

Office of the State Public Defender

770 L St., Suite 1000 Sacramento, California 95814-3362 Telephone: (916) 322-2676

Fax: (916) 327-0459

SUPREME COURT COPY



May 18, 2017

Jorge E. Navarrete, Clerk Supreme Court of the State of California 350 McAllister Street San Francisco, CA 94102

Re:

People v. Kiongozi Jones, Case No. S075725 Supplemental Letter Brief Citing New Authority SUPREME COURT
FILED

MAY 1 9 2017

Jorge Navarrete Clerk

Deputy

Dear Mr. Navarrete:

Appellant submits this letter brief pursuant to rules 8.520, subdivision (d) and 8.630, subdivision (d) of the California Rules of Court.

In his opening brief, appellant challenged the California death penalty scheme on grounds that this Court has rejected in previous decisions holding that the California law does not violate the federal Constitution. (AOB 135-150.) Recently, the United States Supreme Court held Florida's death penalty statute unconstitutional under Apprendi v. New Jersey (2000) 530 U.S. 466 and Ring v. Arizona (2002) 536 U.S. 584 because the sentencing judge, not the jury, made a factual finding, the existence of an aggravating circumstance, that is required before the death penalty can be imposed. (Hurst v. Florida [136 S.Ct. 616, 624] [hereafter "Hurst"].) Hurst provides new support to appellant's claims in Argument VII of his opening brief. (AOB 187-189, 195-196.) In light of Hurst, this Court should reconsider its rulings that imposition of the death penalty does not constitute an increased sentence within the meaning of Apprendi (People v. Anderson (2001) 25 Cal.4th 543, 589, fn. 14); does not require factual findings within the meaning of Ring (People v. Merriman (2014) 60 Cal.4th 1, 106); and does not require the jury to find unanimously and beyond a reasonable doubt that the aggravating circumstances outweigh the mitigating circumstances before the jury can impose a sentence of death (People v. Prieto (2003) 30 Cal.4th 226, 275).

Sincerely

JESSICA K. McGUIRE

Assistant State Public Defender

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

Case Name:

People v. Kiongozi Jones

Case Number:

Supreme Court No. S075725

Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. NA-031990-01

I, Marsha Gomez, declare as follows: I am over the age of 18, not a party to this cause. I am employed in the county where the mailing took place. My business address is 770 L Street, Suite 1000, Sacramento, California 95814. I served a copy of the following document(s):

SUPPLEMENTAL LETTER BRIEF CITING NEW AUTHORITY

by enclosing it in envelopes and

/ depositing the sealed envelope with the United States Postal Service with the postage fully prepaid;

/X / placing the envelopes for collection and mailing on the date and at the place shown below following our ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with this business's practice for collecting and processing correspondence for mailing. On the same day that correspondence is placed for collection and mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business with the United States Postal Service in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid.

The envelopes were addressed and mailed on May 18, 2017, as follows:

Kiongozi Jones, P-21100

CSP-SQ 3-EB-23

San Quentin, CA 94974

Viet H. Nguyen, Deputy Attorney General

Office of the Attorney General 300 S. Spring Street, Suite 1702

Los Angeles, CA 90013

California Appellate Project

101 Second Street, Suite 600

San Francisco, CA 94105

Geraldine S. Russell

Attorney at Law

P.O. Box 2160

La Mesa, CA 91943-2160

Ronald S. Matthias

Senior Assistant Attorney General

Office of the Attorney General

455 Golden Gate Avenue, #11000

San Francisco, CA 94102-3664

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Signed on May 18,

2017, at Sacramento, California.

MARSHA GOMEZ