

**SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK**  
***Appellate Division, Fourth Judicial Department***

163

**KA 20-01434**

PRESENT: LINDLEY, J.P., CURRAN, BANNISTER, GREENWOOD, AND NOWAK, JJ.

---

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, RESPONDENT,

V

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

YANCEY J. FRUSTER, DEFENDANT-APPELLANT.

---

JULIE CIANCA, PUBLIC DEFENDER, ROCHESTER (CLEA WEISS OF COUNSEL), FOR DEFENDANT-APPELLANT.

SANDRA DOORLEY, DISTRICT ATTORNEY, ROCHESTER (AMY N. WALENDZIAK OF COUNSEL), FOR RESPONDENT.

---

Appeal from a judgment of the Supreme Court, Monroe County (Thomas E. Moran, J.), rendered September 8, 2020. The judgment convicted defendant upon a guilty plea of attempted criminal possession of a weapon in the second degree.

It is hereby ORDERED that the judgment so appealed from is unanimously affirmed.

Memorandum: On an appeal from a judgment convicting him upon his plea of guilty of attempted criminal possession of a weapon in the second degree (Penal Law §§ 110.00, 265.03 [3]), defendant contends that Penal Law § 265.03 is unconstitutional in light of the United States Supreme Court's decision in *New York State Rifle & Pistol Assn., Inc. v Bruen* (597 US 1 [2022]). Defendant failed to raise a constitutional challenge to the statute during the proceedings in Supreme Court, and therefore any such contention is unpreserved for our review (*see People v Jacque-Crews*, 213 AD3d 1335, 1335-1336 [4th Dept 2023], *lv denied* 39 NY3d 1111 [2023]; *see generally People v Davidson*, 98 NY2d 738, 739-740 [2002]; *People v Reinard*, 134 AD3d 1407, 1409 [4th Dept 2015], *lv denied* 27 NY3d 1074 [2016], *cert denied* 580 US 969 [2016]). Contrary to defendant's further contention, his "challenge to the constitutionality of [his conviction under the] statute must be preserved" (*People v Baumann & Sons Buses, Inc.*, 6 NY3d 404, 408 [2006], *rearg denied* 7 NY3d 742 [2006]; *see People v Cabrera*, - NY3d -, -, 2023 NY Slip Op 05968, \*2-7 [2023]). We decline to exercise our power to review defendant's constitutional challenge as a matter of discretion in the interest of justice (*see CPL 470.15 [3] [c]*).

Although defendant also contends that his waiver of the right to appeal is invalid, we note that resolution of that issue is of no moment inasmuch as his challenge to the constitutionality of Penal Law

§ 265.03 would survive even a valid waiver of the right to appeal (see *People v Benjamin*, 216 AD3d 1457, 1457 [4th Dept 2023]; see generally *People v Lopez*, 6 NY3d 248, 255 [2006]).

Entered: March 22, 2024

Ann Dillon Flynn  
Clerk of the Court