

S260598

ROBERT D. BACON, SB #73297
484 Lake Park Avenue, PMB 110
Oakland, California 94610
(510) 834-6219
e-mail bacon2254@aol.com
Attorney for Defendant and Appellant

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,)
) No. S_____
Plaintiff and Respondent,) No. B295998
)
vs.)
) Los Angeles
VINCE E. LEWIS,) Superior Court
) No. TA117431
Defendant and Appellant.)
)

DEFENDANT/APPELLANT’S REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE

TO THE HONORABLE TANI CANTIL-SAKAUYE, CHIEF JUSTICE OF CALIFORNIA, AND TO THE HONORABLE ASSOCIATE JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA:

Defendant, appellant, and petitioner Vince E. Lewis, through his counsel, respectfully requests, pursuant to Evidence Code section 459 and Rule 8.252(a), California Rules of Court, that the Court judicially notice the Judicial Council’s letter dated August 28, 2018 addressed to the Hon. Nancy Skinner concerning SB 1437 [Exhibit 1], and the Judicial Council’s letter dated September 13, 2018 addressed to then-Governor Edmund G. Brown, Jr.

concerning SB 1437 [Exhibit 2]. The letters are posted at:

<https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/ga-position-letter-senate-sb1437-skinner.pdf>.

The letters to be noticed are relevant to the issue of when a superior court has authority to summarily deny a Penal Code section 1170.95 petition, which is an issue in this case. (Rule 8.252(a)(2)(A).) These matters were not presented to the superior court, as the petition was denied before appellant was appointed counsel. (Rule 8.252(a)(2)(B).) The matters are a proper subject of judicial notice as official acts of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the state. (Evid. Code, §§ 452, subd. (c), 453, 459; Rule 8.252(a)(2)(C).) The matter to be noticed relates to proceedings occurring before the order now under review. (Rule 8.252(a)(2)(D).)

Submitted February 11, 2020, at Oakland, California.

/s/ Robert D. Bacon
ROBERT D. BACON
Attorney for Appellant

DECLARATION

I declare under penalty of perjury that the statements made in this request are true.

Signed at Oakland, California, February 11, 2020.

/s/ Robert D. Bacon
ROBERT D. BACON

DECLARATION OF SERVICE BY MAIL & E-MAIL

I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to this case. My business address is: PMB 110, 484 Lake Park Avenue, Oakland, California 94610; bacon2254@aol.com.

On February 11, 2020, I served **DEFENDANT/APPELLANT'S REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE** by placing a true copy thereof in an envelope addressed to each of the persons named below at the addresses shown, and by sealing and depositing the envelope in the U.S. Mail at Oakland, California, with postage fully prepaid. There is delivery service by U.S. Mail at each of the places so addressed, and there is regular communication by mail between the place of mailing and each of the places so addressed.

Clerk of the Superior Court
[ATTN: Hon. Ricardo Ocampo]
200 W. Compton Blvd.
Compton, CA 90220

Mr. Vince Lewis
AL6235 A2-102
Kern Valley State Prison
P.O. Box 5101
Delano, California 93216

On the same day, I also served the same document on each of the persons named below by attaching a PDF copy to an E-mail addressed as indicated: Idan Ivri, counsel for respondent: DocketingLAAWT@doj.ca.gov & idan.ivri@doj.ca.gov.

The District Attorney: truefiling@da.lacounty.gov

The California Appellate Project: capdocs@lacap.com.

Jennifer Cheng, Mr. Lewis' trial attorney: jcheng@apd.lacounty.gov.

On the same day, I served the same document on the Clerk of the Second District Court of Appeal by filing it with the California Supreme Court using the TrueFiling utility.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Signed on February 11, 2020, at Oakland, California.

/s/ Robert D. Bacon

Exhibit 1



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

520 Capitol Mall, Suite 600 • Sacramento, California 95814-3368
Telephone 916-323-3121 • Fax 916-323-4347 • TDD 415-865-4272

TANI G. CANTIL-SAKAUYE
Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council

MARTIN HOSHINO
Administrative Director

CORY T. JASPERSON
Director, Governmental Affairs

August 28, 2018

Hon. Nancy Skinner
Member of the Senate
State Capitol, Room 2059
Sacramento, California 95814

Subject: Senate Bill 1437 (Skinner), as amended August 20, 2018 – Support, if amended

Dear Senator Skinner:

The Judicial Council supports SB 1437, if amended, which limits liability for individuals based on a theory of 1st or 2nd degree felony murder and allows individuals previously sentenced on a theory of felony murder to petition for resentencing if they meet specified qualifications. The council appreciates the August 20, 2018 amendments, which include the majority of the amendments requested by the council. However, the council believes that to make the process as efficient as possible, the bill should be amended to authorize courts to summarily dismiss

petitions that do not make a prima facie case without a hearing consistent with petitions for writs of habeas corpus¹ and for resentencing under Proposition 36² and Proposition 47³.

Consistent with these other provisions of law, the council believes that it is more efficient for courts to have the ability to deny petitions filed pursuant to SB 1437 early in the process when they do not make a prima facie showing. Thus, the council requests that SB 1437 be amended to: (1) require that upon receipt of a petition, the court shall determine whether the petitioner has made a prima facie showing that the petitioner falls within the provision of the bill and that the court may request an informal response from the prosecutor before making that determination; (2) provide that if the court determines that the petitioner makes a prima facie showing, the court shall issue an order to show cause (OSC); (3) provide that if a prima facie showing is made and the petitioner is indigent and has requested counsel, the court shall appoint counsel to represent the petitioner; (4) require the prosecution to file and serve a response within 60 days of service of the OSC and provide that the petitioner may file and serve a reply within 30 days after service of the prosecutor's response; and (5) provide that within 60 days after receipt of petitioner's reply is served or the time to serve a reply has expired, the court shall hold a hearing.

Courts regularly review and deny writs of habeas corpus and resentencing petitions filed under Propositions 36 and 47 that do not make a prima facie showing without having a hearing, as contemplated by SB 1437. The proposed amendments will make the petition process more efficient and consistent with these other resentencing laws. This consistency is especially important for courts that have lighter writ calendars. Moreover, the council is concerned that appointing counsel and involving the prosecution in the petition process before an initial review by the court will place unnecessary burdens on courts and on the prosecutors and public defenders to review and respond to petitions that the judge will ultimately summarily deny at a hearing because the petition does not make a prima facie showing.

¹ See California Rule of Court 4.551(c)(1), which provides: "The court must issue an order to show cause if the petitioner has made a *prima facie showing* that he or she is entitled to relief. In doing so, the court takes petitioner's factual allegations as true and makes a preliminary assessment regarding whether the petitioner would be entitled to relief if his or her factual allegations were proved. If so, the court must issue an order to show cause (emphasis added).

² Proposition 36, the Three Strikes Reform Act of 2012, was passed by the voters in November 2012. The process under section Penal Code section 1170.126 contemplates four distinct phases: (1) the filing of a petition for relief under section 1170.126; (2) *an initial screening of the petition to determine whether the inmate meets the minimum statutory requirements for relief*; (3) if a prima facie basis for relief has been shown, a qualification hearing to determine whether the inmate has met all of the statutory requirements for relief and, if so, whether the resentencing of the inmate will pose an unreasonable risk of danger to public safety; and (4) the order of the court on the issue of resentencing (emphasis added).

³ Under Proposition 47, the Safe Neighborhoods and Schools Act, the court may summarily deny relief based on any petition that is facially deficient. Resentencing may be denied based solely on the fact of a prior conviction of a designated "super strike" or any offense requiring registration as a sex offender under section Penal Code section 290(c). (§ 1170.18(i).)

Hon. Nancy Skinner
August 28, 2018
Page 3

For these reasons, the Judicial Council respectfully supports SB 1437, if amended.

Sincerely,

Mailed on August 28, 2018

Sharon Reilly
Attorney

SR/yc-s

cc: Ms. Kate Chatfield, Policy Director, Restore Justice
Mr. Daniel Seeman, Deputy Legislative Affairs Secretary, Office of the Governor
Mr. Martin Hoshino, Administrative Director, Judicial Council of California

Exhibit 2



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

520 Capitol Mall, Suite 600 • Sacramento, California 95814-3368

Telephone 916-323-3121 • Fax 916-323-4347 • TDD 415-865-4272

TANI G. CANTIL-SAKAUYE
Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council

MARTIN HOSHINO
Administrative Director

CORY T. JASPERSON
Director, Governmental Affairs

September 13, 2018

Hon. Edmund G. Brown, Jr.
Governor of California
State Capitol, First Floor
Sacramento, California 95814

Subject: Senate Bill 1437 (Skinner) – Support, if amended

Dear Governor Brown:

Senate Bill 1437 limits liability for individuals based on a theory of 1st or 2nd degree felony murder and allows individuals previously sentenced on a theory of felony murder to petition for resentencing if they meet specified qualifications. The council appreciates the August 20, 2018 amendments, which include the majority of the amendments requested by the council. However, the council believes that to make the process as efficient as possible, the bill should be amended to authorize courts to summarily dismiss petitions that do not make a *prima facie* case without a hearing consistent with petitions for writs of habeas corpus¹ and for resentencing under Proposition 36² and Proposition 47³.

¹ See California Rule of Court 4.551(c)(1), which provides: “The court must issue an order to show cause if the petitioner has made a *prima facie* showing that he or she is entitled to relief. In doing so, the court takes petitioner’s factual allegations as true and makes a preliminary assessment regarding whether the petitioner would be entitled to relief if his or her factual allegations were proved. If so, the court must issue an order to show cause (emphasis added).”

² Proposition 36, the Three Strikes Reform Act of 2012, was passed by the voters in November 2012. The process under section Penal Code section 1170.126 contemplates four distinct phases: (1) the filing of a petition for relief under section 1170.126; (2) *an initial screening of the petition to determine whether the inmate meets the minimum statutory requirements for relief*; (3) if a *prima facie* basis for relief has been shown, a qualification hearing to determine whether the inmate has met all of the statutory requirements for relief and, if so, whether the resentencing of the inmate will pose an unreasonable risk of danger to public safety; and (4) the order of the court on the issue of resentencing (emphasis added).

³ Under Proposition 47, the Safe Neighborhoods and Schools Act, the court may summarily deny relief based on any petition that is facially deficient. Resentencing may be denied based solely on the fact of a prior conviction of a designated “super strike” or any offense requiring registration as a sex offender under section Penal Code section 290(c). (§ 1170.18(i).)

Hon. Edmund G. Brown, Jr.
September 13, 2018
Page 2

Consistent with these other provisions of law, the council believes that it is more efficient for courts to have the ability to deny petitions filed pursuant to SB 1437 early in the process when they do not make a prima facie showing. Thus, the council requested that SB 1437 be amended to: (1) require that upon receipt of a petition, the court shall determine whether the petitioner has made a prima facie showing that the petitioner falls within the provision of the bill and that the court may request an informal response from the prosecutor before making that determination; (2) provide that if the court determines that the petitioner makes a prima facie showing, the court shall issue an order to show cause (OSC); (3) provide that if a prima facie showing is made and the petitioner is indigent and has requested counsel, the court shall appoint counsel to represent the petitioner; (4) require the prosecution to file and serve a response within 60 days of service of the OSC and provide that the petitioner may file and serve a reply within 30 days after service of the prosecutor's response; and (5) provide that within 60 days after receipt of petitioner's reply is served or the time to serve a reply has expired, the court shall hold a hearing.

Courts regularly review and deny writs of habeas corpus and resentencing petitions filed under Propositions 36 and 47 that do not make a prima facie showing without having a hearing, as contemplated by SB 1437. The proposed amendments would make the petition process more efficient and consistent with these other resentencing laws. This consistency is especially important for courts that have lighter writ calendars. Moreover, the council is concerned that appointing counsel and involving the prosecution in the petition process before an initial review by the court will place unnecessary burdens on courts and on the prosecutors and public defenders to review and respond to petitions that the judge will ultimately summarily deny at a hearing because the petition does not make a prima facie showing.

Should you have any questions or require additional information, please contact Sharon Reilly at 916-323-3121.

Sincerely,

Mailed on September 13, 2018

Cory T. Jaspersen
Director, Governmental Affairs

CTJ/SR/yc-s

cc: Hon. Nancy Skinner, Member of the Senate
Hon. Mike A. Gipson, Member of the Assembly, Principal coauthor
Hon. Scott D. Wiener, Member of the Senate, Coauthor
Hon. Rob Bonta, Member of the Assembly, Coauthor
Hon. Autumn R. Burke, Member of the Assembly, Coauthor
Hon. Jose Medina, Member of the Assembly, Coauthor
Ms. Kate Chatfield, Policy Director, Restore Justice
Mr. Daniel Seeman, Deputy Legislative Affairs Secretary, Office of the Governor
Mr. Martin Hoshino, Administrative Director, Judicial Council of California