

# SUPREME COURT COPY

SUPREME COURT No. S073205

DEATH PENALTY

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

**THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,** )

Plaintiff and Respondent, )

v. )

**JACK EMMIT WILLIAMS,** )

Defendant and Appellant. )

) Riverside County

) Superior Ct.

) No. CR49662

Automatic Appeal from the Judgment of the Superior Court  
of the State of California for the County of Riverside

HONORABLE TIMOTHY HEASLETT, JUDGE

**OPENING BRIEF FOR APPELLANT JACK E. WILLIAMS**

Volume I of II  
Guilt Phase Issues  
Pages 1-343

SUPREME COURT  
**FILED**

JUN 21 2006

Frederick N. Orrison Clerk

DEPUTY

**R. Clayton Seaman, Jr.**  
Attorney at Law  
P.O. Box 12008  
Prescott, AZ 86304  
(928) 776-9168  
Bar No. 126315

**Counsel for Appellant  
Jack Emmit Williams**

**DEATH PENALTY**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Subject</i>	<i>Page</i>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	xiv
STATEMENT OF APPEALABILITY .....	1
STATEMENT OF CASE .....	2
STATEMENT OF FACTS .....	9
GUILT PHASE .....	9
Introduction .....	9
Prosecution Evidence .....	14
Background Information - Personal Relationships .....	14
Count III .....	22
Counts IV and V and the Meeting .....	24
Count VI .....	30
Count VII .....	32
Counts VIII and IX .....	35
Counts I and II .....	38
Circumstances Surrounding Appellant's Involvement .....	47
Counts X and XI .....	60
The Arrests and the Tape of Williams' Statement to Police .....	66
Defense Evidence .....	77
Testimony of Kiesha Lawrence presented by Codefendant Dearaujo .....	77
Testimony of Jason Domke <i>Presented by Appellant Williams</i> .....	83
PENALTY PHASE .....	83
Prosecution Evidence .....	83
Testimony of Paul Petrosky, Ms. Los' fiancé .....	84
Family Testimony .....	85
Testimony of co-workers .....	92
County Jail Incidents .....	93
The Mario Loa Incident: Testimonies of Mario Loa, Lisa Alvarez and	

Latrissa Garrison .....	109
The Trina Portlock Incident: Testimony of Trina Portlock .....	112
The Trina Johnson Incident: Testimony of Keith McKay .....	113
Defense Evidence .....	113
Family Testimony .....	113
Character Witnesses .....	115
The Hanna Incident .....	118
The Mario Loa Incident .....	118
Prison Classification System .....	119
Prosecution Rebuttal Evidence .....	122
Inmate Facilities .....	122
ARGUMENTS .....	127
GUILT PHASE ISSUES .....	127
I. BY IMPROPERLY DISMISSING JUROR #12 FOR PURPORTED MISCONDUCT, THE TRIAL COURT VIOLATED APPELLANT'S FIFTH, SIXTH, EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS AS WELL AS HIS RELATED RIGHTS UNDER THE CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION .....	127
Introduction .....	127
Factual Background .....	128
Standard of Review .....	140
The Nature of "Good Cause" to Dismiss a Sitting Juror .....	142
Prejudice .....	148
II. BY IMPROPERLY DISMISSING THE HOLDOUT [AND ONLY REMAINING] BLACK JUROR, JUROR #10, THE TRIAL COURT VIOLATED APPELLANT'S FIFTH, SIXTH, EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS AS WELL AS HIS RELATED RIGHTS UNDER THE CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION .....	152
Introduction .....	152
Factual Background .....	153
Standard of Review .....	174
The Nature of "Good Cause" to Dismiss a Sitting Juror .....	174
Inability to Perform Juror Functions Was Not A Demonstrable Reality Here .....	184

	Juror Inattentiveness .....	184
	Probability of Juror Illness .....	187
	Refusal to deliberate .....	188
	Inadequate Inquiry .....	198
	Prejudice .....	200
<b>III.</b>	<b>SUBSTITUTION OF AN ALTERNATE JUROR FOR ORIGINAL JUROR #10 COERCED A VERDICT .....</b>	<b>203</b>
	Introduction .....	203
	Factual Background .....	203
	Standard of Review .....	207
	Substitution of Alternates Coerced a Verdict .....	207
<b>IV.</b>	<b>THE TRIAL COURT ERRED IN INSTRUCTING ONLY ON FIRST DEGREE FELONY MURDER WITHOUT ANY LESSER INCLUDED OFFENSE INSTRUCTION, AND IN GIVING SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE INSTRUCTIONS WHICH ALLOWED THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE TO BE IMPUTED TO APPELLANT ..</b>	<b>215</b>
	Introduction .....	215
	Factual Background .....	215
	Standard of Review .....	217
	Failure to Instruct on Lesser Included Offenses .....	217
	Prejudice .....	227
	<b>INTRODUCTION TO VICARIOUS LIABILITY ISSUES .....</b>	<b>230</b>
<b>V.</b>	<b>THE TRIAL COURT'S ANSWER TO THE JURY'S QUESTION REGARDING AIDER AND ABETTER LIABILITY WAS NEITHER RESPONSIVE NOR IMPARTIAL. THE RESPONSE THUS VIOLATED APPELLANT'S FIFTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS; HIS SIXTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO A JURY TRIAL AND HIS EIGHTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO A RELIABLE GUILT DETERMINATION IN A CAPITAL CASE .....</b>	<b>233</b>
	Introduction .....	233
	Summary of Argument .....	233
	Factual Background .....	234
	Aider and Abetter Liability for Felony Murder .....	235
	Requirement for Adequate Instructions .....	236
	Requirement for Impartial Instructions .....	240
	Prejudice .....	244

VI.	CALJIC 3.02 WAS MISLEADING AND APPLIED AN IMPROPER STANDARD FOR A NONKILLER WHO AIDED AND ABETTED IN A FELONY MURDER CASE .....	247
	Introduction .....	247
	Factual Background .....	247
	The Natural and Probable Consequences Instruction is Unconstitutional .....	248
VII.	ALTERNATIVELY, IF THE JURY WAS PROPERLY INSTRUCTED ON THE NATURAL AND PROBABLE CONSEQUENCES DOCTRINE, THE TRIAL COURT ERRED IN FAILING TO MODIFY THE INSTRUCTION <i>SUA SPONTE</i> TO TELL THE JURY THAT THE TEST WAS AN OBJECTIVE RATHER THAN A SUBJECTIVE ONE .....	252
	Error in Giving the Standard Instruction. ....	252
	<i>Sua Sponte</i> Duty to Give Correct Instructions .....	254
	Prejudice .....	256
VIII.	THE TRIAL COURT'S FAILURE TO INSTRUCT THE JURORS TO DETERMINE WHETHER THERE WAS A SINGLE OR MULTIPLE CONSPIRACIES VIOLATED APPELLANT'S FIFTH, SIXTH, EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS BY IMPROPERLY LOWERING THE PROSECUTION'S BURDEN OF PROOF ON A MATERIAL ISSUE OF FACT .....	259
	Introduction .....	259
	Summary of Argument .....	259
	Factual Background .....	261
	Duty to Clarify Jury Misunderstanding .....	262
	Jury Misunderstanding- Multiple Conspiracies .....	265
	Davis Holding is Erroneous .....	268
	Jury Misunderstanding - Single Conspiracy .....	270
	Prejudice .....	273
IX.	THE TRIAL COURT ERRED IN FAILING TO REQUIRE THAT THE JURY AGREE UNANIMOUSLY THAT THERE WAS ONE OR MORE CONSPIRACIES AND THAT THE DEFENDANT WAS PART OF EACH SUCH CONSPIRACY .....	276
	Introduction .....	276
	Factual Background .....	276
	Error to Fail to Separately Instruct on Unanimity or the Reasonable	

	Doubt Standard Under Conspiracy Theory .....	278
	Prejudice .....	287
X.	THE TRIAL JUDGE COMMITTED REVERSIBLE ERROR BY INSTRUCTING THE JURY ON CONSCIOUSNESS OF GUILT .....	289
	Introduction .....	289
	Instructions Improper .....	289
	The Instructions Create Improper Permissive Inferences ..	291
	These Instructions Were Impermissibly Argumentative ..	295
	Prejudice .....	298
XI.	THE EVIDENCE WAS CONSTITUTIONALLY INSUFFICIENT TO SUPPORT THE JURY'S ROBBERY-MURDER SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE FINDING AS TO APPELLANT, WHO WAS CONVICTED AS AN AIDER AND ABETTOR OR CO-CONSPIRATOR	289
	Introduction .....	299
	Standard of Review .....	300
	Factual Background .....	302
	Penal Code Section 995 Motion. ....	303
	Penal Code section 1118.1 Motion .....	304
	Jury Instructions .....	307
	Jury Note .....	308
	Proportionality .....	309
	Direct Action or High Degree of Participation of Nontriggerman	
	Accomplice Causing or Contributing to Death .....	316
	Physical Presence at the Location of and Failure to Intervene ...	318
	Prior Plans or Expectations of Violence .....	320
	Even Assuming Arguendo that the California cases of <i>Bustos</i> , <i>Mora and Proby</i> Are Good Law, They Are Easily Distinguishable .....	323
XII.	THE TRIAL COURT ERRED IN REQUIRING APPELLANT WILLIAMS TO WEAR LEG RESTRAINTS DURING THE TRIAL ..	327
	Introduction .....	327
	Factual Background .....	327
	Standard of Review .....	330
	No Justification for Shackling .....	334
	Prejudice .....	339

PENALTY PHASE ISSUES .....	344
XIII. APPELLANT'S DEATH SENTENCE, IMPOSED FOR FELONY MURDER SIMPLICITER, IS A DISPROPORTIONATE PENALTY UNDER THE EIGHTH AMENDMENT AND VIOLATES INTERNATIONAL LAW .....	344
Introduction .....	344
California Authorizes The Imposition Of The Death Penalty Upon A Person Who Kills During An Attempted Felony Without Regard To His Or Her State Of Mind At The Time Of The Killing .....	344
The Robbery-Murder Special Circumstance Violates The Eighth Amendment's Proportionality Requirement And International Law Because It Permits Imposition Of The Death Penalty Without Proof That The Defendant Had A Culpable Mens Rea As To The Killing .....	347
XIV. THE TRIAL COURT VIOLATED APPELLANT SIXTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO COUNSEL BY REFUSING TO CORRECT AN OBVIOUS CONFLICT SITUATION .....	364
Introduction .....	364
Factual Background .....	365
Conflict of Interest Violates the Sixth, Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments as well as the California Constitution .....	384
Conflicts on Criminal Cases .....	385
Standard of Relief in Conflict Situations .....	390
The Conflict Situation Here Requires Automatic Reversal .....	393
Public Defender Office Conflicts .....	397
Duty to Disclose Favorable Witness Information .....	405
Conclusion .....	407
XV. THE TRIAL COURT ERRED IN FAILING TO CORRECT THE JURY'S MISUNDERSTANDING CONCERNING THE MEANING OF A SENTENCE OF LIFE WITHOUT PAROLE AND IN FAILING TO AMELIORATE ITS FEAR THAT THE SENTENCE IT IMPOSED WOULD NOT BE CARRIED OUT .....	409
Introduction .....	409
Factual Background .....	409
Erroneous Instruction .....	415

Execution Portion of CALJIC 8.84 Similarly Flawed. . . . .	424
No Waiver . . . . .	424
Conclusion . . . . .	427

<b>XVI. APPELLANT WAS DEPRIVED OF A FAIR TRIAL AND A RELIABLE PENALTY DETERMINATION IN VIOLATION OF THE FIFTH, SIXTH, EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS BY INTRODUCTION OF IRRELEVANT AND HIGHLY PREJUDICIAL "VICTIM IMPACT EVIDENCE"</b> . . . . .	428
<b>Introduction</b> . . . . .	428
<b>Factual Background</b> . . . . .	429
<b>The Applicable Law</b> . . . . .	447
<b>An Exhaustive Account of Ms. Los' Complete Life History, Including Detailed Descriptions of Her Activities, Achievements and Awards, Was Improperly Presented to the Penalty Jury</b> . . . . .	454
1. <b>The Extensive Life History Evidence Was Unfairly Inflammatory</b> . . . . .	455
2. <b>The Detailed Account of the Victim's Virtues Invited Invidious Comparisons, and the Prosecutor Explicitly Urged the Jurors to Make Those Comparisons During Closing Arguments</b> . . . . .	460
a. <b>Why Comparisons Involving the Victim's Character Are Improper</b> . . . . .	460
b. <b>Comparison Between Victims</b> . . . . .	465
c. <b>Comparison Between the Victim and the Defendant</b> . . . . .	467
d. <b>Emotionally-Charged Evidence About the Impact of the Crime on the Victim's Survivors Was Erroneously Admitted</b> . . . . .	471
e. <b>The Erroneous Admission of This Mass of Improper Victim Impact Evidence Requires Reversal</b> . . . . .	476



Prejudice .....	477
<b>XV. THE TRIAL COURT SHOULD HAVE INSTRUCTED THE JURY ON THE APPROPRIATE USE OF VICTIM IMPACT EVIDENCE .....</b>	<b>480</b>
Introduction .....	480
Proper Instructions Required .....	480
Prejudice .....	485
<b>XVII. THE TRIAL COURT ERRED IN REFUSING TO INSTRUCT ON LINGERING DOUBT IN VIOLATION OF STATE LAW AND THE FIFTH, SIXTH, EIGHTH, AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS ..</b>	<b>486</b>
Introduction .....	486
Factual Background .....	486
Lingering Doubt .....	487
It Is Reasonably Likely That The Jurors Misunderstood That They Were Precluded From Considering And Giving Effect To Their Lingering Doubts That Appellant Was Fully Culpable For Ms. Los' Death When Deciding Whether To Execute Him Or Spare His Life .....	494
Prejudice .....	496
<b>XVIII. INSTRUCTING THE JURY PURSUANT TO CALJIC NO. 8.85 VIOLATED APPELLANT'S EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS TO A RELIABLE SENTENCING DETERMINATION .....</b>	<b>501</b>
Introduction .....	501
CALJIC 8.85 is Improper .....	501
A. The Trial Court's Failure to Instruct That Statutory Mitigating Factors Were Relevant Solely as Potential Mitigators Precluded a Fair, Reliable, and Evenhanded Administration of Capital Punishment .....	501
<b>XIX. INSTRUCTING THE JURY IN ACCORDANCE WITH CALJIC NO. 8.88 VIOLATED APPELLANT'S FIFTH, SIXTH, EIGHTH, AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS .....</b>	<b>505</b>
Introduction .....	505
CALJIC 8.88 is Improper .....	506
A. In Failing to Inform the Jurors That if They Determined That Mitigation Outweighed Aggravation, They Were	

	Required to Impose a Sentence of Life Without Possibility of Parole, CALJIC No. 8.88 Improperly Reduced the Prosecution’s Burden of Proof Below the Level Required by Penal Code Section 190.3 and Reversal Is Required . . . .	508
	B. By Failing to Inform the Jurors That They Had Discretion to Impose Life Without Possibility of Parole Even in the Absence of Mitigating Evidence, CALJIC No. 8.88 Improperly Reduced the Prosecution’s Burden of Proof Below the Level Required by Penal Code Section 190.3 and Reversal Is Required . . . . .	513
	C. The “So Substantial” Standard for Comparing Mitigating and Aggravating Circumstances Is Unconstitutionally Vague and Improperly Reduced the Prosecution’s Burden of Proof Below the Level Required by Penal Code Section 190.3 . . . . .	515
	D. By Failing to Convey to the Jury That the Central Decision at the Penalty Phase Is the Determination of the Appropriate Punishment, CALJIC No. 8.88 Improperly Reduced the Prosecution’s Burden and Reversal Is Required . . . . .	517
XX.	THE DEATH PENALTY IS DISPROPORTIONATE TO APPELLANT’S INDIVIDUAL CULPABILITY AND ITS IMPOSITION WOULD THEREFORE VIOLATE THE EIGHTH AMENDMENT AND ARTICLE I, SECTION 17 OF THE CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION . . . . .	520
	Introduction . . . . .	520
	Proportionality Review . . . . .	520
XXI.	THE VIOLATIONS OF MR. WILLIAMS’ RIGHTS ARTICULATED ABOVE CONSTITUTE VIOLATIONS OF INTERNATIONAL LAW, AND REQUIRE THAT MR. WILLIAMS’ CONVICTIONS AND PENALTY BE SET ASIDE . . . . .	527
	Introduction . . . . .	527
	Background . . . . .	528
	A Sources of International Law . . . . .	528
	1 Treaty Development . . . . .	529
	2 Customary International Law . . . . .	533
	The Racial Discrimination That Permeates Capital Sentencing in General, and Mr. Williams’ Trial in Particular,	

Violates International Law, and Requires that Mr. Williams' Death Penalty Be Set Aside . . . . .	538
Mr. Williams's Deprivation of a Fair Trial and a Reliable Penalty Phase Constitute Violations of Customary International Law . . . . .	559

XXII. CALIFORNIA'S DEATH PENALTY STATUTE, AS INTERPRETED BY  
THIS COURT AND AS APPLIED AT APPELLANT'S TRIAL,  
VIOLATES THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION . . . . . 566

Introduction . . . . .	566
------------------------	-----

A. Appellant's Death Penalty Is Invalid Because Penal Code § 190.2 Is Impermissibly Broad . . . . .	568
---	-----

B. Appellant's Death Penalty Is Invalid Because Penal Code § 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	572
---	-----

C. California's Death Penalty Statute Contains No Safeguards to Avoid Arbitrary and Capricious Sentencing and Deprives Defendants of the Right to a Jury Trial on Each Factual Determination Prerequisite to a Sentence of Death; it Therefore Violates the Sixth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution . . . . .	580
---	-----

1. Appellant's Death Verdict Was Not Premised on Findings Beyond a Reasonable Doubt by a Unanimous Jury That One or More Aggravating Factors Existed and That These Factors Outweighed Mitigating Factors; His Constitutional Right to Jury Determination Beyond a Reasonable Doubt of All Facts Essential to the Imposition of a Death Penalty Was Thereby Violated . . . . .	581
---	-----

a. <i>In the Wake of Apprendi, Ring, and Blakely, Any Jury Finding Necessary to the Imposition of Death Must Be Found True Beyond a Reasonable Doubt . . . . .</i>	583
--	-----

b.	<i>The Requirements of Jury Agreement and Unanimity</i> .....	596
2.	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 .....	601
a.	Factual Determinations .....	601
b.	Imposition of Life or Death .....	602
3.	Even If Proof Beyond a Reasonable Doubt Were Not the Constitutionally Required Burden of Persuasion for Finding (1) That an Aggravating Factor Exists, (2) That the Aggravating Factors Outweigh the Mitigating Factors, and (3) That Death Is the Appropriate Sentence, Proof by a Preponderance of the Evidence Would Be Constitutionally Compelled as to Each Such Finding .....	607
4.	Some Burden of Proof Is Required in Order to Establish a Tie-Breaking Rule and Ensure Even-Handedness. ....	609
5.	Even If There Could Constitutionally Be No Burden of Proof, the Trial Court Erred in Failing to Instruct the Jury to That Effect .....	610
6.	California Law Violates the Sixth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution by Failing to Require That the Jury Base Any Death Sentence on Written Findings Regarding Aggravating Factors .....	611
7.	California's Death Penalty Statute as Interpreted by the	

	California Supreme Court Forbids Inter-case Proportionality Review, Thereby Guaranteeing Arbitrary, Discriminatory, or Disproportionate Impositions of the Death Penalty .....	615
8.	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 .....	620
9.	The Use of Restrictive Adjectives in the List of Potential Mitigating Factors Impermissibly Acted as Barriers to Consideration of Mitigation by Appellant's Jury .....	621
D.	The California Sentencing Scheme Violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Federal Constitution by Denying Procedural Safeguards to Capital Defendants Which Are Afforded to Non-capital Defendants .....	621
XXIII. THE CUMULATIVE EFFECT OF THE ERRORS IN THIS CASE REQUIRE THAT APPELLANT'S CONVICTIONS AND DEATH SENTENCE BE REVERSED .....		
	Prejudicial Federal Constitutional Errors .....	631
	Prejudicial Errors Under State Law .....	633
		634
CONCLUSION .....		
		637
CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT .....		
		638
PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL AND DECLARATION OF PRINTING ON RECYCLED PAPER .....		
		639

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<i>Authority</i>	<i>Page</i>
UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT CASES	
<i>Addington v. Texas</i> (1979) 441 U.S. 418 .....	592, 602, 605
<i>Apodaca v. Oregon</i> (1972) 406 U.S. 404 .....	150, 202, 597
<i>Apprendi v. New Jersey</i> (2000) 530 U.S. 466 .....	226, 354, 581-583, 586, 592-594, 620
<i>Asakura v. Seattle</i> (1924) 265 U.S. 332 .....	553
<i>Atkins v. Virginia</i> (2002) 536 U.S. 304 .....	348, 352, 354, 357, 362, 535, 617, 625, 628
<i>Barclay v. Florida</i> (1976) 463 U.S. 939 .....	615
<i>Batson v. Kentucky</i> (1986) 476 U.S. 79 .....	465
<i>Beck v. Alabama</i> (1980) 447 U.S. 625 .....	149, 201, 220, 226, 227, 285, 302, 331, 384, 605, 607, 626
<i>Bell v. Ohio</i> (1978) 438 U.S. 637 .....	491
<i>Blakely v. Washington</i> (2004) 124 S.Ct. 2531 .....	581-583, 589, 592, 597, 600, 620, 629
<i>Bollenbach v. United States</i> (1946) 326 US 607 .....	237, 241, 246, 264, 417
<i>Booth v. Maryland</i> (1987) 482 U.S. 496 .....	448, 460, 466, 477, 479
<i>Boyde v. California</i> (1990) 494 U.S. 370 .....	258, 490, 508
<i>Brady v. Maryland</i> (1963) 373 U.S. 83 .....	406
<i>Brown v. Louisiana</i> (1980) 447 U.S. 323 .....	597

<i>Buchanan v. Angelone</i> (1998) 522 U.S. 269 .....	490
<i>Bush v. Gore</i> (2000) 531 U.S. 98 .....	628
<i>Bute v. Illinois</i> (1948) 333 U.S. 640 .....	285
<i>Caldwell v. Mississippi</i> (1985) 472 U.S. 320 .....	415, 490, 634
<i>Chapman v. California</i> (1967) 386 U.S. 18 .. 228, 244, 274, 298, 339, 478, 485, 496, 513	
<i>Coker v. Georgia</i> (1977) 433 U.S. 584 .....	311, 347, 361, 535, 617, 625
<i>Cool v. United States</i> (1972) 409 U.S. 100 .....	512
<i>County Court of Ulster County, New York v. Allen</i> (1979) 442 U.S. 140 .....	291
<i>Crist v. Bretz</i> (1978) 437 U.S. 28 .....	149, 200
<i>Cuyler v. Sullivan</i> (1980) 446 U.S. 335 .....	384, 389, 390, 399
<i>Deck v. Missouri</i> (2005) 544 U.S. 622 .....	330, 338, 339, 340
<i>Den ex dem. Murray v. Hoboken Land and Improvement Co.</i> (1855) 59 U.S. (18 How.) 272 .....	597, 608
<i>Douglas v. Alabama</i> (1965) 380 U.S. 415 .....	425, 439
<i>Downum v. United States</i> (1963) 372 U.S. 734 .....	149, 200, 201
<i>Duncan v. Louisiana</i> (1968) 391 U.S. 145 .....	149, 201
<i>Eddings v. Oklahoma</i> (1982) 455 U.S. 104 .....	504, 610
<i>Enmund v. Florida</i> (1982) 458 U.S. 782 ... 305, 309, 312, 314-316, 348-352, 357-362, 415, 522, 535, 617, 625	
<i>Estelle v. Williams</i> (1976) 425 U.S. 501 .....	330, 339
<i>Evitts v. Lucey</i> (1985) 469 U.S. 387 .....	512

<i>Eyde v. Robertson</i> (1884) 112 U.S. 580 .....	529, 564
<i>Ford v. Wainwright</i> (1986) 477 U.S. 399 .....	525, 625, 626
<i>Francis v. Franklin</i> (1986) 471 U.S. 307 .....	291
<i>Franklin v. Lynaugh</i> (1988) 487 U.S. 164 .....	491
<i>Furman v. Georgia</i> (1972) 408 U. S. 238 .....	250, 284, 347, 465, 515, 547, 568, 616
<i>Gardner v. Florida</i> (1977) 430 U.S. 349 .....	415, 598, 602, 626
<i>Gideon v. Wainwright</i> (1963) 372 U.S. 335 .....	285, 510
<i>Giglio v. United States</i> (1971) 405 U.S. 150 .....	406
<i>Giles v. Maryland</i> (1967) 386 U.S. 66 .....	406
<i>Gilmore v. Taylor</i> (1993) 508 U.S. 333 .....	286
<i>Glasser v. United States</i> (1942) 315 U.S. 60 .....	386
<i>Godfrey v. Georgia</i> (1980) 446 U.S. 420 .....	516, 548, 568, 579
<i>Gray v. Mississippi</i> (1987) 481 U.S. 648 .....	286
<i>Green v. Georgia</i> (1979) 442 U.S. 95 .....	493, 500
<i>Gregg v. Georgia</i> (1976) 428 U.S. 153 . 284, 347, 362, 503, 516, 550, 611, 617, 619, 626	
<i>Griffin v. United States</i> (1991) 502 U.S. 46 .....	597, 608
<i>Grutter v. Bollinger</i> (2003) 123 S.Ct. 2325 .....	535
<i>Harmelin v. Michigan</i> (1991) 501 U.S. 957 .....	598, 613, 627
<i>Herrera v. Collins</i> (1993) 506 U.S. 390 .....	286
<i>Hewitt v. Helms</i> (1983) 459 U.S. 460 .....	514



<i>Hicks v. Oklahoma</i> (1980) 447 U.S. 343 .....	151, 202, 491, 509, 512, 525, 608, 609, 634
<i>Hitchcock v. Dugger</i> (1987) 481 U.S. 393 .....	498
<i>Holbrook v. Flynn</i> (1986) 475 U.S. 560 .....	339
<i>Holloway v. Arkansas</i> (1978) 435 U.S. 475 .....	384, 386, 390, 402-403
<i>Hopkins v. Reeves</i> (1998) 524 U.S. 88 .....	350
<i>Hopper v. Evans</i> (1982) 456 U.S. 605 .....	228
<i>Illinois v. Allen</i> (1970) 397 U.S. 337 .....	332, 341
<i>In re Winship</i> (1970) 397 U.S. 358 .....	257, 278, 284, 300, 602, 604 602, 604
<i>Jackson v. Virginia</i> (1979) 443 U.S. 307 .....	300
<i>Jenkins v. United States</i> (1965) 380 U.S. 445 .....	208
<i>Johnson v. Louisiana</i> (1972) 406 U.S. 356 .....	597
<i>Johnson v. Mississippi</i> (1988) 486 U.S. 578 .....	331, 384, 502, 598, 602
<i>Kelly v. South Carolina</i> (2002) 534 U.S. 246 .....	419
<i>Kinsella v. United States</i> (1960) 361 U.S. 234 .....	626
<i>Knight v. Florida</i> (1999) 120 S.Ct. 461 .....	535
<i>Krulewitch v. United States</i> (1949) 336 U.S. 440 .....	209, 262, 272

<i>Leary v. United States</i> (1969) 395 U.S. 6 .....	291
<i>Lewis v. Jeffers</i> (1990) 497 U.S. 764 .....	453
<i>Lockett v. Ohio</i> (1978) 438 U.S. 586 .....	309, 351, 490, 598, 621, 626
<i>Lowenfield v. Phelps</i> (1988) 484 U.S. 231 .....	212
<i>Matthews v. Eldridge</i> (1976) 424 U.S. 319 .....	603
<i>Maynard v. Cartwright</i> (1988) 486 U.S. 356 .....	547, 579
<i>McCleskey v. Kemp</i> (1987) 481 U.S. 279 .....	461, 465, 544-547, 563, 625, 635
<i>McKoy v. North Carolina</i> (1990) 494 U.S. 433 .....	490
<i>Mickens v. Taylor</i> (2002) 535 U.S. 162 .....	390, 399, 402
<i>Mills v. Maryland</i> (1988) 486 U.S. 367 .....	610, 613, 621, 629
<i>Monge v. California</i> (1998) 524 U.S. 721 .....	595, 598, 605, 607, 622, 627, 629
<i>Murray v. The Schooner Charming Betsy</i> (1804) 6 U.S. (2 Cranch) 64 .....	528
<i>Oyama v. California</i> (1948) 332 U.S. 633 .....	539
<i>Parker v. Dugger</i> (1991) 498 U.S. 308 .....	525, 634
<i>Payne v. Tennessee</i> (1991) 501 U.S. 808 .....	448, 451, 455, 457, 466-468, 475, 477, 479

<i>Penry v. Lynaugh</i> (1989) 492 U.S. 302 .....	354
<i>Plyler v. Doe</i> (1982) 457 U.S. 202 .....	512, 556
<i>Powell v. Alabama</i> (1932) 287 U.S. 45 .....	284
<i>Powers v. Ohio</i> (1991) 499 U.S. 400 .....	149, 200
<i>Presnell v. Georgia</i> (1978) 439 U.S. 14 .....	602
<i>Proffitt v. Florida</i> (1976) 428 U.S. 242 .....	610, 618
<i>Pulley v. Harris</i> (1984) 465 U.S. 37 .....	571, 616, 619
<i>Quercia v. United States</i> , (1933) 289 U. S. 466 .....	240
<i>Rabe v. Washington</i> (1972) 405 U.S. 313.....	477
<i>Reagan v. United States</i> (1895) 157 U.S. 301 .....	510
<i>Reid v. Covert</i> (1957) 354 U.S. 1 .....	285, 626
<i>Richardson v. United States</i> (1999) 526 U.S. 813 .....	599, 600
<i>Riggins v. Nevada</i> (1992) 504 U.S. 127 .....	331
<i>Ring v. Arizona</i> (2002) 536 U.S. 584 ... 581, 584, 586, 592-596, 600, 613-615, 620, 629	
<i>Robinson v. California</i> (1962) 370 U.S. 660 .....	347

<i>Roper v. Simmons</i> (2005) 543 U.S. 551, 125 S.Ct. 1183 .....	347, 348, 352, 358
<i>Rose v. Clark</i> (1986) 478 U.S. 570 .....	274
<i>Sandstrom v. Montana</i> (1979) 442 U.S. 510 .....	353
<i>Santosky v. Kramer</i> (1982) 455 U.S. 745 .....	595, 603-605
<i>Schad v. Arizona</i> (1991) 501 U.S. 624 .....	228, 279
<i>Schlup v. Delo</i> (1995) 115 S.Ct. 851 .....	285
<i>Shafer v. South Carolina</i> (2001) 532 US 36 .....	245, 419- 421
<i>Simmons v. South Carolina</i> (94) 512 US 154 .....	245, 418, 420, 421, 492, 500
<i>Skinner v. Oklahoma</i> (1942) 316 U.S. 535 .....	622
<i>Skipper v. South Carolina</i> (1986) 476 U.S. 1 .....	490, 493, 500
<i>Solem v. Helm</i> (1983) 463 U.S. 277 .....	309
<i>South Carolina v. Gathers</i> (1989) 490 U.S. 806 .....	448, 479
<i>Spaziano v. Florida</i> (1984) 468 U.S. 447 .....	286
<i>Speiser v. Randall</i> (1958) 357 U.S. 513 .....	601, 603
<i>Strickland v. Washington</i> (1984) 466 U.S. 668.....	477, 627

<i>Stringer v. Black</i> (1992) 503 U.S. 222 .....	503
<i>Stromberg v. California</i> (1931) 283 U. S. 359 .....	248
<i>Sullivan v. Louisiana</i> (1993) 508 U.S. 275 ,113 S.Ct. 2078 .....	274, 278, 496, 509, 609-611
<i>Taylor v. Kentucky</i> (1978) 436 U.S. 478 .....	631
<i>Tennard v. Dretke</i> (2004) 542 U.S. 274, 124 S.Ct. 2562 .....	490, 491
<i>The Paquete Habana</i> (1900) 175 U.S. 677 .....	528, 533, 536, 562
<i>Thompson v. Oklahoma</i> (1988) 487 U.S. 815 .....	348, 535, 617
<i>Tison v. Arizona</i> (1987) 481 U.S. 137 .....	303, 311, 318, 320, 323, 326, 348, 350, 361
<i>Townsend v. Sain</i> (1963) 372 U.S. 293 .....	611
<i>Trans World Airlines, Inc. v. Franklin Mint Corp.</i> (1984) 466 U.S. 243 .....	528
<i>Trop v. Dulles</i> (1958) 356 U.S. 86 .....	354, 622
<i>Tuilaepa v. California</i> (1994) 512 U.S. 967 .....	454
<i>Turner v. Murray</i> (1986) 476 U.S. 28 .....	461, 464, 482, 547, 627
<i>United States v. Bagley</i> (1985) 473 U.S. 667 .....	406
<i>United States v. Balsys</i> (1998) 524 U.S. 666 .....	557

<i>United States v. Gainey</i> (1965) 380 U.S. 63 .....	291
<i>Village of Willowbrook v. Olech</i> (2000) 528 U.S. 562 .....	460
<i>Walton v. Arizona</i> (1990) 497 U.S. 639 .....	582
<i>Wardius v. Oregon</i> (1973) 412 U.S. 470 .....	510
<i>Washington v. Texas</i> (1967) 388 U.S. 14 .....	510
<i>Weems v. United States</i> (1910) 217 U.S. 349 .....	354
<i>Weinberger v. Rossi</i> (1982) 456 U.S. 25 .....	528
<i>Wheat v. United States</i> (1988) 486 U.S. 153 .....	384
<i>Williams v. Florida</i> (1970) 399 U.S. 78 .....	150, 202
<i>Woodson v. North Carolina</i> (1976) 428 U.S. 280 . 309, 331, 384, 502, 517, 547, 605, 626	
<i>Yates v. Evatt</i> (1991) 500 U.S. 391 .....	274, 339, 496
<i>Zant v. Stephens</i> (1983) 462 U.S. 862 .....	251, 312, 384, 454, 461, 502, 516, 568, 626, 633

#### FEDERAL CASES

<i>Abebe-Jira v. Negeno</i> (11th Cir. 1996) 72 F.3d 844 .....	536, 563
--	----------

<i>Andrews v. Collins</i> (5 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1994) 21 F.3d 612 .....	489
<i>Ballard v. Estelle</i> (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1991) 937 F.2d 453 .....	492
<i>Bush v. Singletary</i> (11 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1993) 988 F.2d 1082 .....	316
<i>Chandler v. United States</i> (11 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000) 218 F.3d 1305 .....	489
<i>Charfauros v. Board of Elections</i> (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2001) 249 F.3d 941 .....	628
<i>Church v. Sullivan</i> (10 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1991) 942 F.2d 1501 .....	386
<i>Clark v. Jago</i> (6 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1982) 676 F.2d 1099 .....	250
<i>Conde v. Henry</i> (1999) 198 F.3d 734 .....	492
<i>Cordova v. Lynaugh</i> (5 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1988) 838 F.2d 764 .....	220
<i>Duest v. Singletary</i> (11 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1993) 997 F.2d 1336 .....	228
<i>Ferrier v. Duckworth</i> (7 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1990) 902 F.2d 545 .....	473
<i>Fetterly v. Paskett</i> (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1993) 997 F.2d 1295 .....	492
<i>Filartiga v. Pena-Irala</i> (2 <sup>nd</sup> Cir. 1980) 630 F.2d 876 .....	528, 534, 536, 560, 561-563
<i>In Martinez v. City of Los Angeles</i> (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1998) 141 F.3d 1373 .....	560
<i>Jimenez v. Myers</i> (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1993) 40 F.3d 976 .....	212

<i>Kadic v. Karadzic</i> (2nd Cir. 1995) 70 F.3d 232 .....	536, 540, 561
<i>Kennedy v. Cardwell</i> (6th Cir. 1973) 487 F.2d 101 .....	332, 339
<i>Lear v. Cowan</i> (7th Cir. 2000) 220 F.3d 825 .....	351
<i>Lightbourne v. Dugger</i> (11th Cir. 1987) 829 F.2d 1012 .....	386
<i>Ma v. Ashcroft</i> (9th Cir. 2001) 257 F.3d 1095 .....	563
<i>Mak v. Blodgett</i> (1992) 970 F.2d 614 .....	493, 500
<i>McDowell v. Calderon</i> (9th Cir. 1997) 130 F.3d 833 .....	237, 238, 264, 417
<i>Moore v. Kemp</i> (11th Cir. 1987) 809 F.2d 702 .....	455, 464, 469
<i>Morris v. Woodford</i> (9th Cir. 2001) 273 F.3d 826 .....	246
<i>Myers v. Ylst</i> (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1990) 897 F.2d 417 .....	613, 629
<i>People of Saipan v. United States Department of Interior</i> (9th Cir. 1974) 502 F.2d 90	554
<i>Perez v. Marshall</i> (9th Cir. 1997) 119 F.3d 1422 .....	213
<i>Perillo v. Johnson</i> (5th Cir. 2000) 205 F.3d 775 .....	393, 395
<i>Phillips v. Woodford</i> (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2001) 267 F.3d 966 .....	631
<i>Piaskowski v. Bett</i> (7 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2001) 256 F.3d 687 .....	271, 280



<i>Powell v. United States</i> (9th Cir. 1965) 347 F.2d 156 .....	237, 238, 264, 417
<i>Price v. Glosson Motor Lines</i> (4th Cir. 1975) 509 F.2d 1033 .....	238, 265, 418
<i>Pruett v. Norris</i> (8th Cir. 1998) 153 F.3d 579 .....	351
<i>Reeves v. Hopkins</i> (8th Cir. 1996) 102 F.3d 977 .....	351
<i>Resnover v. Pearson</i> (7th Cir. 1992) 965 F.2d 1453 .....	317
<i>Rhoden v. Rowland</i> (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1998) 172 F.3d 633 .....	331
<i>Rupe v. Wood</i> (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1996) 93 F.3d 1434 .....	493, 500
<i>Rupe v. Wood</i> (W.D. Wn. 1994) 863 F. Supp. 1315 .....	491
<i>Sellers v. Estelle</i> (5th Cir. 1981) 651 F.2d 1074 .....	406
<i>Silva v. Woodford</i> (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2002) 279 F.3d 825 .....	492
<i>Smith v. Horn</i> (3 <sup>rd</sup> Cir. 1997) 120 F.3d 400 .....	256, 258
<i>Spain v. Rushen</i> (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1989) 883 F.2d 712 .....	331, 339
<i>Stewart v. Dugger</i> (11 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1989) 877 F.2d 851 .....	489
<i>Suniga v. Bunnell</i> (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1993) 998 F.2d 664 .....	634
<i>Tarver v. Hopper</i> (11 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1999) 169 F.3d 710 .....	489

<i>Trone v. Smith</i> (9th Cir. 1980) 621 F.2d 994 .....	397
<i>United States v. Noriega</i> (1992) 808 F.Supp. 791 .....	556
<i>United States v. Symington</i> (9th Cir. 1999) 195 F.3d 1080 .....	180, 194
<i>United States ex rel. Simon v. Murphy</i> (E.D.Penn. 1972) 349 F.Supp. 818 .....	404
<i>United States v. Agosto</i> (8th Cir. 1982) 675 F.2d 965 .....	386
<i>United States v. Alred</i> (11 <sup>th</sup> Cir 1998) 144 F.3d 1405 .....	268
<i>United States v. Anguiano</i> (9th Cir. 1989) 873 F.2d 1314 .....	283
<i>United States v. Arnedo- Sarmiento</i> (2ndCir. 1975) 524 F.2d 591 .....	385
<i>United States v. Bolden</i> (D.C. Cir. 1975) 514 F.2d 1301 .....	237, 238, 264, 265, 418
<i>United States v. Carter</i> (5th Cir. 1974) 491 F.2d 625 .....	241, 242
<i>United States v. Cheely</i> (9th Cir. 1994) 36 F.3d 1439 .....	351
<i>United States v. Christakis</i> (9th Cir. 2001) 238 F.3d 1164 .....	390
<i>United States v. Davis</i> (E.D.LA 2001) 132 F.Supp.2d 455 .....	488
<i>United States v. DiCesare</i> (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir 1985) 765 F.2d 890 .....	268
<i>United States v. Dolan</i> (3d Cir. 1978) 570 F.2d 1177 .....	386, 389