denying his first appeal of the denial of a motion to correct an illegal sentence. We find no merit to defendant's arguments and conclude no further discussion is warranted. R. 2:11-3(e)(2).

Affirmed.

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



CLERK OF THE APPELLATE DIVISION