

BelmontShore-NaplesPatch

[Sign Up](#) [Log In](#) [Change Towns](#) [Follow this Patch](#)

Editor [Nancy Wride](#): Heard some news you want us to check out? Let me know:
Nancy.Wride@patch.com

[Home](#)[News](#)[Events](#)[Places](#)[Marketplace](#)[Q&A](#)[Volunteer](#)Search [Police & Fire](#)

Ex-LAPD Officer, Belmont Shore Resident Gets Eight Months for Child Porn Possession

John Robert Deegan is sentenced to eight months in prison.

By [Cindy Rhodes](#) [Email the author](#) | April 26, 2011

[Print](#)[7 Comments](#)[Recommend](#)

Be the first of your friends to recommend this.

[Email](#)[Tweet](#)[View full size](#)

A former Los Angeles Police Department officer, whose son is serving time for possessing child pornography, was sentenced today to eight months behind bars for the same crime.

John Robert Deegan, 55, who lives in Belmont Shore, must also serve four months in home detention, pay a \$3,000 fine and spend seven years in supervised release.

Last year, the defendant's 29-year-old son, Jonathon Deegan, was sentenced in Los Angeles federal court to eight years in prison and 30 years of supervised release.

The elder Deegan was given what is considered a lenient sentence, U.S. District Judge Jacqueline H. Nguyen said, because there were a number of factors in play.

Nguyen called attention to the small number of illicit images found on Deegan's computer and that the pictures were "not as egregious" as material found in cases like this one.

However, she added, each time such an image is downloaded, "the child is victimized again."

The judge also brought up Deegan's "lifetime of exceptional service to the community ... in a very tough neighborhood" and the minute likelihood he would commit any future crimes of the same nature.

"This is a difficult sentencing," Nguyen said, noting that Deegan's background as a police officer "makes him vulnerable" to abuse while in prison."

Deegan's son, Jonathon, was sentenced in April to eight years in federal prison and 30 years of supervised release. They reportedly found up to 600 images on Jonathan Deegan's computer of children, some as young as 4 years old, involved in sex acts with adults, according to United States Attorney's Office spokesperson Thom Mrozek.

Last September, a Los Angeles federal grand jury indicted the father and son in court. The elder Deegan was with the Los Angeles Police Department for more than 20 years before he was put on paid leave in March 2009, and relieved of duty one year ago, said Mrozek.

According to court documents, FBI agents first suspected the son of receiving and sending pornographic images and video on the internet. When they served a search warrant on the Deegan home in Belmont Shore last year, they found child pornography on the father's computer as well, Mrozek said. Jonathan Deegan had been charged with receiving, possessing and distributing child pornography, and his father was charged with receipt and possession, the spokesman said.

Investigators were able to identify some of the children in the pictures, none of whom are from Southern California, and the Deegans are not suspected of ever contacting them, according to the U.S. Attorney's Office.

City News Service contributed to this report.

Interested in a follow-up to this article?

Keep me posted!

Recommend

Be the first of your friends to recommend this.

Email

Tweet

[Follow this article](#)

[Submit a tip](#)

[Add photos & video](#)

[7 Comments](#)

COMMENTS (7)



John B. Greet

9:13am on Wednesday, April 27, 2011

Flag as inappropriate

Deegan received what Judge Nguyen considered a "lenient" sentence, in part, because of the "small number of illicit images found on Deegan's computer." Really? Apparently even *one* such image is not sufficiently despicable to merit the harshest sentence allowable under the law.

Deegan received what Judge Nguyen considered a "lenient" sentence, in part, because "the pictures were 'not as egregious' as material found in cases like this one." Really? Apparently the images were sufficiently "egregious" to meet the legal standard for pornographic. Apparently, though, this is not sufficiently despicable to merit the harshest sentence allowable under the law.

As should be the case in spousal and child abuse convictions, there should be zero "leniency" extended in child pornography convictions. Zero.

[Log in to reply](#)

April Economides

9:21am on Wednesday, April 27, 2011

Flag as inappropriate

Ditto what John said.

[Log in to reply](#)



Panglonymous

10:02am on Wednesday, April 27, 2011

Flag as inappropriate

"It's one of the hottest industries in America. Easier to order at home than a pizza, bigger than rock music, it's arguably the most profitable enterprise in cyberspace. AT&T has been in the business. Yahoo! has profited from it. Westin and Marriott have made more money selling it than selling snacks and drinks in their mini-bars. And with estimates as high as \$10 billion a year, it boasts the kind of earnings that most American businesses would envy."

-PBS Frontline (2002)

<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/porn/view/>

[Log in to reply](#)



John B. Greet

10:35am on Wednesday, April 27, 2011

Flag as inappropriate

Adult pornography, Pan, yes. What consenting adults choose to do or view in this area is one thing. Victimized children is quite another. I suggest there should be *zero* tolerance from our courts in this area. When our courts extend leniency, as Judge Nguyen did in this case, they are demonstrating a degree of tolerance that I think is absolutely unacceptable.

One such despicable image is no less egregious than 1000 such images.

No such image is any *less* despicable than any other.

If the person in the image is a child, and if the image is deemed to be pornographic, that should be all the consideration necessary to impose the harshest possible sentence the law allows upon someone who is convicted of such crimes. A sentence for one such image should be sufficiently harsh to truly prove both punitive *and* preventative. Once that sentence is established it should never, EVER, be less. If more such images are found then we simply multiply the sentence for one such image by the number of images in question.

If the person thus convicted dies a miserable death in the darkest, dankest corner of the most horrific prison we can possibly build...