

AWARDING CUSTODY CREDITS AFTER REALIGNMENT

J. RICHARD COUZENS

Judge of the Superior Court
County of Placer (Ret.)

TRICIA A. BIGELOW

Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, 2nd Appellate District, Div. 8

May 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. INTRODUCTION.....	3
B. THE APPLICABLE RULES	4
1. Crimes or violations of probation committed, sentenced, and final prior to January 25, 2010.....	5
2. Crimes or violations of probation committed and sentenced prior to January 25, 2010, but not yet final as of January 25, 2010	5
3. Crimes and violations of probation committed prior to January 25, 2010, but sentenced after that date.....	8
4. Crimes and violations of probation committed between January 25, 2010, and September 28, 2010	10
5. Crimes and violations of probation with underlying crimes committed between September 28, 2010, and October 1, 2011	11
6. Crimes and violations of probation with underlying crime committed on or after October 1, 2011.....	13
a. Sentences to county jail	13
b. Sentences to state prison	13
c. Credit for sentences imposed after October 1, 2011, for crimes committed prior to the effective date	14
d. Violations of probation	14
C. EXCLUSION FROM THE ENHANCED CREDIT PROVISIONS.....	15
1. Defendants who are required to register as a sex offender under section 290.....	15
2. Defendants committed for a serious felony listed in section 1192.7.	15
3. Defendants who have prior convictions for a serious or violent felony.	16
4. Defendants who are subject to special credit limitations.....	16
D. CALCULATION OF CREDITS	17
1. FORMULA A [Traditional formula].....	17
2. FORMULA B [Formula effective January 25, 2010, and October 1, 2011].....	18
3. FORMULA C [Credit formula effective September 28, 2010].....	19
E. ADDITIONAL ISSUES.....	19
1. Whether disqualifying conditions must be pled and proved.....	19
2. Effect of striking of prior serious or violent felonies under section 1385	20

3. Correction of award of credits for cases not final on January 25, 2010	21
4. No conduct credits for “flash incarceration”	21
5. Equal protection	22
6. Credits and Three Strikes cases	23
APPENDIX I: Summary of Key Provisions.....	24

A. Introduction

The rule is straightforward: “The sentencing court is responsible for calculating the number of days the defendant has been in custody before sentencing and for reflecting the total credits allowed on the abstract of judgment.” (*People v. Black* (2009) 176 Cal.App.4th 145, 154; also *People v. Buckhalter* (2001) 26 Cal.4th 20, 30-31.) It is the obligation of the court to determine at the time of sentencing the actual time and conduct credits to be award against the sentence. (Cal. Rules of Court, Rule 4.310.) The statement of credits should include the total credits given, broken down between actual time and any good time/work time conduct credits. The court’s task, however, is anything but straightforward. It has been complicated by the fact that there have been four different versions of the statutes governing the award of conduct credits in 18 months. The purpose of this memorandum is to offer some guidance to trial judges and counsel as they navigate their way through the maze of changing rules and credit formulas.

Prior to January 25, 2010, Penal Code section 4019* gave defendants confined in or committed to county jail six days or more two days of conduct credit for every six days of actual custody time served, or one-third off their sentence. Stated differently, for every four days of actual time served, a total of six days of the sentence would be deemed served. This credit was awarded to defendants committed to county jail for a misdemeanor or as a condition of probation in a felony case, and as a matter of pre-sentence credit to defendants sentenced to state prison.

Effective January 25, 2010, section 4019 was amended to give defendants confined in or committed to county jail four days or more two days of conduct credit for every four days of actual custody time served, or approximately one-half off their sentence. In other words, for every two days of actual time, four days of the sentence was deemed served. The net effect of the change was to give an extra two days of credit for every two days actually served. The credits applied to persons sentenced to county jail, and to pre-sentence credits for persons sent to state prison. Excluded from the enhanced credit provisions were defendants who had a prior conviction for a serious or violent felony, defendants who were being sentenced on a serious felony, and any person required to register as a sex offender under section 290.

Effective September 28, 2010, section 4019 was returned to its wording prior to January 25, 2010: persons confined in or committed to county jail six days or longer would receive two days of conduct credit for every six days of actual custody time served. The

* Unless otherwise indicated, all references are to the Penal Code.

new provisions eliminated the enhanced credits for persons sentenced to county jail. Section 2933, a statute applying to credits in state prison, was amended to grant persons sentenced to prison one day of credit for every day of pre-sentence time served in county jail. Excluded from the enhanced credit provisions were defendants who had a prior conviction for a serious or violent felony, defendants who were being sentenced on a serious felony, and any person required to register as a sex offender under section 290. The excluded defendants would receive only two days of conduct credit for every six days served. The statutory change applied only to crimes committed on or after September 28, 2010.

Effective October 1, 2011, as a result of the enactment of the Criminal Justice Realignment Act of 2011, section 4019 has been amended to now provide that inmates confined in or committed to county jail four days or longer are to receive two days of conduct credit for every four days served, or approximately one-half off their sentence. In other words, for every two days of actual time in custody, four days of the sentence will be deemed served. As with the change made on January 25, 2010, the net effect of the amendment is to give an extra two days of credit for every two days actually served. The provisions apply to persons serving a misdemeanor sentence, a term in jail imposed as a condition of probation in a felony case, pre-sentence credit for persons sentenced under section 1170, subdivision (h), some persons sentenced to state prison, and persons serving jail custody for violation of state parole or Post-Release Community Supervision (PRCS). The new provisions also apply to persons denied felony probation and sentenced to county jail under section 1170, subdivision (h). The Legislature eliminated the provisions in section 4019 that excluded the enhanced credit award for persons convicted of prior serious or violent felonies, persons committed for serious felonies, and persons required to register under section 290. Section 2933, governing credit for persons sent to state prison, has been restored to its original language: state prison inmates will receive six months of conduct credit for every six months of actual time served; there are no exclusions, only conduct credit limitations such as sections 2933.1 [violent felonies] and 2933.2 [murder]. The amendments made by the realignment legislation are to be applied prospectively only to crimes committed on or after October 1, 2011.

B. The Applicable Rules

The question of what rule will apply to any given sentence will depend on the potential relationship between four variables: 1) when the crime was committed; 2) when the sentencing hearing is held; 3) whether the defendant is disqualified from the benefits of the new statutes; and 4) whether the defendant receives a state prison or county jail sentence. One or a combination of these variables will dictate the applicable law and the correct formula to use in the calculation of credits. There are six time periods and sentencing circumstances relevant to this determination.

1. *Crimes or violations of probation committed, sentenced, and final prior to January 25, 2010*

The law applicable to cases fully final prior to January 25, 2010, likely will be governed by *In re Estrada* (1965) 63 Cal.2d 740: “The key date is the date of final judgment. If the amendatory statute lessening punishment becomes effective prior to the date the judgment of conviction becomes final then, in our opinion, it, and not the old statute in effect when the prohibited act was committed, applies.” (*Id.* at p. 744.) The reverse corollary also is true: if the amendatory statute becomes effective after the case is final, the old statute applies.

A more difficult issue is presented by defendants with sentences that became final prior to January 25, 2010, but who are on probation and still serving a term in custody after January 25, 2010. It is well understood that the court retains the ability to modify conditions of probation during the entire probationary period. (Pen. Code, § 1203.3, subd. (a).) It could be argued that if the court has the discretion to modify conditions of probation, the judgment is not “final” for the purposes of affording a sentenced defendant the benefits of the amendment to section 4019, as long as the defendant still is on probation.

In re Kemp (2011) 192 Cal.App.4th 252, at least as to persons sentenced to state prison, holds the law effective January 25, 2010, and September 28, 2010, to the extent it increases a defendant’s custody credit, will apply regardless of when the judgment becomes final. To deny the enhanced credit would deny such defendants equal protection of the law. Nothing in the opinion suggests its logic would be inapplicable to persons serving county jail sentences. Thus far *Kemp* is the only case to apply the legislative changes to sections 4019 and 2933 fully retroactively. *Kemp* has been granted review by the Supreme Court.

The law applicable to cases falling in this first category is a little unclear. If the reasoning of *Estrada* prevails, the entitlement to credit will be governed by the law as it was prior to September 28, 2010. If *Kemp* is upheld, defendants will receive credits in accordance with sections 4019 and 2933, as they existed after January 25, 2010, and September 28, 2010, respectively, regardless of when the case became final and whether they were sentenced to state prison or county jail. The credit formulas are discussed below.

2. *Crimes or violations of probation committed and sentenced prior to January 25, 2010, but not yet final as of January 25, 2010*

Most of the published opinions addressing the changes to section 4019 fall in this second category. In each case the crime and sentencing took place before the effective date of the amendment to section 4019, but the case was not final as of that date. The courts are split on the question of which law applies. The

following cases hold the new statute “retroactively” applies to all cases not final as of January 25, 2010: *People v. Brown* (2010) 182 Cal.App.4th 1354 [3d Dist.] [granted review], *People v. House* (2010) 183 Cal.App.4th 1049 [2nd Dist., Div. 1][granted review and held], *People v. Landon* (2010) 183 Cal.App.4th 1096 [1st Dist., Div. 1][granted review and held], *People v. Delgado* (2010) 184 Cal.App.4th 271[2nd Dist., Div. 6][rehearing granted], *People v. Norton* (2010) 184 Cal.App.4th 408[1st Dist., Div. 3][depublished], *People v. Pelayo* (2010) 184 Cal.App.4th 481 [1st Dist., Div. 5][granted review and held], *People v. Keating* (2010) 185 Cal.App.4th 364[2nd Dist., Div. 2][review granted], and *People v. Bacon* (2010) 186 Cal.App.4th 333 [2nd Dist., Div. 8][review granted]; *People v. Jones* (2010) 188 Cal.App.4th 165, 185 [3rd Dist.][granted review and depublished].

The following cases hold the new statute operates only prospectively, at least to the extent that it does not apply to cases sentenced prior to January 25, 2010: *People v. Rodriguez* (2010) 182 Cal.App.4th 535 [5th Dist.][granted review], *People v. Otubuah* (2010) 184 Cal.App.4th 422 [4th Dist., Div. 2][depublished], *People v. Hopkins* (2010) 184 Cal.App.4th 615 [6th Dist.][granted review and held], and *People v. Eusebio* (2010) 185 Cal.App.4th 990 [2nd Dist., Div. 4][granted review].

The Supreme Court clearly has signaled its intent to occupy the field. Until the court issues its opinion, however, trial courts are free to select whichever law is the more persuasive. Those opinions denying any retroactive application generally follow the reasoning in *Rodriguez*. *Rodriguez* determined the Legislature did not intend the amendment to apply to a defendant sentenced prior to its effective date, who served all of the relevant custody time prior to its effective date, but whose case was not final as of January 25, 2010. *Rodriguez* found the purpose of awarding conduct credits is to encourage good behavior while in custody. Absent a contrary intent expressed by the Legislature, awarding additional conduct credit for time served in the past would not serve this purpose. The court also relied on *In re Stinnette* (1979) 94 Cal.App.3d 800, 804-805, which determined a prospective application of an increase in custody credits did not violate a defendant’s right to equal protection of the law. In the end, *Rodriguez* held the defendant did not overcome the presumption in Penal Code section 3, that no part of the Penal Code is retroactive “unless expressly so declared.”

Those courts applying the statute to cases not final as of January 25, 2010, hold the Legislature intended full retroactive application of the law. These decisions generally are based on the California Supreme Court decision in *In re Estrada* (1965) 63 Cal.2d 740. As observed in *Estrada*: “The key date is the date of final judgment. If the amendatory statute lessening punishment becomes effective prior to the date the judgment of conviction becomes final then, in our opinion, it, and not the old statute in effect when the prohibited act was committed, applies.” (*Id.* at p. 744.) “When the Legislature amends a statute so as to lessen the punishment it has obviously expressly determined that its former penalty was too severe and

that a lighter punishment is proper as punishment for the commission of the prohibited act. It is an inevitable inference that the Legislature must have intended that the new statute imposing the new lighter penalty now deemed to be sufficient should apply to every case to which it constitutionally could apply. The amendatory act imposing the lighter punishment can be applied constitutionally to acts committed before its passage provided the judgment convicting the defendant of the act is not final. This intent seems obvious, because to hold otherwise would be to conclude that the Legislature was motivated by a desire for vengeance, a conclusion not permitted in view of modern theories of penology.” (*Id.* at p. 745.)

Several cases favoring retroactive application also observe that in *People v. Hunter* (1977) 68 Cal.App.3d 389, the court of appeal applied the reasoning of *Estrada* to a credit issue very similar to the one posed by the amendment to section 4019. Prior to 1975, defendants were not entitled to “back time” credit against sentences imposed as a condition of probation. In 1976, Penal Code section 2900.5 was amended to allow such a credit. The court in *Hunter* concluded the amendment applied to custody time imposed as a condition of probation for cases not yet final as of the effective date of the amendment. Similar reasoning was used to determine such conduct credit was earned on sentences imposed prior to the imposition of a state prison sentence.

Several cases also rely on *People v. Doganiere* (1978) 86 Cal.App.3d 237, and distinguish *Stinnette*. *Doganiere* applied *Estrada* to an amendment involving conduct credits. In *Doganiere* the People argued that *Estrada* did not apply because an amendment extending the opportunity to earn conduct credits is designed to control future behavior. (*Id.* at p. 239.) The argument was rejected. “Under *Estrada*, it must be presumed that the Legislature thought the prior system of not allowing credit for good behavior was too severe.” (*Id.* at p. 240.) Those cases favoring only a prospective application of the changes to section 4019 argue that the awarding of conduct credit was not a legislative determination that sentences were too severe, rather, it was a legislative determination that motivating and incentivizing good behavior would help to maintain discipline and minimize threats to prison and jail security. They point to *In re Stinnette* (1979) 94 Cal.App.3d 800, which concluded there should be no retroactive application of an amendment to section 2931 which allowed state prison inmates to earn conduct credits. *Stinnette* restricted application of the amendment to time served after the effective date. However, the *Stinnette* court did not address the question whether it must be presumed the Legislature intended retroactive application. The Determinate Sentencing Law expressly provided for prospective application. The issue in *Stinnette* was whether this prospective application violated the defendant’s equal protection rights. The court concluded it did not, because there was a rational basis for treating those who had already begun serving their sentences differently from those who began serving their sentences after the effective date. (*Id.* at pp. 805-806.)

Finally, several of the cases favoring retroactive application find authoritative a number of other portions of SB 18, the bill making the changes to section 4019, in finding the Legislature, in fact, intended a retroactive application of the new credit calculations.

For the purposes of determining the retroactive application of a statute that mitigates the consequences of a crime, a case is not final until the expiration of the time for petitioning for a writ of certiorari in the United State Supreme Court. “ ‘The key date is the date of final judgment. If the amendatory statute lessening punishment becomes effective prior to the date the judgment of conviction becomes final then, in our opinion, it, and not the old statute in effect when the prohibited act was committed, applies.’ (*In re Estrada* (1965) 63 Cal.2d 740, 744 [48 Cal.Rptr. 172, 408 P.2d 948].) ‘In *Pedro T.* we cited with approval a case holding that, for the purpose of determining retroactive application of an amendment to a criminal statute, a judgment is not final until the time for petitioning for a writ of certiorari in the United States Supreme Court has passed. (*In re Pedro T.* (1994) 8 Cal.4th 1041, 1046 [36 Cal.Rptr.2d 74, 884 P.2d 1022], citing *In re Pine* (1977) 66 Cal.App.3d 593, 594 [136 Cal.Rptr. 718]; see also *Bell v. Maryland* (1964) 378 U.S. 226, 230 [12 L.Ed.2d 822, 84 S.Ct. 1814] [“The rule applies to any such [criminal] proceeding which, at the time of the supervening legislation, has not yet reached final disposition in the highest court authorized to review it”].)’ (*People v. Nasalga* (1996) 12 Cal.4th 784, 789, fn. 5 [50 Cal.Rptr.2d 88, 910 P.2d 1380].)” (*People v. Vieira* (2005) 35 Cal.4th 264, 305-306.) A petition for writ of certiorari is considered timely filed if filed with the court within 90 days after entry of judgment of the state court of last resort. (Rules of the U.S. Supreme Court, Rule 13.1.)

Depending on the Supreme Court’s decision regarding retroactivity, defendants in this second category of cases either will receive credits under sections 4019 or 2933 as they existed prior to January 25, 2010, or will receive the enhanced credits under the statute effective January 25, 2010, whether the sentence is to prison or county jail. The credit formulas are discussed below.

3. Crimes and violations of probation committed prior to January 25, 2010, but sentenced after that date

Most of the cases addressing the issue of retroactivity concerned defendants who were sentenced prior to January 25, 2010. *People v. Zarate* (2011) 192 Cal.App.4th 939, however, addresses the situation where the defendant was sentenced after the effective date, but who earned custody credits prior to the change. *Zarate* determined it was not a retroactive application of the law for the sentencing court to award credits according to the law *at the time of sentencing*. The Supreme Court has granted review of *Zarate*.

Zarate's reasoning presumably would apply also to any defendant sentenced on a violation of probation after January 25, 2010, whether the defendant is sentenced to county jail or state prison. Any conduct credits applicable to the new commitment would be calculated according to the formula effective January 25, 2010, regardless of when the custody was served.

The statute also would apply to a person who commits a crime prior to January 25, 2010, and up to September 28, 2010, but who is sentenced after September 28, 2010. For reasons discussed below, the changes made effective September 28, 2010, cannot apply to any crime committed before that date. The law in effect as of the date these defendants are sentenced is the law enacted January 25, 2010.

If an appellate court remands a case for reconsideration of a limited issue, such as the determination of the restitution fine, the defendant is not entitled to a reconsideration of his conduct credits. (*People v. Nychay* (2011) 193 Cal.App.4th 771. In *Nychay* the defendant was originally sentenced prior to January 25, 2010, but the remand for reconsideration of the restitution fine occurred after that date. *Nychay* has been granted review by the Supreme Court.

Payton v. Superior Court (2011) ___ Cal.App.4th ___ [2012 WL 165402], concerns a defendant who committed a crime and was sentenced prior to January 25, 2010. Thereafter, in May 2011 he was found in violation of his probation and was sentenced to 90 days in jail; the trial court applied conduct credits based on the law prior to January 25, 2010. The appellate court issued a writ of habeas corpus, directing the jail to apply the credit formula enacted January 25, 2010. The court's reasoning was based on a portion of the brief submitted by the Attorney General: "The Attorney General explains the 'legislative intent in awarding or increasing credit for good conduct is to encourage good behavior and work performance by inmates in custody. Such good behavior and work performance helps to maintain the security and safety of local custody facilities. [¶] For these reasons, inmates are entitled to the conduct credits which are in effect at the time their custody is served. Because all of petitioner's custody time was served after the effective date of the amendment, he is entitled to the credits which could have served as the incentive for his good behavior. Accordingly, he is entitled to six additional days of conduct credits for his pre-sentence custody time. He should also have been earning conduct credits at this rate over the course of his 90-day period of custody.'" (*Id.* at p. ___; emphasis added.) No citation or further explanation is given for the emphasized portion of the Attorney General's brief. Care should be used in applying the phrase literally to all sentences. Such an application, for example, might conflict with the amendments to the statute made effective September 28, 2010, and October 1, 2011, both of which apply only to crimes committed on or after the designated dates. *Payton*, however, appears to correctly apply the credit law applicable at the time of sentencing, and as such, is not a retroactive application of the new credit formula.

Defendants sentenced in this third category will receive credits under the credit formula effective January 25, 2010, whether the commitment is to state prison or county jail, and even if the sentencing hearing is after September 28, 2010. The credit formulas are discussed below.

4. *Crimes and violations of probation committed between January 25, 2010, and September 28, 2010*

There can be no question that for crimes committed between January 25, 2010, and September 28, 2010, the controlling law is the formula put into play on January 25, 2010. This law will apply even though the sentencing hearing occurs after September 28, 2010. There are two reasons for this. First, the legislation effective September 28, 2010, expressly provides that it only applies to crimes committed on or after that date. (Pen. Code, § 4019, subd. (g).) Second, to *reduce* credits is to *increase* the penal consequences for the commission of a crime. Application of the changes to crimes committed before the effective date would constitute an ex post facto law.

Custody credit for violations of probation occurring during this time period likely will be governed by the law effective January 25, 2010, regardless of when the underlying crime was committed. The January statute will be the law applicable to all violation hearings held after January 25, 2010, and, as noted above, the statute effective September 28, 2011, is applicable only to *crimes* committed after that date.

The ex post facto problem was discussed by our Supreme Court in *In re Ramirez* (1985) 39 Cal.3d 931. The defendant challenged a 1982 change of the law that increased the amount of conduct credits that could be taken away from a person in state prison because of misbehavior occurring after the effective date of the change. In rejecting defendant's ex post facto challenge, the court distinguished the United States Supreme Court decision in *Weaver v. Graham* (1981) 450 U.S. 24. In *Weaver* the court reviewed a Florida statute that reduced the ability of a defendant to earn conduct credits while in prison, as applied to a person who committed a crime before the effective date of the change. *Weaver* observed: "[O]ur decisions prescribe that two critical elements must be present for a criminal or penal law to be *ex post facto*: it must be retrospective, that is, it must apply to events occurring before its enactment, and it must disadvantage the offender affected by it." (*Id.* at p. 29; footnotes omitted.)

In *Weaver* the court found the reduction of the ability of a defendant to earn conduct credits constituted a "disadvantage" for the purpose of ex post facto considerations: "Under this inquiry, we conclude § 944.275 (1) is disadvantageous to petitioner and other similarly situated prisoners. On its face, the statute reduces the number of monthly gain-time credits available to an inmate who abides by prison rules and adequately performs his assigned tasks. By

definition, this reduction in gain-time accumulation lengthens the period that someone in petitioner's position must spend in prison. In *Lindsey v. Washington* [(1937) 301 U.S. 397,] at 401-402, we reasoned that '[it] is plainly to the substantial disadvantage of petitioners to be deprived of all opportunity to receive a sentence which would give them freedom from custody and control prior to the expiration of the 15-year term.' Here, petitioner is similarly disadvantaged by the reduced opportunity to shorten his time in prison simply through good conduct." (*Weaver, supra*, at p. 33.) "Thus, the new provision constricts the inmate's opportunity to earn early release, and thereby makes more onerous the punishment for crimes committed before its enactment. This result runs afoul of the prohibition against *ex post facto* laws." (*Id.* at pp. 35-36; footnote omitted.)

Our Supreme Court in *Ramirez* distinguished *Weaver* based on the fact that the statutory change in *Ramirez* did not effect the ability of defendant to *earn* conduct credits; it only effected a prisoner's ability to *lose* credits based on misconduct occurring in the prison. "There is a critical difference between a diminution of the ordinary rewards for satisfactory performance of a prison sentence -- the issue in *Weaver* -- and an increase in sanctions for *future misbehavior* in prison -- which is at issue here. Here, petitioner's opportunity to earn good behavior and participation credits is unchanged. All that has changed are the sanctions for prison misconduct. Unlike *Weaver*, petitioner's effective sentence is not altered by the 1982 amendments unless petitioner, by his own action, chooses to alter his sentence." (*Ramirez, supra*, at p. 937; emphasis original.) Other cases holding a reduction of credits violates the *ex post facto* clause if the reduction applies to crimes occurring prior to the legislative change include: *John L. v. Superior Court* (2004) 33 Cal.4th 158, 182; *People v. Palacios* (1997) 56 Cal.App.4th 252, 256-257; and *People v. Rutledge* (1983) 139 Cal.App.3d 620, 623-625.

The statute effective September 28, 2010, which clearly reduces credit awards for good performance for persons committed to county jail, is more analogous to *Weaver*. As such, its retroactive application to crimes or probation violations committed prior to its effective date would likely be considered in conflict with the *ex post facto* clause.

Defendants sentenced in this fourth category will receive credits under the credit formula effective January 25, 2010, whether the commitment is to state prison or county jail, and even if the defendant is sentenced after September 28, 2010. The credit formulas are discussed below.

5. *Crimes and violations of probation with underlying crimes committed between September 28, 2010, and October 1, 2011*

Unless the equal protection argument of *Kemp* prevails, custody credit for crimes committed between September 28, 2010, and October 1, 2011, will be governed by the provisions of section 4019 and 2933 effective September 28, 2010.

Accordingly, defendants sentenced to county jail during this period will only receive the conduct credits traditionally designated in section 4019, as it existed prior to January 25, 2010: if sentenced to six or more days, the defendant will receive two days of conduct credit for every six days of actual time served.

Most defendants sentenced to state prison will receive the enhanced credits authorized by section 2933, subdivision (e): for every day spent in local custody, the defendant will receive an additional day of conduct credit against the prison sentence. Enhanced credits, however, will not be awarded to defendants who have prior serious or violent felony convictions, who are being sentenced for a serious felony, or who are required to register as a sex offender under section 290.

Although the placement of the new credit rules in section 2933 might suggest the prison is responsible for calculating them, undoubtedly it remains the responsibility of the trial court to make the credit determination. It is the trial court that will have the easiest access to actual time and conduct credit information while the defendant is in local facilities.

Violations of probation committed between September 28, 2010, and October 1, 2011, where the underlying crime for which probation was granted was committed prior to October 1, 2011, should be sentenced under the law effective as follows:

- Underlying crime occurred prior to January 25, 2010: use the formula effective January 25, 2010.
- Underlying crime occurred between January 25, 2010, and September 28, 2010: use the formula effective January 25, 2010.
- Underlying crime occurred between September 28, 2010, and October 1, 2011, use the formula effective September 28, 2011.

Because the statutes effective September 28, 2010, and October 1, 2011, expressly provide their provisions are applicable only to crimes occurring after their effective dates, their provisions will only apply to probation violations based on underlying offenses occurring after those respective dates. To apply the statutes to probation violations where the underlying offense occurred prior to their effective dates, likely would contravene the *ex post facto* clause.

Defendants sentenced in this fifth category will receive a credit calculation under section 4019 as it existed prior to January 25, 2010, if committed to county jail. Unless otherwise excluded, defendants will receive one day of pre-sentence conduct credit for every pre-sentence day of actual custody under section 2933 if sentenced to state prison. The credit formulas are discussed below.

6. Crimes and violations of probation with underlying crime committed on or after October 1, 2011

a. Sentences to county jail

The most recent change, made in connection with the 2011 Realignment Legislation, amends section 4019 to specify, *without any exclusion*, that inmates who are sentenced to four or more days are to receive two days of conduct credit for every four days of actual custody time served in county jail. (§ 4019, subd. (b) and (c).) In other words, for every two days of actual time in custody, four days will have been deemed served, or essentially half-time credit. (§ 4019, sub. (f).) The change is made effective for all crimes *committed* on or after October 1, 2011. The effective date of this change should not be confused with the effective date of the changes related to section 1170, subdivision (h), which are effective as to all crimes *sentenced* after October 1, 2011.

The Legislature eliminated the exclusions based on the defendant having a prior adult serious or violent felony conviction, being sentenced for a serious felony, or being required to register as a sex offender under section 290.

The new provisions of section 4019 will be applicable to all sentences served in county jail, including misdemeanor sentences, all felony sentences imposed and served as a condition of probation, and all sentences imposed as a result of a violation of parole or PRCS, where the underlying crime occurred on or after October 1, 2011. The new provisions also will apply to all pre and post-sentence credit for persons serving a term in county jail under section 1170, subdivision (h), for a crime committed on or after October 1, 2011. (§ 4019, subd. (a)(6).)

b. Sentences to state prison

Section 4019 will govern the defendant's entitlement to any *pre-sentence* credit. Unless otherwise limited by such statutes as sections 2933.1 and 2933.2, the pre-sentence credit for persons sent to state prison will be four days of total credit for every two days served.

Section 2933, subdivision (b), governs *post-sentence* credit for persons sent to state prison: for every six months of actual custody, the defendant is awarded an additional six months of conduct credit. Unless otherwise limited, all inmates serving a sentence in state prison will receive the same credit. The realignment legislation eliminated the exclusions based on the fact the defendant has a prior adult serious or violent felony conviction, is being sentenced for a serious felony, or is required to register as a sex offender under section 290.

c. Credit for sentences imposed after October 1, 2011, for crimes committed prior to the effective date

As noted above, the new credit provisions are effective only as to crimes committed on or after October 1, 2011. Any custody credit earned prior to October 1, 2011, is to be governed by the applicable prior law. (§ 4019, subd. (h).) Accordingly, when sentencing a defendant after October 1, 2011, for a crime occurring prior to that date, the court must look to the formula applicable to the time when the crime was committed. In other words, the court should determine when the crime occurred (or in cases of a violation of probation, when the underlying crime occurred), then refer to paragraphs 1 – 5 above to determine the applicable credit formula.

The only “gap” in the prior law concerns sentences imposed after October 1, 2011, where the defendant is sentenced to county jail under the provisions of section 1170, subdivision (h); that section did not exist prior to October 1, 2011. In absence of further corrective legislation or appellate review, it is suggested the defendant receive pre and post-sentence credit based on the formula applicable to state prison commitments. Except as to where the sentence is served, commitments under section 1170, subdivision (h), are being treated the same as state prison commitments. It would seem reasonable for the defendant to receive “state prison” credit during this transition period.

d. Violations of probation

Because the most recent changes to section 4019 are limited to crimes committed on or after October 1, 2011, the newest rules will have no application to violations of probation when the underlying crime occurred prior to that date. Courts must look to the prior law to determine the applicable formula. (See paragraphs 1-5, *supra*.) The new provisions, however, will apply to violations of probation when the underlying crime occurred on or after October 1, 2011.

This last category of crimes will cover only crimes committed on or after October 1, 2011, and violations of probation or parole where the underlying crime occurred on or after October 1, 2011. Defendants sentenced to county jail for four or more days will receive pre and post-sentence conduct credit of two days for every four days of actual time served. Defendants being sentenced to state prison will receive pre-sentence conduct credit of two days of conduct credit for every four days of actual time served. The credits in state prison will be calculated under section 2933. The credit formulas are discussed below.

C. Exclusion From the Enhanced Credit Provisions

Defendants sentenced to state prison or county jail under the credit formula effective January 25, 2010, or state prison under the credit formulas effective September 28, 2010, will not have custody credits calculated by the more liberal versions of the new statutes if they come within any of the following exclusions. (Pen. Code, §§ 4019, subd. (b)(2) and (c)(2) [law effective 1/25/10], 2933, subd. (e)(3) [law effective 9/28/10].)

1. *Defendants who are required to register as a sex offender under section 290.*

The exclusion clearly will apply to all defendants who are being sentenced on a current crime where registration is either mandatory or required as a matter of discretion under section 290.006. (Pen. Code, §§ 4019, subd. (b)(2) and (c)(2) [law effective 1/25/10], and 2933, subd. (e)(3)[law effective 9/28/10].) Because the statute excludes the enhanced credits only “[i]f the prisoner is *required* to register as a sex offender pursuant to Chapter 5.5 (commencing with Section 290),” [emphasis added] the defendant would be entitled to the new custody credits if the court exercised its discretion *not to* require registration under Penal Code section 290.006.

There is a question whether the exclusion will apply to persons who are required to register for a prior crime, and not because of the crime currently being sentenced. The plain language of the statute suggests that anyone required to register, whether or not for the current offense, will have limited credits. So, for example, a defendant sentenced for driving under the influence may not be entitled to half-time credit if he was previously convicted of a sex offense and is subject to the registration requirement. Because the statutory wording is relatively clear and unambiguous, it seems likely that trial courts are required to follow its dictates and exclude such defendants from the enhanced credit provisions. (*California Fed. Saving & Loan Assn. v. City of Los Angeles* (1995) 11 Cal.4th 342, 349.)

2. *Defendants committed for a serious felony listed in section 1192.7.*

Subdivisions (b)(2) and (c)(2) of section 4019, effective January 25, 2010, and subdivision (e)(3) of section 2933, effective September 28, 2010, provide that the enhanced credit formula will not apply to persons committed for a *serious* felony. Neither statute contains a similar limitation for persons committed for a *violent* felony. This omission, at first blush, may appear to be a legislative oversight, given that in all other respects the statute limits credits in cases involving both serious and violent felonies. It is likely there is no mention of commitments for violent felonies so as not to confuse the new legislation with the 15% limitation

on credits under section 2933.1, at least as to persons sent to prison. Section 2933.1, however, does not apply to persons sentenced for violent felonies, but placed on probation. (*In re Carr* (1998) 65 Cal.App.4th 1525, 1536.) So, as written, the statute dictates the anomalous result of an award of one-third conduct credits to persons convicted of serious felonies, but one-half conduct credits to persons convicted of violent felonies who are granted probation under the interim versions of section 4019. In most instances, the list of serious felonies provided in Penal Code section 1192.7, subdivision (c), includes all violent felonies as listed in Penal Code section 667.5, subdivision (c). A comparison of the two lists reveals that only the following crimes are violent, but not serious felonies: sodomy in violation of Penal Code section 286, subdivisions (c) or (d); oral copulation in violation of Penal Code section 288a, subdivision (c) or (d); sexual penetration as defined in Penal Code section 289, subdivision (j); assault with intent to commit Penal Code sections 288, 289, or 264.1. However, each of these offenses require a defendant to register as a sex offender, thus limiting the credit to one-third time for this independent reason.

3. *Defendants who have prior convictions for a serious or violent felony.*

Defendants who have prior conviction for a serious felony under section 1192.7, subdivision (c), or a violent felony under section 667.5(c), whether being sentenced to state prison or a county jail, will not receive the enhanced conduct credits. (Pen. Code, §§ 4019, subd. (b)(2) and (c)(2) [law effective 1/25/10], and 2033, subd. (e)(3)[law effective 9/28/10].) Because the statute limits the credits when the defendant has prior serious or violent felony “convictions,” the restriction will not apply to defendants having only juvenile “adjudications” that will qualify as strikes under the Three Strikes law. (*People v. Pacheco* (2011) 194 Cal.App.4th 343, 346.) Furthermore, because the legislation makes express reference to prior convictions under sections 667.5, subdivision (c), and 1192.7, subdivision (c), the exclusion likely will not be triggered by out-of-state adult convictions for serious or violent crimes.

4. *Defendants who are subject to special credit limitations.*

The realignment legislation has made no change to the custody credits awarded to defendants convicted of murder or a violent felony. Section 2933.1, applicable to violent felonies, limits pre and post-sentence conduct credits to 15% “notwithstanding any other law.” Similarly, section 2933.2, applicable to murder convictions, prohibits any grant of conduct credits “notwithstanding Section 2933.1 or any other law.” The changes to sections 2933 and 4019, which now grant half-time credit to most persons committed to the county jail, remain limited by sections 2933.1 and 2933.2.

D. Calculation of credits

The calculation of conduct credits will depend on the application of a particular formula depending on 1) when the crime was committed, 2) when the sentencing hearing is held, 3) whether the defendant is disqualified from the benefits of the new statutes, and 4) whether the defendant receives a state prison or county jail sentence. Depending on the interplay between these variables, the court will use one of three possible credit formulas: the traditional formula, the formula effective January 25, 2010 and October 1, 2011, or the formula effective September 28, 2010.

1. FORMULA A [Traditional formula]

The following formula is applicable to situations where none of the new credit provisions apply:

“Statutory” Formula (*In re Marquez* (2003) 30 Cal.4th 14, 25-26):

- Divide actual time in custody by 4 (drop fractions and don’t “round up”)
- Multiply by 2 = conduct credits
- Conduct credits + actual time = total credits

“Shortcut” Formula:

- Actual [-1 if odd] ÷ 2 = conduct [-1 if odd]

Under Formula A, conduct credits always will be an even number.

If the defendant is confined in or committed to county jail for six or more days, he is entitled to two days of conduct credit for every four days served. If the defendant is *sentenced* to five days or less, there are no conduct credits. For example, if a defendant is *sentenced* to 10 days, and has pre-sentence actual time credit of four days, the defendant will receive an additional two days of conduct credit for a total credit of six days against the 10-day sentence. If, however, the defendant is sentenced to five days in jail and has four days of actual time credit, he will need to serve one more day to complete the sentence.

The traditional formula is applicable to all pre-sentence credits for a state prison sentence or all local time for persons committed to county jail in the following sentencing situations, as discussed above (unless a special credit limitation applies):

- *Crimes or violations of probation sentenced and final prior to January 25, 2010*, whether or not defendant is sentenced to state prison or county jail.
- *Crimes or violations of probation sentenced prior to January 25, 2010, but not yet final as of that date* [if changes to section 4019 are not

retroactive], whether or not defendant is sentenced to state prison or county jail.

- *Crimes committed and violations of probation based on underlying crimes committed between September 28, 2010, and October 1, 2011, if defendant is sentenced to county jail.*
- *Defendants excluded from the enhanced credit provisions for crimes committed or violations of probation based on underlying crimes committed between January 25, 2010, and October 1, 2011.*

2. FORMULA B [Formula effective January 25, 2010, and October 1, 2011]

The following formula is used when the credit provisions effective January 25, 2010, or October 1, 2011, apply:

“Statutory” Formula (applying the reasoning of *Marquez* to the provisions of section 4019 effective 1/25/10 and 10/1/11):

- Divide actual time in custody by 2 (drop fractions and don’t “round up”)
- Multiply by 2 = conduct credits
- Conduct credits + actual time = total credits

“Shortcut” Formula:

- Actual = conduct credit [-1 if odd]

Under this Formula B, conduct credits always will be an even number.

If the defendant is confined in or committed to county jail for four days or longer, for every two days of actual custody, the defendant will get an additional conduct credit of two days. If the defendant is *sentenced* to three days or less, there will be no conduct credits awarded. For example, if a defendant is *sentenced* to 10 days, and has pre-sentence actual time credit of two days, the defendant will receive an additional two days of conduct credit, for a total credit of four days against the 10-day sentence. However, if the defendant is sentenced to three days in jail and has two days of actual time credit, he will receive no conduct credit and will need to serve one more day to complete the sentence.

The foregoing formula is applicable to all pre-sentence credits for a state prison sentence or all local time for persons committed to county jail in the following sentencing situations, as discussed above (unless a special credit limitation or exclusion applies):

- *Crimes or violations of probation sentenced prior to January 25, 2010, but not yet final as of that date [if changes to section 4019 are retroactive], whether or not defendant is sent to prison or jail.*

- *Crimes and violations of probation committed prior to January 25, 2010, but sentenced after that date, whether or not defendant is sent to prison or jail.*
- *Crimes and violations of probation committed between January 25, 2010, and September 28, 2010, whether or not the defendant is sent to state prison or county jail.*
- *Crimes or violations of probation committed between September 28, 2010, and October 1, 2011, where the underlying offense for which probation was granted occurred between those dates, if the defendant is sent to county jail.*
- *Crimes committed after October 1, 2011, and the defendant is committed to a county jail for a misdemeanor, a felony condition of probation, or under section 1170(h).*
- *Violations of probation or parole where the underlying crime was committed on or after October 1, 2011.*

3. *FORMULA C [Credit formula effective September 28, 2010]*

The following formula is used for defendants *sent to state prison* (unless a special credit limitation or exclusion applies):

For every day of actual time in custody, the defendant receives one day of conduct credit. Accordingly, if the defendant does 26 days in custody, he receives 26 days of conduct credits, for a total pre-sentence credit of 52 days. Under this formula, conduct credits can be either an even or odd number.

This credit formula applies in the following situations:

- *Crimes committed between September 28, 2010, and October 1, 2011.*
- *Probation violations based on underlying crimes committed between September 28, 2010, and October 1, 2011.*

E. Additional issues

1. *Whether disqualifying conditions must be pled and proved.*

The enhanced custody credits allowed by the amendment to sections 2933 and 4019 are not available to defendants who have prior violent or serious felony convictions listed in sections 667.5, subdivision (c), and 1192.7, subdivision (c), or who are required to register as a sex offender. But the credit statutes do not indicate whether these circumstances must be pled and proved for the court to deny the extra custody credit. There will be no issue if the defendant is actually

charged with and found to have committed a prior serious or violent felony, or if the defendant is being sentenced for a current crime that requires registration as a sex offender. The “plead and prove” requirement, however, will be an issue in all other circumstances. *People v. Lara* (2011) 193 Cal.App.4th 1393, and *People v. Jones* (2010) 188 Cal.App.4th 165, holding there is a pleading and proof requirement, have been granted review or depublished by the Supreme Court. *People v. James* (2011) 196 Cal.App.4th 1102, and *People v. Voravongsa* (2011) 197 Cal.App.4th 657, conclude there is no requirement to plead and prove the existence of a prior disqualifying strike. There is no reason to suggest that these cases not equally applicable to other disqualifying factors. The Supreme Court has also granted review of these cases.

The pleading and proof requirement remains a matter of some dispute. Most notably, neither section 2933 nor 4019 contain such an explicit requirement. A similar circumstance arises with a defendant’s eligibility for Proposition 36 treatment. Except in limited circumstances, a defendant with a prior serious or violent felony conviction is not eligible for Proposition 36. (Pen. Code, § 1210.1, subd. (b)(1).) *In re Varnell* (2003) 30 Cal.4th 1132, 1143, concluded the prosecution is not required to plead and prove the disqualifying convictions. The court also concluded no such duty was compelled by *Apprendi v. New Jersey* (2000) 530 U.S. 466. (*Id.* at pp. 1141-1142.) Finally, it should be recalled that *Apprendi* and its progeny have only been applied in determining the maximum sentence a person is ordered to serve; they have never been applied to such things as the calculation of the minimum term of custody. (See, *e.g.*, where *Blakely v. Washington* (2004) 542 U.S. 296, 304-305 expressly distinguished its circumstances from those in *McMillan v. Pennsylvania* (1986) 477 U.S. 79, where the court imposed a statutory *minimum* if particular facts were found.)

2. *Effect of striking of prior serious or violent felonies under section 1385*

Whether the exercise of the court’s discretion under section 1385 to dismiss prior serious or violent felony convictions will effect the award of credits also is a matter of some dispute. *People v. Jones* (2010) 188 Cal.App.4th 165, *People v. Koontz* (2011) 193 Cal.App.4th 151, and *People v. Lara* (2011) 193 Cal.App.4th 1393, which hold that such a dismissal does allow the court to grant the enhanced custody credits, have been granted review or depublished. *People v. Voravongsa* (2011) 197 Cal.App.4th 657, concludes the court may not use section 1385 to dismiss factors that would disqualify a defendant from receiving the enhanced custody credit. *Voravongsa* has been granted review.

Again, this issue was discussed in *Varnell*. The court concluded no exercise of discretion under section 1385 will remove the serious or violent felonies for the purpose of qualifying the defendant for Proposition 36 treatment. (*Varnell* at pp. 1136-1139.) “[W]hen a court has struck a prior conviction allegation, it has not

'wipe[d] out' that conviction as though the defendant had never suffered it; rather, the conviction remains a part of the defendant's personal history, and a court may consider it when sentencing the defendant for other convictions, including others in the same proceeding.” (*People v. Garcia* (1999) 20 Cal.4th 490, 499.)

3. *Correction of award of credits for cases not final on January 25, 2010*

If the Supreme Court determines that the provisions of section 4019 effective January 25, 2010, are retroactive, defendants may ask the trial court to correct the award of the pre-sentence credits for cases that were not final as of January 25, 2010. There is a question whether the trial court has jurisdiction to correct the previously entered award of credits. There is no problem if a defendant seeks the modification before filing a notice of appeal. Generally, though, the filing of a notice of appeal divests the trial court of jurisdiction to act. (*In re Antilia* (2009) 176 Cal.App.4th 622, 629.)

There is authority, however, that *requires* a defendant to seek correction of the award of pre-sentence credit in the trial court before raising the issue on appeal. Penal Code section 1237.1 prohibits a defendant from taking an appeal from a judgment of conviction on the ground of an error in the calculation of pre-sentence custody credits, “unless the defendant first presents the claim in the trial court at the time of sentencing, or if the error is not discovered until after sentencing, the defendant first makes a motion for correction of the record in the trial court.” Case law dictates that the appropriate method for correcting errors in the calculation of credits is to move for correction in the trial court first. (See, e.g., *People v. Salazar* (1994) 29 Cal.App.4th 1550, 1556-1557; *People v. Culpepper* (1994) 24 Cal.App.4th 1135, 1138-1139; *People v. Fares* (1993) 16 Cal.App.4th 954, 957; *People v. Little* (1993) 19 Cal.App.4th 449.) An exception to that rule is when other issues are also being raised on appeal. In such instances, the credit issue need not first be raised in the trial court. (*People v. Acosta* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 411, 427 [“section 1237.1, when properly construed does *not* require defense counsel to file a motion to correct a pre-sentence award of credits in order to raise that question on appeal when other issues are litigated on appeal.”].) The reason for such a rule is that the trial court is in a better position to access the records that are necessary to determine the appropriate award of conduct credits. (*People v. Hyde* (1975) 49 Cal.App.3d 97, 102.) Given such authority, the trial court clearly has jurisdiction to make a correction in pre-sentence custody credits even after the filing of a notice of appeal.

4. *No conduct credits for “flash incarceration”*

Defendants serving a period of “flash incarceration” while on PCRS pursuant to sections 3000.08 or 3454 are to receive no conduct credits under section 4019. (§ 4019, subd. (i).)

5. *Equal protection*

In re Kemp (2011) 192 Cal.App.4th 252, at least as to persons sentenced to state prison, holds the law effective January 25, 2010, and September 28, 2010, to the extent it increases a defendant's custody credit, will apply regardless of when the judgment becomes final. To deny the enhanced credit would deny such defendants equal protection of the law. Nothing in the opinion suggests its logic would be inapplicable to persons serving county jail sentences. Thus far *Kemp* is the only case to apply the legislative changes to sections 4019 and 2933 fully retroactively. *Kemp* has been granted review by the Supreme Court.

Although the Supreme Court has picked up *Kemp*, it is particularly interesting to note *Kemp*'s reliance on *In re Kapperman* (1974) 11 Cal.3d 542, an opinion which appears to remain good law. *Kemp* observed: "On the issue of whether the date of finality of judgment constitutes a rational basis for disparate treatment between two subgroups of prisoners equally situated, we find guidance in the reasoning of *In re Kapperman* (1974) 11 Cal.3d 542, 114 Cal.Rptr. 97, 522 P.2d 657 (*Kapperman*). *Kapperman* was delivered into the custody of the Director of Corrections prior to March 4, 1972. At that time, he was not statutorily entitled to, and did not receive, credit for 304 days he spent in actual custody prior to his delivery to the Director of Corrections. (*Id.* at pp. 544–545, 114 Cal.Rptr. 97, 522 P.2d 657.) Effective March 4, 1972, section 2900.5 provided that actual custody credit be given to prisoners upon their delivery to the Director of Corrections. (*Kapperman*, at pp. 544–545, 114 Cal.Rptr. 97, 522 P.2d 657.) However, subdivision (c) of section 2900.5 made the section applicable only to prisoners delivered to the Director of Corrections on or after March 4, 1972. (*Kapperman*, at p. 545, 114 Cal.Rptr. 97, 522 P.2d 657.) (¶) *Kapperman* contended that the state's classifications arbitrarily denied him a substantial benefit without there being a rational relationship for doing so, thereby violating federal and state principles of equal protection. (*Kapperman*, *supra*, 11 Cal.3d at p. 545, 114 Cal.Rptr. 97, 522 P.2d 657.) The California Supreme Court agreed, concluding that because section 2900.5, subdivision (c)'s prospective-only limitation bore no legitimate purpose to the classifications, such classifications violated both the state and federal equal protection principles. (*Kapperman*, at pp. 549–550, 114 Cal.Rptr. 97, 522 P.2d 657.) Therefore, the credit provided under section 2900.5 was extended to those prisoners either incarcerated or on parole for felony offenses regardless of the date of their commitment to state prison. (*Kapperman*, at pp. 549–550, 114 Cal.Rptr. 97, 522 P.2d 657.)"

People v. Borg (2011) ___ Cal.App.4th ___ [2010 WL 1075887], held the Equal Protection Clause did not apply to persons who committed crimes prior to October 1, 2011. The court reasoned: "While defendant proposes that 'there is no rational basis' for precluding a retroactive application of the more generous formula of conduct credits to some prisoners, based only on the dates their crimes were committed or credits were earned, we perceive a legitimate reason for limiting the extension of credits. The Legislature may have decided that the nature and scope of the fiscal emergency required

granting additional credits to the specified classes of prisoners previously denied them – those who must register as sex offenders, or committed serious felonies, or had suffered a prior conviction for a serious or violent felony – only after the effective date of the amendments. That basis for the legislation is substantiated by the explicit articulation in subdivision (h) of section 4019 of a prospective application of the statutory amendments. Reducing prison populations by granting a prospective-only increase in conduct credits strikes a proper, rational balance between the state's fiscal concerns and its public safety interests.” (*Id.* At p. ____.) The opinion did not discuss *Kapperman*.

6. Credits and Three Strikes cases

It is important to note that the various rules regarding the calculation of custody credits have no effect on the credit awarded by CDCR to persons sentenced under the Three Strikes law. Subdivision (c)(5) of section 667 and subdivision (a)(5) of section 1170.12 specify that conduct credits are limited to 20 percent while the defendant is serving the prison sentence. The only statutes that further restrict conduct credits for strike commitments are section 2933.1 for violent offenders (15% limit), and 2933.2 for persons convicted of murder (no conduct credit).

The award of pre-sentence conduct credit for strike offenders, however, will be the normal 4019 credits, determined in accordance with the credit statute applicable at the time the crime was committed. Again, the only exception will be persons coming within the provisions of 2933.1 (15% if committed to prison for a violent offense) and 2933.2 (no conduct credit for murder).

APPENDIX I: Summary of Key Provisions

**AWARDING CONDUCT CREDITS UNDER
P.C. §§ 4019 and 2933**

Summary of Key Provisions

Couzens and Bigelow

Key Time Periods

Time Period	Jail Sentence	Prison Sentence
<i>Crimes and VOP's committed, sentenced, and final prior to 1/25/10</i>	Formula A – for pre and post-sentence credit	Formula A – for pre-sentence credit (unless limited)
<i>Crimes and VOP's committed and sentenced prior to 1/25/10, but not final</i>	Formula A – for pre and post-sentence credit [if NOT retroactive] Formula B – for pre and post-sentence credit [if retroactive] Formula A – if excluded	Formula A – for pre-sentence credit (unless limited) [if NOT retroactive] Formula B – for pre-sentence credit (unless limited) [if retroactive] Formula A – for pre-sentence credit if excluded (unless limited)
<i>Crimes and VOP's committed prior to 1/25/10, but sentenced after</i>	Formula B – for pre and post-sentence credit Formula A – if excluded	Formula B – for pre-sentence credit (unless limited) Formula A – for pre-sentence credit if excluded (unless limited)
<i>Crimes and VOP's with underlying crimes committed between 1/25/10, and 9/28/10</i>	Formula B – for pre and post-sentence credit Formula A – if excluded	Formula B – for pre-sentence credit (unless limited) Formula A – for pre-sentence credit if excluded (unless limited)
<i>Crimes and VOP's with underlying crimes committed between 9/28/10, and 10/1/11</i>	Formula A – for pre and post-sentence credit	Formula C – for pre-sentence credit (unless limited) Formula A – for pre-sentence credit if excluded (unless limited)
<i>Crimes and VOP's with underlying crimes committed on or after 10/1/11</i>	Formula B – for pre and post-sentence credit	Formula B – for pre-sentence credit (unless limited) Post-sentence credit is under section 2933

Credit Formulas

Formula A – Traditional 4019

“Statutory” Formula (*In re Marquez* (2003) 30 Cal.4th 14, 25-26):

- Divide actual time in custody by 4 (drop fractions and don’t “round up”)
- Multiply by 2 = conduct credits
- Conduct credits + actual time = total credits

“Shortcut” Formula:

- Actual [-1 if odd] ÷ 2 = conduct [-1 if odd]

Conduct credits always will be even number. No entitlement to credits unless confined in or committed to county jail for 6 or more days.

Formula B

The following formula is used when the credit provisions effective January 25, 2010, and October 1, 2011, are applicable:

“Statutory” Formula (applying the reasoning of *Marquez* to the interim provisions of section 4019):

- Divide actual time in custody by 2 (drop fractions and don’t “round up”)
- Multiply by 2 = conduct credits
- Conduct credits + actual time = total credits

“Shortcut” Formula:

- Actual = conduct credit [-1 if odd]

Conduct credits always will be even number. No entitlement to credits unless confined in or committed to county jail for 4 or more days.

Formula C

For every day of actual local time, award one day of conduct credit.

Applicable only to state prison sentences. Conduct credits can be either even or odd number.

Exclusions From Enhanced Credits (Jail or State Prison)

P.C. § 290 registration – current crime, or prior crime [pled and proved?]

Committed for serious felony (P.C. § 1192.7(c)) – current crime

Prior serious (P.C. § 1192.7(c)) or violent felony (P.C. § 667.5(c)) conviction [pled and proved?]

Credits limited – P.C. §§ 2933.1, 2933.2