



Eric Gonzalez
District Attorney

DISTRICT ATTORNEY
KINGS COUNTY
350 JAY STREET
BROOKLYN, NY 11201-2908
(718) 250-2000
WWW.BROOKLYNDA.ORG

November 18, 2025

The Honorable Danny Chun
Kings County Supreme Court
Criminal Term, Part 19
320 Jay Street
Brooklyn, NY 11201

Re: People v. Miriam Yarimi, Ind. No. 71759-25
Sentencing Memorandum

Dear Justice Chun,

INTRODUCTION¹

Miriam Yarimi (*hereinafter referred to as* “the Defendant”) was convicted upon a plea of guilty to three counts of Second-Degree Manslaughter before Your Honor in satisfaction of the indictment. The Defendant’s convictions stemmed from her vehicle operation: reckless driving in which caused the death of three people and injured several others on Saturday, March 29, 2025. Although the People recommended the maximum sentence (five-to-fifteen), the Defendant pled, over the People’s objection, to a court offer of an indeterminant sentence of three-to-nine years imprisonment, a disposition taken within the Court’s authority.

The Defendant, a 33-year-old with a suspended license and a desire for social media fame, drove her blue 2023 Audi A3, NY license plate “WIGM8KER” in an impressively reckless and selfish manner. The Defendant sped. She used her cell phone while driving. She blew through multiple red lights. Unsurprisingly, the Defendant, concerned only with her own safety, wore her own seatbelt. Unfortunately, she remained disinterested in who else she put at risk. Her actions affected the lives of so many that day: three separate families, nine separate victims. They never stood a chance against the Defendant’s 68 mile-per-hour, two-ton weapon with a tech package.

As the matter is now pending sentencing before Your Honor on November 19, 2025, please accept this letter as the People’s opportunity to shed light on the dark and tragic facts of that day so that this Court can see who this Defendant really is: a person who puts her interests above everyone else and society at large.

FACTUAL SYNOPSIS: DEFENDANT’S PRE-COLLISION CONDUCT

On March 29, 2025, the Defendant, Miriam Yarimi, recklessly drove on Ocean Parkway and Quentin Road in Brooklyn. She zig-zagged down Coney Island Avenue before turning westbound onto Avenue P for

¹ Not every fact and detail learned during this investigation is included as this is an overview designed to provide background and context.

several blocks, stopping only at the intersection of East 7th Street. The light was a steady red and a car was passing southbound. The Defendant careened that steady red light and accelerated past two school busses parked in front of a Yeshiva. As the Defendant continued down Avenue P, her car came to a stop around the middle of the block. She was held at the position of fourth in line behind another red light at the intersection of Ocean Parkway. The Defendant was using her cell phone. Specifically, the mobile device was in her physical hand, the screen was on, and she was using the video feature. For over a minute, she sat at the red light on her phone. To be clear, her cell phone usage was visible through not only her tinted panoramic sunroof, fully ajar, but her front passenger door window as well.

For over a minute, she could be observed using, holding, and *videoing* with her phone while driving. For over a minute, she *chose* to look at the screen rather than to look at the pedestrians ahead. The phone use continued, and so did her callous driving. The light ahead of her turned green and her race against herself began. The Defendant then turned onto Ocean Parkway and in doing so, overtook the car in front of her. Her impetuous driving was tracked via video for several blocks.

The Defendant then accelerated. With her foot on the gas and the engine revving, she sped northbound up Ocean Parkway towards Kings Highway. She continued through the intersection, despite the steady red light. Her vehicle slowed up a bit as she maneuvered her way through the intersecting traffic (both vehicular and pedestrian), but she was not to be stopped. The speed limits and red lights continued to be ignored. She continued north on Ocean Parkway toward the intersection of Quentin Road, propelling through that red light as well. Her vehicle slowed down ever so gradually just to make her way through the oncoming, and intersecting, traffic. Narrowly avoiding collision, she continued on and through. Her reaction to that almost-collision was not to slow down, but instead to accelerate. She had now depressed the gas pedal to the maximum.² She floored it. This was all just the lead-up, and it was all on video.

FACTUAL SYNOPSIS: DEFENDANT'S COLLISION CAUSING CONDUCT

The Defendant put the car into full throttle. She floored it. There was zero brake applied. There was minimal tilt in the steering column. The Defendant initially collided into an Uber carrying a young mother (36-years-old) and her four young children (ages twelve, four, and three). The Uber, a Toyota Camry, had the green light. The Toyota was turning onto Ocean Parkway. It had both forward and rear facing dashcams. The Defendant had blown the red. This too, was captured on video.

The collision and carnage that followed did not stop there. As the Defendant's velocity and torque remained high, the defendant's car smashed into the Uber, ricocheted, tumbled, and went airborne. As the Defendant's car was careening across Ocean Parkway, the Saada family was crossing the street. They were coming from synagogue on Shabbat. They had the walk sign. They were in the crosswalk. They were holding hands. They did everything right that day except having the catastrophic misfortune of being in the way of Miriam Yarimi. The Defendant and her car then collided into them. Their bodies were catapulted into the air. The two daughters, ages eight and three, were killed instantly. The son, age four, barely breathing, clung to life. The mother, age 34, was pinned under the Defendant's vehicle. They never made it to the sidewalk.

Ultimately, the Defendant's vehicle came to a final rest, not because the Defendant applied any brakes, as she did not press them, but only because of the collision. Her Audi landed upside down. This, too, was captured on video, and from multiple angles. Numerous first responders, other pedestrians, and good Samaritans hurried to the scene. Police, firefighters, paramedics, members of the Hatzalah volunteer ambulance service, and others did their best to help save lives. They performed CPR and rendered first aid to everyone out in the street.

² The mechanical details of the Defendant's engine and pedals were also learned from the events captured in the vehicle's Electronic Data Recorder.

Within moments, the Defendant's Audi was surrounded by members of the New York Fire Department. While the Defendant was screaming for the CIA, numerous firefighters and first responders hurried to the Defendant. They used the "jaws of life" device to gain access into the car and cut the seatbelt so the Defendant could exit. They were met with resistance. The Defendant proceeded to curse out and insult the very same firefighters that were helping her. The Defendant exited the car through the passenger side, stood to her feet and with barely a scratch, under her own power, walked to an ambulance.

The Defendant was taken by ambulance to a local hospital where she continued to curse and scream. She displayed combative behavior and physically resisted the ambulance crew. She remained aggressive and even tried to exit the stretcher as she denied any relevant medical history or being on any current medications. Her belligerence continued at the hospital, where she continued to curse and scream, claiming the devil was in her eyes and that the police were out to get her. She stated, in sum and substance, among other things, that she did not hurt anyone, and then demanded proof. She insisted on getting her phone from her car, that the evidence was in my phone³, and that she needed her eyes scanned. She demanded to be uncuffed and that she needed 'whatever was in her body out.' She was interviewed by a detective, stated her address was 2112 Avenue P, Brooklyn, and in yet another effort to hide evidence, refused to submit to a chemical breath test. The Defendant was then arrested and processed.

THE OVERWHELMING EVIDENCE

The evidence in this case was overwhelming. The Defendant was tracked – from start to finish – on video. In many cases, from multiple angles and multiple recordings.

Multiple search warrants were obtained in this case. They provided for, among other things, a search of the Defendant's vehicle, which yielded the Defendant's physical driver's license, vape pens, her phone, and even enabled for the airbags to be forensically tested. The warrants also revealed the data from the vehicle's Electronic Data Report (EDR), showing the Defendant traveling at a speed of 68 miles per hour at the point of final collision (25 mph speed limit). There was full throttle applied and no brakes deployed with minimal tilt on the steering wheel. Another warrant provided crucial digital evidence on the Defendant's phone, including a photo taken just the day prior of her collection of tickets, moving and parking violations.

Another search warrant was obtained for the Defendant's blood, which was preserved following her stint at the hospital, and search warrants for digital evidence, including her social media accounts, which yielded evidence from various apps ranging from Facebook and Instagram, WhatsApp, Snapchat, as well as her iCloud and others. She even made a point of posting screenshots when she finally paid the tickets that the Defense publicly questioned to the media.

This case involved more than just digital and forensic evidence. There were also various bank and other business and financial records proving the Defendant's guilt. The Defendant's license had been suspended by the Department of Motor Vehicles, for a lapse in her insurance. Notices were mailed to her home at 511 Avenue M. At the hospital, the Defendant conveniently listed her address as 2112 Avenue P, although that simply was just part of an attempt to avoid liability. At the time of the collision, the Defendant's legally registered address was 511 Avenue M. However, the Defendant was privileged. She enjoyed many residences. The Defendant, having achieved success in avoiding fiscal responsibility by hiding behind her many homes, attempted to avoid criminal responsibility after killing three people by giving a different one.

The Defendant's privilege would remain with her throughout the entire case. While the Defendant drove recklessly with her 2023 Audi A3, she had another car order in the works. Approximately two weeks prior to the collision, she had purchased a custom Porsche 718 Boxter S with a price tag of approximately

³ The Defendant reiterated that that the evidence was in her phone again in a Department of Corrections recorded call on April 28, 2025.

\$150,000. That was not luxurious enough for her. Just three days prior to the collision, on March 26, 2025, she had changed her order, upgrading to a \$181,000 Porsche 911 Carrera Cabriolet. In support of her purchases, she provided her physical driver's license and provided her registered address, and that same physical license card was recovered from inside of her upside-down Audi.⁴

The evidence stemming from her financial records does not end there. The Defendant was not unfamiliar with moving, parking, and vehicle operation violations. It was clear that, regardless of which of her many homes she was using on any particular day, it was clear that she was getting her mail. Proof of receipt was found in her vehicle (depicted above) and she also proudly announced her payment of those tickets on social media. It should not go unnoticed that she had stopped paying her Audi bills, and had to re-acquire the car after repossession action commenced. The same would hold true with her insurance lapse.

Throughout all of this, one thing became clear: when she wanted the benefit of good credit, she used her official address; when she needed to distance herself from liability, she reported living elsewhere.⁵

DEFENDANT'S HISTORY

As the Court has considered the Defense's October 6, 2025, Pre-Pleading Memorandum, there are several things which require clarification or expansion, correction, or in some cases, should be characterized as either self-serving and/or unverifiable.

Eviction as a Public Nuisance from her Second Home

This was the Defendant's first arrest, but it was not the first time that she was at odds with society's norms of consideration and neighborliness. Notably, she was being evicted for her rampageous conduct inside 2112 Avenue P. Although the Defense has portrayed the Defendant as an upstanding member of her community, it is clear that she can not even co-exist amongst her literal neighbors.

Disrespect for Other's Religions

Although the Defense has noted her time in custody has been 'tough for her,' records have actually shown that she has been involved in several fights. Notably, on May 15, 2025, she got into one after *she* interrupted Bible studies for another group and was uncooperative with several other investigations.

Deflection of Civil Blame and Potentially Unlawful Financial Action

In recorded phones call between October 22, 2025, and October 26, 2025, the Defendant references her civil suit and her finances,⁶ and her intent to move her money to South America.⁷ The Defendant has even attempted to deflect her civil liabilities by countersuing the Uber that *she* struck.⁸

LACK OF REMORSE

From the time of initial collision, through even the initial discovery phase, the Defendant has showed no remorse. Even worse, she has at times, blamed the victims. She has now appeared before Your Honor in

⁴ The Defendant's license and privilege to drive was additionally suspended during the pendency of this case.

⁵ Court records also show that eviction proceedings against the Defendant had commenced prior to this collision from 2112 Avenue P, for her egregious conduct. *See, generally, P and 21 LLC v. Miriam Yarimi, et al*, L & T Index no. 313654-24/KI.

⁶ It should not go unnoticed that has also empowered another attorney, Michael Laufer, as her Power of Attorney since the onset of the instant criminal case. The Defendant has also associated with Ying Stafford, who has been suspended from the practice of law in New York in connection with falsifying records. *See, generally, Matter of Stafford*, 238 AD3d 106 (1st Dept, 2025).

⁷ The Defendant should be cautioned against committing any financial crimes.

⁸ *See, generally, Saada v. Yarimi*, Kings Cnty Civil Court Index No. 512108/2025.

search of sympathy and compassion. The Defendant has displayed virtually no sympathy or compassion for anyone around her while at the same time, maintained an expectation she should not be held accountable.

Since arrest, the Defendant has been incarcerated. While at the Department of Correction, the Defendant has made hundreds of phone calls. Most have been to her ex-husband (with whom they have a child-in-common) or her mother. On innumerable occasions, the Defendant has discussed the facts of this case. She has seen the videos. She has heard the stories. It is apparent that she knows the gravity of her offenses yet still approached this case with entitlement. The relevant excerpts are below.

'Why Should I Apologize'

On April 30, 2025, the Defendant was talking to her ex-husband about how to move forward in response to killing a family and injuries several children of another. Her ex-husband recommended apologizing. The Defendant's response was sharp and clear: "Why should I apologize, I'm just as much of a victim as they are."

'Contact People to Get Me Out of Trouble'

On April 30, 2025, the Defendant stated to her ex-husband "...you always know how to contact people to get out of trouble, why can't you contact the Judge to get me out?" Her sense of entitlement continued into the next day on May 1, 2025, when she asked, "Why isn't the Jewish community helping me?"

'I Could Put on a Show and Say I'm Schizophrenic'

On April 22, 2025, the Defendant was complaining about her incarceration to her ex-husband, including that she was being framed. She continued to discuss and stated that "I am playing the games... I could also pretend, you know... I could also, you know, put on a show... like, why don't I just pretend I'm schizophrenic?"

CONCLUSION

The Defendant should be held accountable for her actions. She should not have been driving that day. She should not have been racing around the streets of Brooklyn. The Defendant is not above the law. She is not above society. To the extent that she has now pled guilty (along with a waiver of appeal), she should be sentenced, as promised, to three counts of Second-Degree Manslaughter.

Very truly yours,
ERIC GONZALEZ
District Attorney

By: *Michael Boykin*
Michael Boykin
Assistant District Attorney

Cc: Joseph Amsel, Esq.
118-21 Queens Blvd, Ste. 606
Forest Hills, NY 11375

Cc: Steven Legon, Esq.
20 Vesey Street, Ste. 400
New York, NY 10007

AFFIRMATION OF SERVICE

I, Michael Boykin, an attorney admitted to practice in the courts of the State of New York, and an assistant district attorney in and for the County of Kings, affirm, under the penalties of perjury, that on the 18th day of November 2025, I served this document by

serving a true copy of this document through electronic means via electronic mail, pursuant to the consent of the parties to accept service through electronic means, by emailing Joseph Amsel and Steven Legon, Attorneys for Miriam Yarimi, at the following email address jzamsellaw@amsellaw.com; steven.legon@gmail.com; and slegon@aol.com.

enclosing a true copy in a postpaid envelope addressed to: _____ and by causing it to be deposited in an official depository of the United States Postal Service within the State of New York.

serving a true copy of this document on _____, Attorney for _____ located at _____ by causing a true copy to be handed to the attorney in court or his/her representative from the office that was authorized to accept service.

Dated: Brooklyn, New York
November 18, 2025

Michael Boykin

Assistant District Attorney