

Ariana Costa

From: Dan Garcia <dangarcia37@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 8, 2026 7:54 PM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: Support House Bill 2026-H--8055

You don't often get email from dangarcia37@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

My name is Daniel Garica. I am Alyssa Garcia's brother.

On March 5, 2017, my sister was stabbed more than 27 times by a man who admitted he intended to kill the first person he saw that day. He purchased a knife, walked into her workplace — a neighborhood store two houses from our home — and carried out a sustained, deliberate attack.

She survived because of rapid emergency response and extraordinary medical care. But survival does not erase intent.

What many people do not realize is that under current Rhode Island law — R.I. Gen. Laws §11-5-1 — a person convicted of assault with intent to commit murder can face a minimum sentence as low as one year. One year for proven intent to take a life.

As her brother, I struggle to reconcile that gap. When someone acts with clear, demonstrated lethal intent — and that intent is proven beyond a reasonable doubt — the law should reflect the gravity of that act. The only reason this is not a homicide charge is because my sister survived. The intent was the same.

For the last eight years, my family has lived with the aftermath. We have attended hearings. We have prepared impact statements. We have waited for notifications. Each legal proceeding forces Alyssa to revisit the worst day of her life. Each one affects our entire family.

This is the gap.

It is not just about the initial sentence. It is about the continued retraumatization survivors experience when sentencing structures allow repeated legal re-engagement in cases of proven lethal intent.

What makes this even more important to me is this:

The amendment my sister is advocating for does not directly benefit her case.

She is not doing this for personal gain. She is not doing this to change her own outcome. She is voluntarily putting herself back into public conversations about her trauma to protect people she may never meet.

She is advocating for future victims.

She believes — and I agree — that when intent to kill is proven, the law should provide proportional accountability and greater sentencing certainty so survivors are not forced to relive their trauma repeatedly through ongoing legal processes.

That is honorable.

It takes strength to survive what she survived. It takes even greater strength to step forward publicly and say, “Let’s fix this so someone else doesn’t have to experience what I did.”

This amendment does not create a new crime.

It does not lower the burden of proof.

It does not eliminate rehabilitation.

It applies only after conviction, when intent to kill has already been established beyond a reasonable doubt.

It is a narrowly tailored correction to a statutory gap.

As her brother, I almost lost my sister. I watched my family gather in a hospital not knowing if she would live. I have seen the long-term impact of trauma — not just on her, but on all of us.

Rhode Island has the opportunity to align its law with a fundamental principle: intent matters.

I respectfully urge you to support this amendment — not only for my sister, but for future survivors and families who should not have to fight both violence and a legal framework that fails to fully reflect it.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Daniel Garica