

SUPREME COURT COPY

COPY

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,)
) No. S127621
Plaintiff and Respondent,)
) San Diego County
 v.) Superior Court
) No. SCD161640
 SCOTT THOMAS ERSKINE,)
)
Defendant and Appellant.)
 _____)

SUPREME COURT
FILED

APR 10 2014

Frank A. McGuire Clerk

Deputy

Automatic Appeal From the Superior Court of San Diego County
Honorable Kenneth K. So, Judge

APPELLANT'S OPENING BRIEF

KIMBERLY J. GROVE
Attorney at Law
CA STATE BAR NO. 095225
P.O. Box 425
Ligonier, Pennsylvania 15658
(724) 238-3497

Attorney for Appellant

DEATH PENALTY

COPY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STATEMENT OF APPEALABILITY	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	
I. The Charges	1
II. Pre-trial Proceedings and Voir Dire	4
III. The Guilt Phase	4
IV. First Penalty Phase	5
V. Second Penalty Phase	6
VI. Post-Trial Proceedings and Sentencing	7
STATEMENT OF THE FACTS	
THE GUILT PHASE	
I. The Crimes	8
II. Other Crimes Evidence	
A. Jennifer M.	14
B. Renee Baker	16
THE SECOND PENALTY PHASE	
I. Prosecution Evidence	
A. Circumstances of the Crimes	18
B. Other Criminal Conduct	
1. <i>Douglas Erskine</i>	18
2. <i>Judy C.</i>	20
3. <i>Barbara G. (Spring 1976)</i>	21
4. <i>Randie C.</i>	23
5. <i>Colleen L. (April 17, 1978)</i>	24

6.	<i>Virgen M. (April 18, 1978)</i>	25
7.	<i>Robert M. (June 24, 1980)</i>	27
8.	<i>Michael A. (January 6, 1981)</i>	30
9.	<i>Deborah Erskine (May 14, 1989)</i>	32
10.	<i>Renee Baker (June 1989)</i>	34
11.	<i>Phyllis Serrano (March 11, 1993)</i>	34
12.	<i>Jennifer M. (October 22, 1993)</i>	35
II.	Defense Evidence	
A.	Appellant's Background	37
B.	Neurological and Psychological Assessments	
1.	<i>Learning Disabilities</i>	46
2.	<i>Neurological Impairment</i>	47
3.	<i>Mental Disorders</i>	48
III.	Prosecution's Rebuttal Evidence	50

AUTHORITIES AND ARGUMENT

I.	THE TRIAL COURT ERRED IN ADMITTING IMPROPER CHARACTER EVIDENCE WHICH WAS MORE PREJUDICIAL THAN PROBATIVE.	
A.	Proceedings Below	51
B.	Evidence Regarding the Prior Incidents Should Have Been Excluded as Improper Character Evidence.	
1.	<i>General Principles Regarding Other Crimes Evidence.</i>	57
(a)	<i>Subdivision (b) of Section 1101</i>	60
(b)	<i>Evidence Code section 1108</i>	62
(c)	<i>Standard of Review</i>	65

2.	<i>The Evidence Did Not Tend Logically, Naturally and by Reasonable Inference to Prove a Material Issue of Fact as Required for Admission Under Subdivision (b) of Section 1101.</i>	67
	(a) <i>Identity</i>	68
	(b) <i>Common Scheme or Plan</i>	71
	(c) <i>Intent</i>	72
	(d) <i>The Trial Court Erred in Admitting the Evidence Under Section 1101</i>	74
3.	<i>The Trial Court Erred in Admitting the Prior Crimes Evidence Under Evidence Code Section 1108.</i>	75
4.	<i>The Evidence Should Have Been Excluded Under Evidence Code Section 352.</i>	78
C.	Prejudice	84
II.	THE TRIAL COURT'S IMPROPER REMOVAL OF PROSPECTIVE JUROR #154 FOR CAUSE NECESSITATES REVERSAL OF THE DEATH PENALTY JUDGMENT.	
A.	Introduction	87
B.	General Legal Principles	88
C.	Factual Background	89
D.	The Exclusion of Prospective Juror #154 for Cause Was Not Supported by Substantial Evidence That Her Feelings about the Death Penalty Would Prevent or Substantially Impair Her Ability to Perform Her Duties as a Juror.	97
E.	Remedy	104
III.	THE FEDERAL AND STATE CONSTITUTIONS BAR THE RE-TRIAL OF THE PENALTY PHASE OF A CAPITAL CASE AFTER THE JURY IN THE FIRST PENALTY TRIAL WAS UNABLE TO REACH A UNANIMOUS VERDICT.	
A.	Introduction	105

B.	Proceedings Below	106
C.	Penalty Phase Retrials After A Hung Jury Are In Conflict With Evolving Standards Of Decency, Which Are Reflected In The Death Penalty Statutes Of 23 State And Federal Jurisdictions, And Such Retrials Are Barred By The Federal And State Constitutions.	106
IV.	THE DEATH SENTENCE MUST BE STRICKEN BECAUSE EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE SHOWS THAT THE CALIFORNIA DEATH PENALTY SCHEME FAILS IN PRACTICE TO MEET MINIMUM CONSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENTS; BUT IF IT IS NOT UNCONSTITUTIONAL, THEN THE TRIAL COURT ERRED BY REJECTING ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURES TO OVERCOME FAILINGS SHOWN BY THAT EVIDENCE.	
A.	Introduction	116
B.	The Record	117
C.	The Constitutional Violation	122
D.	The Trial Court Erred in Refusing to Implement Alternative Remedies	125
V.	THE TRIAL JUDGE VIOLATED APPELLANT'S CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS WHEN HE INSTRUCTED JURORS THAT THEY SHOULD REACH A VERDICT ON PENALTY "REGARDLESS OF THE CONSEQUENCES."	
A.	Introduction	127
B.	Instructing the Jurors That They Should Reach a Verdict on Penalty Regardless of the Consequences Diminished Their Sense of Responsibility.	128

V.	BOTH TODAY AND AT THE TIME OF THE CHARGED MURDERS IN THIS CASE, THE CALIFORNIA DEATH PENALTY STATUTE HAS FAILED TO NARROW THE CLASS OF OFFENDERS ELIGIBLE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY AND THUS VIOLATES THE EIGHTH AMENDMENT OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AND ARTICLE I, SECTION 17 OF THE CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION.	
A.	Introduction	131
B.	Rather Than Narrow the Class of Defendants Eligible for the Death Penalty California's Death Penalty Statute Was Intended to, and Does on Its Face, Make the Vast Majority of Murderers Eligible for the Death Penalty. . . .	134
C.	Empirical Evidence Demonstrates that, in Practice, Penal Code Section 190.2, as It Existed in 1993, Did Not Narrow The Class of Death Eligible Murders.	145
D.	Conclusion	148
VII.	EXECUTING A PERSON SUCH AS APPELLANT, WHO IS PSYCHIATRICALY, ORGANICALLY, AND EMOTIONALLY DISORDERED, IS CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT IN VIOLATION OF THE EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS OF THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION AND THE PARALLEL PROVISIONS OF THE STATE CONSTITUTION, AND VIOLATES THE DUE PROCESS AND EQUAL PROTECTION CLAUSES OF THE STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS.	
A.	Executing a Person Who is Psychiatrically, Organically, and Emotionally Disordered, Is Cruel And Unusual Punishment in Violation of the Eighth Amendment	150
B.	The Death Sentence Violates Appellant's Rights Under the Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses of the State and Federal Constitutions.	159

C.	Appellant’s Death Sentence Must Be Reversed.	162
VIII.	CALIFORNIA’S USE OF THE DEATH PENALTY AS A REGULAR FORM OF PUNISHMENT FALLS SHORT OF INTERNATIONAL NORMS OF HUMANITY AND DECENCY AND VIOLATES THE EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS.	163
IX.	CALIFORNIA’S DEATH PENALTY STATUTE, AS INTERPRETED BY THIS COURT AND APPLIED AT APPELLANT’S TRIAL, VIOLATES THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION.	
A.	Appellant’s Death Penalty Is Invalid Because Penal Code Section 190.3(a) as Applied Allows Arbitrary and Capricious Imposition of Death in Violation of The Fifth, Sixth, Eighth, And Fourteenth Amendments to The United States Constitution.	169
B.	California’s Death Penalty Statute Contains No Safeguards to Avoid Arbitrary and Capricious Sentencing and Deprives Defendants of the Right to a Jury Determination of Each Factual Prerequisite to a Sentence of Death; It Therefore Violates the Sixth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.	171
1.	<i>California’s Death Penalty Scheme Violates the Sixth Amendment Right to Jury Trial Because California Does Not Require the Jury to Find Beyond a Reasonable Doubt, and Unanimously (or by a Majority), That One or More Aggravating Factors Existed and That These Factors Outweighed Mitigating Factors.</i>	<i>172</i>
a.	<i>In the Wake of Apprendi, Ring, Blakely, and Cunningham, Any Jury Finding Necessary to the Imposition of Death Must Be Found True Beyond a Reasonable Doubt.</i>	<i>175</i>

b.	<i>The Requirements of Jury Agreement and Unanimity</i>	186
2.	<i>The Due Process and the Cruel and Unusual Punishment Clauses of the State and Federal Constitution Require That the Jury in a Capital Case Be Instructed That They May Impose a Sentence of Death Only If They Are Persuaded Beyond a Reasonable Doubt That the Aggravating Factors Outweigh the Mitigating Factors and That Death Is the Appropriate Penalty.</i>	191
3.	<i>California Law Violates the Sixth, Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution by Failing to Require That the Jury Make Written Findings Regarding Aggravating Factors Upon Which Its Death Verdict Is Based.</i>	196
4.	<i>California's Death Penalty Statute as Interpreted by this Court Forbids Inter-Case Proportionality Review, Thereby Guaranteeing Arbitrary, Discriminatory, or Disproportionate Impositions of the Death Penalty.</i>	199
C.	<i>The California Sentencing Scheme Violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Federal Constitution by Denying Procedural Safeguards to Capital Defendants That Are Afforded to Non-capital Defendants.</i>	201
D.	<i>The Prosecution May Not Rely in the Penalty Phase on Unadjudicated Criminal Activity; Further, Even If It Were Constitutionally Permissible for the Prosecutor to Do So, Such Alleged Criminal Activity Could Not Constitutionally Serve as a Factor in Aggravation Unless Found to Be True Beyond a Reasonable Doubt by a Unanimous Jury.</i>	208

E.	The Use of Restrictive Adjectives in the List of Potential Mitigating Factors Impermissibly Acted as Barriers to Consideration of Mitigation by Appellant’s Jury.	209
F.	The Failure to Instruct That Statutory Mitigating Factors Were Relevant Solely as Potential Mitigators Precluded a Fair, Reliable, and Evenhanded Administration of the Capital Sanction.	209
G.	The Trial Court’s Failure to Delete Inapplicable Sentencing Factors From the Jury Instructions Violated Appellant’s Constitutional Rights.	212
	CONCLUSION	214
	CERTIFICATION OF WORD COUNT	214

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Adams v. Texas</i> (1980) 448 U.S. 38	99
<i>Addington v. Texas</i> (1979) 441 U.S. 418	192
<i>Amdahl Corp. v. County of Santa Clara</i> (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th 604 ..	67
<i>Apodaca v. Oregon</i> (1972) 406 U.S. 404	187
<i>Apprendi v. New Jersey</i> (2000) 530 U.S. 466	173-179, 183-185, 209
<i>Arizona v. Fulminante</i> (1991) 499 U.S. 279	85
<i>Atkins v. Virginia</i> (2002) 536 U.S. 304	107-112, 151-167, 204, 207
<i>Beck v. Alabama</i> (1980) 447 U.S. 625	194-195, 205, 213
<i>Blakely v. Washington</i> (2004) 542 U.S. 296	173-178, 181-187, 190, 207, 209
<i>Boulden v. Holman</i> (1969) 394 U.S. 478	97
<i>Brown v. Louisiana</i> (1980) 447 U.S. 323	187
<i>Bush v. Gore</i> (2000) 531 U.S. 98	206
<i>Caldwell v. Mississippi</i> (1985) 472 U.S. 320	124
<i>California v. Brown</i> (1987) 479 U.S. 538	196
<i>California v. Ramos</i> (1983) 463 U.S. 992	114-115, 205-206
<i>Campbell v. Blodgett</i> (9th Cir. 1993) 997 F.2d 512	211
<i>Carlos v. Superior Court</i> (1983) 35 Cal.3d 131	135-136
<i>Carsey v. United States</i> (D.C. Cir. 1967) 392 F.2d 810	113

<i>Chapman v. California</i> (1967) 386 U.S. 18	85
<i>Charfauros v. Board of Elections</i> (9 th Cir. 2001) 249 F.3d 941 ...	206-208
<i>City of Cleburne, Tex. v. Cleburne Living Center</i> (1985) 473 U.S. 432	159
<i>City of Sacramento v. Drew</i> (1989) 207 Cal.App.3d 1287	66
<i>Cleburne v. Cleburne Living Center, Inc.</i> (1985) 473 U.S. 432 ...	160-161
<i>Coker v. Georgia</i> (1977) 433 U.S. 584	107-108, 204
<i>Commonwealth v. O'Neal</i> (Mass. 1975) 327 N.E.2d 662	201
<i>Conservatorship of Roulet</i> (1979) 23 Cal.3d 219	192-194
<i>Cunningham v. California</i> (2007) 549 U.S. 270	173-178
<i>Den ex dem. Murray v. Hoboken Land and Improvement Co.</i> (1855) 59 U.S. (18 How.) 272	187
<i>Diaz v. State</i> (Fla. 2006) 945 So.2d 1136	153
<i>Eddings v. Oklahoma</i> (1982) 455 U.S. 104	103, 124
<i>Enmund v. Florida</i> (1982) 458 U.S. 782	107-108, 150, 204
<i>Estelle v. McGuire</i> (1991) 502 U.S. 62	85
<i>Fetterly v. Paskett</i> (9 th Cir. 1993) 997 F.2d 1295	211
<i>Ford v. Wainwright</i> (1986) 477 U.S. 399	107, 204-205
<i>Furman v. Georgia</i> (1972) 408 U.S. 238	110, 116, 131, 145, 149, 164, 200
<i>Garceau v. Woodford</i> (9 th Cir. 2001) 275 F.3d 769	85
<i>Gardner v. Florida</i> (1977) 430 U.S. 349	191, 205

<i>Godfrey v. Georgia</i> (1980) 446 U.S. 420	123
<i>Graham v. Florida</i> (2010) 560 U.S. 48	109
<i>Gray v. Mississippi</i> (1987) 481 U.S. 648	87, 104
<i>Green v. United States</i> (1957) 355 U.S. 184	113-114
<i>Gregg v. Georgia</i> (1976) 428 U.S. 153	116, 123, 132, 146, 196, 205
<i>Griffin v. United States</i> (1991) 502 U.S. 46	186
<i>Harmelin v. Michigan</i> (1991) 501 U.S. 957	188
<i>Heller v. Doe</i> (1993) 509 U.S. 312	160-161
<i>Hicks v. Oklahoma</i> (1980) 447 U.S. 343	84
<i>Hilton v. Guyot</i> (1895) 159 U.S. 113	164
<i>Hovey v. Superior Court</i> (1980) 28 Cal. 3d 1	116
<i>In re Charlisse C.</i> (2008) 45 Cal.4th 145	101, 103
<i>In re Eric J.</i> (1979) 25 Cal.3d 522	160
<i>In re Neville</i> (5th Cir. 2006) 440 F.3d 220	153
<i>In re Smith</i> (2008) 42 Cal.4th 1251	160
<i>In re Sturm</i> (1974) 11 Cal.3d 258	197
<i>In re Winship</i> (1970) 397 U.S. 358	191
<i>Johnson v. Louisiana</i> (1972) 406 U.S. 356	187
<i>Johnson v. Mississippi</i> (1988) 486 U.S. 578	187
<i>Johnson v. State</i> (Nev. 2002) 59 P.3d 450	176, 183

<i>Jones v. United States</i> (1999) 527 U.S. 373	110
<i>Kansas v. Marsh</i> (2006) 548 U.S. 163	168, 200
<i>Kennedy v. Louisiana</i> (2008) 554 U.S. 407	156-159
<i>Kinsella v. United States</i> (1960) 361 U.S. 234	205
<i>Lewis v. Jeffers</i> (1990) 497 U.S. 764	113
<i>Lewis v. State</i> (Ga. 2005) 620 S.E.2d 778	153
<i>Lockett v. Ohio</i> (1978) 438 U.S. 586	124
<i>Lockhart v. McCree</i> (1986) 476 U.S. 162	89
<i>Long Beach City Employees Assn. v. City of Long Beach</i> (1986) 41 Cal.3d 937	136
<i>Lungren v. Deukmejian</i> (1988) 45 Cal.3d 727	136
<i>Manduley v. Superior Court</i> (2002) 27 Cal.4th 537	160
<i>Martin v. Waddell's Lessee</i> (1842) 41 U.S. 367	164, 165, 167
<i>Matheney v. State</i> (Ind. 1992) 583 N.E.2d 1202	140, 141
<i>Matthews v. Eldridge</i> (1976) 424 U.S. 319	192
<i>Maynard v. Cartwright</i> (1988) 486 U.S. 356	122-123
<i>McCleskey v. Kemp</i> (1987) 481 U.S. 279	204
<i>McGautha v. California</i> (1971) 402 U.S. 183	103, 104
<i>McKinney v. Rees</i> (9 th Cir. 1993) 993 F.2d 1378	58, 85
<i>McKoy v. North Carolina</i> (1990) 494 U.S. 433	112
<i>Michelson v. United States</i> (1948) 335 U.S. 469	59, 84, 86

<i>Miller v. United States</i> (1871) 78 U.S. 268	164
<i>Mills v. Maryland</i> (1988) 486 U.S. 367	124, 197, 208
<i>Miyamoto v. Department of Motor Vehicles</i> (2009) 176 Cal.App.4th 1210	66, 101
<i>Monge v. California</i> (1998) 524 U.S. 721 ...	185-188, 194-196, 201, 208
<i>Morgan v. Illinois</i> (1992) 504 U.S. 719	87, 124-125
<i>Myers v. Ylst</i> (9th Cir. 1990) 897 F.2d 417	197-200, 208
<i>Nordlinger v. Hahn</i> (1992) 505 U.S. 1	159
<i>Ohio Adult Parole Auth. v. Woodard</i> (1998) 523 U.S. 272	160
<i>Old Chief v. United States</i> (1997) 519 U.S. 172	78-79
<i>Owen v. Superior Court</i> (1979) 88 Cal.App.3d 757	135
<i>Payne v. Tennessee</i> (1991) 501 U.S. 808	85
<i>Penry v. Lynaugh</i> (1989) 492 U.S. 302	107-109, 124
<i>People v Bacigalupo</i> (1993) 6 Cal.4th 857	132
<i>People v. Adcox</i> (1988) 47 Cal.3d 207	145-150
<i>People v. Alcala</i> (1984) 36 Cal.3d 604	61-62
<i>People v. Alexander</i> (2010) 49 Cal.4th 846	127-128
<i>People v. Allen</i> (1986) 42 Cal.3d 1222	176, 204-207
<i>People v. Anderson</i> (2001) 25 Cal.4th 543	178-181
<i>People v. Antick</i> (1975) 15 Cal.3d 79	69
<i>People v. Bacigalupo</i> (1993) 6 Cal.4th 457	113, 132, 148

<i>People v. Balcom</i> (1994) 7 Cal.4th 414	69-73
<i>People v. Beames</i> (2007) 40 Cal.4th 907	134
<i>People v. Bean</i> (1988) 46 Cal.3d 919	150-151
<i>People v. Beltran</i> (1989) 210 Cal.App.3d 1295	141
<i>People v. Bemore</i> (2000) 22 Cal.4th 809	134
<i>People v. Bender</i> (1945) 27 Cal.2d 164	140
<i>People v. Birden</i> (1986) 179 Cal.App.3d 1020	143
<i>People v. Bittaker</i> (1989) 48 Cal.3d 1046	170-171
<i>People v. Black</i> (2005) 35 Cal.4th 1238	177-178
<i>People v. Boyd</i> (1985) 38 Cal.3d 765	211
<i>People v. Bradford</i> (1997) 15 Cal.4th 1229	85
<i>People v. Bolin</i> (1998) 18 Cal.4th 297	186
<i>People v. Branch</i> (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 274	84
<i>People v. Britt</i> (2002) 104 Cal.App.4th 500	63, 75
<i>People v. Brown</i> (1985) 40 Cal.3d 512	127
<i>People v. Brown (Brown I)</i> (1985) 40 Cal.3d 512	176
<i>People v. Cahill</i> (1993) 5 Cal.4th 478	85
<i>People v. Carpenter</i> (1997) 15 Cal.4th 312	211
<i>People v. Carpenter</i> (1999) 21 Cal.4th 1016	212
<i>People v. Cash</i> (2002) 28 Cal.4th 703	125

<i>People v. Cole</i> (2004) 33 Cal.4th 1158	72
<i>People v. Coleman</i> (1988) 46 Cal.3d 749	138
<i>People v. Cooper</i> (1991) 53 Cal.3d 1158	143
<i>People v. Crittenden</i> (1994) 9 Cal.4th 83	89, 96
<i>People v. Cudjo</i> (1993) 6 Cal.4th 585	65
<i>People v. Daniels</i> (1991) 52 Cal.3d 815	67, 77, 84
<i>People v. Dejourney</i> (2011) 192 Cal.App.4th 1091	65
<i>People v. Demetrulias</i> (2006) 39 Cal.4th 1	176
<i>People v. Dickey</i> (2005) 35 Cal.4th 884	176
<i>People v. Dillon</i> (1983) 34 Cal.3d 441	133, 143
<i>People v. Duncan</i> (1991) 53 Cal.3d 955	130-131
<i>People v. Dyer</i> (1988) 45 Cal.3d 26	169
<i>People v. Easley</i> (1983) 34 Cal.3d 858	127
<i>People v. Edelbacher</i> (1989) 47 Cal.3d 983	138, 140
<i>People v. Ewoldt</i> (1994) 7 Cal.4th 380	62, 65, 67, 69, 71-74, 81-82
<i>People v. Fairbank</i> (1997) 16 Cal.4th 1223	172
<i>People v. Falsetta</i> (1999) 21 Cal.4th 903	59-60, 63-65, 75 79, 81-82
<i>People v. Farnam</i> (2002) 28 Cal.4th 107	175-176
<i>People v. Fauber</i> (1992) 2 Cal.4th 792	196

<i>People v. Feagley</i> (1975) 14 Cal.3d 338	192
<i>People v. Fierro</i> (1991) 1 Cal.4th 173	200
<i>People v. Fitch</i> (1997) 55 Cal.App.4th 172	63
<i>People v. Flood</i> (1998) 18 Cal.4th 470	128
<i>People v. Foster</i> (2010) 50 Cal.4th 1301	81-82
<i>People v. Frierson</i> (1979) 25 Cal.3d 142	115-116
<i>People v. Frye</i> (1998) 18 Cal.4th 894	134
<i>People v. Garceau</i> (1993) 6 Cal.4th 140	59, 77, 85
<i>People v. Green</i> (1980) 27 Cal.3d 1	135
<i>People v. Griffin</i> (2004) 33 Cal.4th 536	89
<i>People v. Guerrero</i> (1976) 16 Cal.3d 719	59, 61
<i>People v. Guiton</i> (1993) 4 Cal.4th 1116	213
<i>People v. Gurule</i> (2002) 28 Cal.4th 557	212
<i>People v. Hardy</i> (1992) 2 Cal.4th 86	170
<i>People v. Harris</i> (1998) 60 Cal.App.4th 727	65-66
<i>People v. Haston</i> (1968) 69 Cal.2d 223	68
<i>People v. Hawthorne</i> (1992) 4 Cal.4th 43	175, 190, 198
<i>People v. Hayes</i> (1990) 52 Cal.3d 577	190, 197
<i>People v. Heard</i> (2003) 31 Cal.4th 946	104
<i>People v. Hernandez</i> (2003) 30 Cal.4th 835	180-182

<i>People v. Hillhouse</i> (2002) 27 Cal.4th 469	133
<i>People v. Hollie</i> (2010) 180 Cal.App.4th 1262	79-80
<i>People v. Hovarter</i> (2008) 44 Cal.4th 983	67, 69-70
<i>People v. Isom</i> (2006) 145 Cal.App.4th 1371	63
<i>People v. James</i> (2000) 81 Cal.App.4th 1343	63-64, 75
<i>People v. Jenkins</i> (2000) 22 Cal.4th 900	160
<i>People v. Jennings</i> (1988) 46 Cal.3d 963	128
<i>People v. Jennings</i> (2000) 81 Cal.App.4th 1301	65, 79
<i>People v. Johnson</i> (1992) 5 Cal.App.4th 552	143-144
<i>People v. Karis</i> (1988) 46 Cal.3d 612	83
<i>People v. Kaurish</i> (1990) 52 Cal.3d 648	100
<i>People v. Kaurish</i> (1990) 52 Cal.3d 648	88
<i>People v. Keenan</i> (1988) 46 Cal.3d 478	128
<i>People v. Kelly</i> (2007) 42 Cal.4th 763	61-62, 65, 70-71, 86
<i>People v. Kimble</i> (1988) 44 Cal.3d 480	110
<i>People v. Kipp</i> (1998) 18 Cal.4th 349	67
<i>People v. Laws</i> (1993) 12 Cal.App.4th 786	141
<i>People v. Lindberg</i> (2008) 45 Cal.4th 1	65
<i>People v. Louis</i> (1986) 42 Cal.3d 969	85
<i>People v. Loy</i> (2011) 52 Cal.4th 46	65, 82

<i>People v. Marshall</i> (1990) 50 Cal.3d 907	200-201
<i>People v. Martinez</i> (2009) 47 Cal.4th 399	88
<i>People v. Mayfield</i> (1993) 5 Cal.4th 142	128
<i>People v. McCormack</i> (1991) 234 Cal.App.3d 253	143
<i>People v. McKinnon</i> (2011) 52 Cal.4th 610	97, 99
<i>People v. Medina</i> (1995) 11 Cal.4th 694	189
<i>People v. Mincey</i> (1992) 2 Cal.4th 408	131-132
<i>People v. Miramontes</i> (2010) 189 Cal.App.4th 1085	65
<i>People v. Montiel</i> (1994) 5 Cal.4th 877	211
<i>People v. Morales</i> (1989) 48 Cal.3d 527	140-141
<i>People v. Morrison</i> (2004) 34 Cal.4th 698	134
<i>People v. Morse</i> (1992) 2 Cal.App.4th 620	141
<i>People v. Mungia</i> (1991) 234 Cal.App.3d 1703	142
<i>People v. Nicolaus</i> (1991) 54 Cal.3d 551	170
<i>People v. Olivas</i> (1976) 17 Cal.3d 236	201-202
<i>People v. Ortiz</i> (2003) 109 Cal.App.4th 104	59
<i>People v. Pearson</i> (2012) 53 Cal.4th 306	104
<i>People v. Prieto</i> (2003) 30 Cal.4th 226	176, 179, 182, 202
<i>People v. Raley</i> (1992) 2 Cal.4th 870	138-139
<i>People v. Ramos</i> (1982) 30 Cal.3d 553	114

<i>People v. Ramos</i> (1984) 37 Cal.3d 136	114-115
<i>People v. Ravenscroft</i> (1988) 198 Cal.App.3d 639	143
<i>People v. Ray</i> (1996) 13 Cal.4th 313	129
<i>People v. Riccardi</i> (2012) 54 Cal.4th 758	87
<i>People v. Robinson</i> (2005) 37 Cal.4th 592	170
<i>People v. Rodriguez</i> (1986) 42 Cal.3d 730	195
<i>People v. Rogers</i> (2006) 39 Cal.4th 826	196
<i>People v. Rowland</i> (1992) 4 Cal.4th 238	81
<i>People v. Salemme</i> (1992) 2 Cal.App.4th 775	143
<i>People v. Schader</i> (1969) 71 Cal.2d 761	59
<i>People v. Sims</i> (1993) 5 Cal.4th 405	85-86
<i>People v. Smallwood</i> (1986) 42 Cal.3d 415	60-61, 67, 84, 86
<i>People v. Smith</i> (2005) 35 Cal.4th 334	83
<i>People v. Snow</i> (2003) 30 Cal.4th 43,	176, 181, 202
<i>People v. Spector</i> (2011) 194 Cal.App.4th 1335	67
<i>People v. Stanley</i> (1967) 67 Cal.2d 812	81
<i>People v. Steele</i> (2002) 27 Cal.4th 1230	77
<i>People v. Stewart</i> (2004) 33 Cal.4th 425	88-89, 96, 99-100, 103
<i>People v. Story</i> (2009) 45 Cal.4th 1282	76
<i>People v. Streeter</i> (2012) 54 Cal.4th 205	128

<i>People v. Taylor</i> (1990) 52 Cal.3d 719	186
<i>People v. Taylor</i> (2010) 48 Cal.4th 574	105
<i>People v. Thomas</i> (1977) 19 Cal.3d 630	192
<i>People v. Thomas</i> (2012) 53 Cal.4th 771	126
<i>People v. Thompson</i> (1980) 27 Cal.3d 303	57, 62, 76, 80, 84
<i>People v. Thompson</i> (1992) 7 Cal.App.4th 1966	142
<i>People v. Thornton</i> (1974) 11 Cal.3d 738	68
<i>People v. Walker</i> (1988) 47 Cal.3d 605	170
<i>People v. Walker</i> (2006) 139 Cal.App.4th 782	66
<i>People v. Webster</i> (1991) 54 Cal.3d 411	142
<i>People v. Wesson</i> (2006) 138 Cal.App.4th 959	82-83
<i>People v. Wheeler</i> (1978) 22 Cal.3d 258	189-190
<i>People v. Wilson</i> (2008) 44 Cal.4th 758	87
<i>People v. Yeoman</i> (2003) 31 Cal.4th 93	72-75
<i>People v. Zapien</i> (1993) 4 Cal.4th 929	84
<i>Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pa. v. Casey</i> (1992) 505 U.S. 833	159
<i>Plyler v. Doe</i> (1982) 457 U.S. 202	159
<i>Presnell v. Georgia</i> (1978) 439 U.S. 14	191-192
<i>Pulley v. Harris</i> (1984) 465 U.S. 37	168
<i>Pulley v. Harris</i> (1984) 465 U.S. 37	135

<i>Reno v. Flores</i> (1993) 507 U.S. 292	159
<i>Richardson v. United States</i> (1984) 486 U.S. 317	113
<i>Richardson v. United States</i> (1999) 526 U.S. 813	189
<i>Ring v. Arizona</i> (2002) 536 U.S. 584	173-179, 181-188, 190, 197-199, 207-209
<i>Roberts v. Louisiana</i> (1976) 428 U.S. 325	123
<i>Roberts v. Louisiana</i> (1977) 431 U.S. 633	124
<i>Robinson v. California</i> (1962) 370 U.S. 660	84
<i>Rockwell v. Superior Court</i> (1976) 18 Cal.3d 420	134
<i>Romer v. Evans</i> (1996) 517 U.S. 620	160
<i>Roper v. Simmons</i> (2005) 543 U.S. 551	107-109, 151-161
<i>Rosales-Lopes v. United States</i> (1981) 451 U.S. 182	125
<i>Santosky v. Kramer</i> (1982) 455 U.S. 745	185-186, 193
<i>Sargon Enterprises, Inc. v University of Southern California</i> (2012) 55 Cal.4th 747	66
<i>Sattazahn v. Pennsylvania</i> (2003) 537 U.S. 101	113
<i>Shafer v. South Carolina</i> (2001) 532 U.S. 36	123
<i>Simmons v. South Carolina</i> (1994) 512 U.S. 154	123
<i>Skaggs v. Commonwealth</i> (Ky. 1985) 694 S.W.2d 672	112
<i>Skinner v. Oklahoma</i> (1942) 316 U.S. 535	202
<i>Skipper v. South Carolina</i> (1986) 476 U.S. 1	124

<i>Solem v. Helm</i> (1983) 463 U.S. 277	151-153
<i>Speiser v. Randall</i> (1958) 357 U.S. 513	191-192
<i>Stanford v. Kentucky</i> (1989) 492 U.S. 361	163-164
<i>State v. Bobo</i> (Tenn. 1987) 727 S.W.2d 945	208-210
<i>State v. Hancock</i> (Ohio 2006) 840 N.E.2d 1032	153-155
<i>State v. Hochstein</i> (Neb. 2001) 632 N.W.2d 273	110
<i>State v. Johnson</i> (Mo. 2006) 207 S.W.3d 24	153
<i>State v. Ketterer</i> (Ohio 2006) 855 N.E.2d 48	155-156, 158
<i>State v. Nelson</i> (N.J. 2002) 803 A.2d 1	156
<i>State v. Peeler</i> (Conn. 2004) 857 A.2d 808	110
<i>State v. Ring</i> (Az. 2003) 65 P.3d 915	183
<i>State v. Rizzo</i> (Conn. 2003) 833 A.2d 363	195-196
<i>State v. Whitfield</i> (Mo. 2003) 107 S.W.3d 253	183
<i>Stringer v. Black</i> (1992) 503 U.S. 222	123
<i>Sullivan v. Louisiana</i> (1993) 508 U.S. 275	86
<i>Sumner v. Shuman</i> (1987) 483 U.S. 66	124
<i>Tennard v. Dretke</i> (2004) 542 U.S. 274	112
<i>Tennessee v. Garner</i> (1985) 471 U.S. 1	160
<i>Thompson v. Oklahoma</i> (1988) 487 U.S. 815	107, 164
<i>Townsend v. Sain</i> (1963) 372 U.S. 293	196

<i>Trop v. Dulles</i> (1958) 356 U.S. 86	106-107, 164-165
<i>Tuilaepa v. California</i> (1994) 512 U.S. 967	137, 170
<i>Turner v. Murray</i> (1986) 476 U.S. 28	123-125
<i>United States v. Booker</i> (2005) 543 U.S. 220	174-178, 209
<i>United States v. Guardia</i> (10 th Cir. 1998) 135 F.3d 1326	80
<i>United States v. Moussaoui</i> (4th Cir. 2010) 591 F.3d 263	111
<i>United States v. Myers</i> (5th Cir. 1977) 550 F.2d 1036	59
<i>Uttecht v. Brown</i> (2007) 551 U.S. 1	88, 104
<i>Vacco v. Quill</i> (1997) 521 U.S. 793	159
<i>Vorse v. Sarasy</i> (1997) 53 Cal.App.4th 998	83
<i>Wainwright v. Witt</i> (1985) 469 U.S. 412	87, 89, 97, 125
<i>Walton v. Arizona</i> (1990) 497 U.S. 639	173-174
<i>Washington v. Glucksberg</i> (1997) 521 U.S. 702	160-161
<i>Westbrook v. Milahy</i> (1970) 2 Cal.3d 765	201
<i>Williams v. Taylor</i> (2000) 529 U.S. 362	124
<i>Witherspoon v. Illinois</i> (1968) 391 U.S. 510	87, 103, 125
<i>Woldt v. People</i> (Colo. 2003) 64 P.3d 256	183
<i>Wolff v. McDonnell</i> (1974) 418 U.S. 539	161
<i>Woodson v. North Carolina</i> (1976) 428 U.S. 280	109, 124, 205, 210
<i>Yates v. Evatt</i> (1991) 500 U.S. 391	85-86

<i>Yoshisato v. Superior Court</i> (1992) 2 Cal.4th 978	136, 139
<i>Zablocki v. Redhail</i> (1978) 434 U.S. 374	160
<i>Zant v. Stephens</i> (1983) 462 U.S. 862	132, 146, 205

Statutes

Evidence Code

section 210	75-76
section 350	75
section 352	51-52
section 1101	51, 57-84
section 1108	51, 57-86

Penal Code

section 189	139-139, 144
section 190	179-180
section 190.2	132
section 190.3	169
section 190.4	110, 204-205
section 190.5	161
section 459	143
section 1158	188
section 1158a	188
section 1170	197
section 1181	162
section 1259	128
section 1260	162-163
section 1376	161

California Rules of Court

rule 4.42	203-204
rule 4.421	206
rule 4.423	206

California Constitution

Article I, section 5	105, 114-115
Article I, section 7	105, 114-115, 160
Article I, section 15	105, 114-115, 160
Article I, section 16	87, 105, 114-115, 188

Article I, section 17	105, 105-106, 114-115, 131, 149-150
Article I, section 24	160
Article I, section 27	115

United States Constitution

Sixth Amendment:

87, 104-105, 169, 171-178, 181, 183-189, 191, 196-199, 207-209, 212-213

Eighth Amendment:

105-109, 112-114, 123, 128, 131, 137, 146-171, 184-188, 191, 194, 196, 199-200, 208-213

Fourteenth Amendment:

87, 104-105, 108, 113-114, 147-148, 152-153, 158-160, 163, 167, 169, 171, 173, 183, 186-188, 191, 196-197, 206, 2308-213

Federal Statutes

18 U.S.C. § 3594	111
21 U.S.C. § 848	189

Federal Rules of Evidence

rule 413	62, 63
----------------	--------

Secondary Authorities

23 Charles Alan Wright & Kenneth W. Graham, Jr., Federal Practice and Procedure § 5411	63
---	----

A.L.I., Model Penal Code §210.6(2)	111
--	-----

American Bar Association, <i>Recommendation and Report on the Death Penalty and Persons with Mental Disabilities</i> (2006) 30 MENTAL & PHYSICAL DISABILITY L. REP. 668	155
--	-----

Amnesty International, “The Death Penalty: List of Abolitionist and Retentionist Countries” (Nov. 24, 2006)	164
--	-----

Bentele and Bowers, <i>How Jurors Decide On Death: Guilt Is Overwhelming; Aggravation Requires Death; And Mitigation Is No Excuse</i> (2001) 66 Brooklyn L. Rev. 1011	119
---	-----

David P. Leonard <i>The Federal Rules of Evidence and the Political Process</i> (1995) 22 FORDHAM URB. L.J. 305	63
Note, <i>Is The Death of the Death Penalty Near? The Impact of Atkins and Roper on the Future of Capital Punishment for Mentally Ill Defendants</i> (2007) 76 Ford. L.Rev. 465	156
Sanger, <i>Comparison of Illinois Commission Report on Capital Punishment with the Capital punishment System in California</i> (2003) 44 Santa Clara L.Rev. 101	137
Shatz, <i>The Eighth Amendment, the Death Penalty, and Ordinary Robbery-Burglary Murderers: A California Case Study</i> (2007) 59 Fla. L. Rev. 719	137
Shatz and Rivkind, <i>The California Death Penalty Scheme: Requiem for Furman?</i> (1997) 72 N.Y.U. L. Rev. 1283	148
Slobogin, <i>Mental Illness and the Death Penalty</i> (2000) 1 Cal.Crim.L.Rev. 3	161
Slobogin, <i>What Atkins Could Mean for People With Mental Illness</i> (2003) 33 N.M. L.Rev. 293	161
<i>Soering v. United Kingdom: Whether the Continued Use of the Death Penalty in the United States Contradicts International Thinking</i> (1990) 16 Crim. and Civ. Confinement 339	163
Stevenson, <i>The Ultimate Authority on the Ultimate Punishment: The Requisite Role of the Jury in Capital Sentencing</i> (2003) 54 Ala L. Rev. 1091	183-185
<i>Symposium, Report of the Massachusetts Governor's Council on Capital Punishment</i> (2005) 80 Ind. L.J. 1	138
Winick, <i>The Supreme Court's Evolving Death Penalty Jurisprudence: Severe Mental Illness as the Next Frontier</i> (2009) 50 B.C. L.Rev. 785	155