

SUPREME COURT OF HAWAI‘I

State v. Emch

183 P.3d 755 (Haw. 2008) · No. No. 28009 · Decided April 21, 2008

SUMMARY

The Supreme Court of Hawai‘i vacated Bob Emch’s extended-term sentence because the sentencing scheme then in effect violated his Sixth Amendment right to a jury trial under Apprendi and related precedent. The court remanded for resentencing consistent with State v. Jess, including the possibility of resentencing under a judicially reformed or legislatively amended extended-term sentencing scheme.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Supreme Court of Hawai‘i
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Per curiam; Moon, C.J.; Levinson, J.; Nakayama, J.; Duffy, J.; Acoba, J. (dissenting)
JURISDICTION	Hawaii
DECIDED	April 21, 2008
DOCKET	No. 28009
DISPOSITION	vacated
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Emch petitioned for a writ of certiorari to review the Intermediate Court of Appeals' summary disposition order affirming the circuit court's denial of his motion to correct an illegal sentence.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Review on certiorari of whether the extended-term sentence was illegal and unconstitutional under the cited constitutional precedents; the opinion does not expressly state a separate standard-of-review formulation.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published Hawai‘i Supreme Court opinion; precedential.
PARTIES	Bob Emch v. State of Hawai‘i

TOPICS

- sentencing
- sentencing guidelines
- sixth amendment
- criminal procedure
- appellate procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Emch's extended-term sentence imposed under Hawai'i Revised Statutes § 706-662(1) was unconstitutional and illegal because the sentencing court, rather than a jury, made the finding that an extended term was necessary for the protection of the public.
2. Whether the case should be remanded for resentencing and whether the circuit court could impose an extended term under a judicially reformed statute or the subsequently amended statutory scheme.

HOLDINGS

1. An extended-term sentence imposed under the applicable version of Hawai'i Revised Statutes § 706-662(1) is illegal because the sentencing court made the additional finding that extended imprisonment was necessary for the protection of the public, thereby violating the defendant's Sixth Amendment right to a jury trial under *State v. Maugaotega II*.
2. On remand, and upon appropriate motion, the circuit court may resentence Emch to an extended term by exercising its inherent authority to judicially reform the applicable statute or by using the provisions of the legislatively amended sentencing scheme identified in *State v. Jess*.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"As such, under Maugaotega II, the sentence violates Emch's sixth amendment right to a jury trial and is therefore illegal." (183 P.3d 755)

"Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Emch's extended term sentence is vacated and this case is remanded to the circuit court for resentencing consistent with our opinion in Jess." (183 P.3d 755)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The circuit court imposed an extended-term sentence on Bob Emch under Hawai'i Revised Statutes §§ 706-661 and 706-662(1) after finding that he was a persistent offender whose extended imprisonment was necessary for the protection of the public. The sentence was imposed under the pre-2007 version of Hawai'i's extended-term sentencing scheme, which permitted the sentencing court to make the additional necessity finding. Emch challenged the sentence as violating his Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendment rights under *Apprendi* and related decisions.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The circuit court of the first circuit denied Emch's motion to correct an illegal sentence on May 31, 2006. The Intermediate Court of Appeals affirmed in a summary disposition order. The Hawai'i Supreme Court accepted Emch's application for a writ of certiorari because the ICA's decision was inconsistent with *State v. Maugaotega II*, then vacated the extended-term sentence and remanded for resentencing consistent with *State v. Jess*.

DISPOSITION

vacated

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The case is remanded to the circuit court for resentencing consistent with *State v. Jess*. Upon appropriate motion, the circuit court may impose an extended term under a judicially reformed version of Hawai'i Revised Statutes § 706-662 or under the provisions of Act 1, the amended sentencing scheme.

CASES CITED

- *Apprendi v. New Jersey*, 530 U.S. 466 (2000)
- *State v. Maugaotega II*, 115 Hawai'i 432, 168 P.3d 562 (2007)
- *Cunningham v. California*, 549 U.S. ___, 127 S. Ct. 856 (2007)
- *State v. Jess*, No. 28483, Slip Op. (Haw. Mar. 31, 2008)

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

STATE OF HAWAI'I, Plaintiff-Appellee-Respondent, v. BOB EMCH, Defendant-Appellant-Petitioner. No. 28009. Supreme Court of Hawaii. April 21, 2008. Stephen K. Tsushima, Deputy Prosecuting Attorney, for the Plaintiff-Appellee-Respondent The State of Hawai'i. Phyllis J. Hironaka, Deputy Public Defender, for the Defendant-Appellant-Petitioner Bob Emch. SUMMARY DISPOSITION ORDER MOON, C.J., LEVINSON, NAKAYAMA, and DUFFY, JJ., and ACOBA, J., dissenting. On January 11, 2008, the defendant-appellant-petitioner Bob Emch filed an application for a writ of certiorari, urging us to review the summary disposition order (SDO) of the Intermediate Court of Appeals (ICA) affirming the May 31, 2006 order of the circuit court of the first circuit, the Honorable Dexter D. Del Rosario presiding, denying his motion to correct an illegal sentence.

He argues that the ICA gravely erred in concluding that the circuit court's imposition of an extended term sentence under Hawai'i Revised Statutes (HRS) §§ 706-661 (Supp. 2005)[1] and 706-662(1) (Supp. 2005)[2] did not violate his rights under the fifth, sixth, and fourteenth amendments to the United States Constitution, as explicated in *Apprendi v. New Jersey*, 530 U.S. 466 (2000), and its progeny, including *State v. Maugaotega*, 115 Hawai'i 432, 168 P.3d 562 (2007) (*Maugaotega II*).

See ICA's SDO at 2. We accepted his application on February 20, 2008 for the reason that the ICA's decision was inconsistent with our opinion in *Maugaotega II*. Upon carefully reviewing the record and the briefs submitted by the parties and having given due consideration to the arguments advanced and the issues raised, we vacate Emch's extended term sentence and remand this case to the circuit court for resentencing consistent with our opinion in *State v. Jess*, No. 28483, Slip Op.

(Haw. March 31, 2008). Four days after the ICA entered its summary disposition order upholding Emch's extended term sentence, we decided *Maugaotega II*. In that case, the defendant was sentenced under HRS § 706-662(4)(a), because the circuit court determined that the defendant was a multiple offender whose extended imprisonment was necessary for the protection of the public.

115 Haw. at 436, 168 P.3d at 566. In light of *Cunningham*, we held that HRS § 706-662 was unconstitutional on its face, insofar as the statute, in all of its iterations, (1) "authorize[d] the sentencing court to extend a defendant's sentence beyond the 'standard term' authorized solely by the jury's verdict" and (2) required "the sentencing court, rather than the trier of fact, to make an additional necessity finding that.. does not fall under *Apprendi*'s prior-or-concurrent-convictions exception."

115 Hawai'i at 446, 168 P.3d at 576. Consequently, we concluded that the "extended term sentences imposed by the circuit court violated [the defendant's] sixth amendment right to a jury trial and were illegal." *Id.* In the present matter, the circuit court imposed an extended term sentence on Emch pursuant to HRS § 706-662(1) because it found Emch to be a persistent offender whose imprisonment for an extended term is necessary for the protection of the public.

As such, under *Maugaotega II*, the sentence violates Emch's sixth amendment right to a jury trial and is therefore illegal. See *id.* In addition to requesting a vacatur, Emch also asks us to order the circuit court to resentence him to non-extended terms on remand.

In *Jess*, we held that a defendant, whose extended term sentence imposed under HRS § 706-662 (Supp. 1996) was invalidated, may be resentedenced to an extended term of imprisonment pursuant to either (1) a judicially reformed version of the statute where the circuit court exercises its inherent judicial authority or (2) the legislatively amended incarnation of the statute, Act 1, see *supra* notes 1-2.

See No. 28483, Slip Op. at 7-8, 59-67. Hence, upon appropriate motion, the circuit court may resentence Emch to an extended term of imprisonment by exercising its inherent authority to judicially reform HRS § 706-662 (Supp. 2005) or by utilizing the provisions set forth in Act 1.

Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Emch's extended term sentence is vacated and this case is remanded to the circuit court for resentencing consistent with our opinion in *Jess*. NOTES [1] In 2005, HRS 706-661 provided: In the cases designated in [HRS §] 706-662 [see *infra* note 2], a person who has been convicted of a felony may be sentenced to an extended indeterminate term of imprisonment.

When ordering such a sentence, the court shall impose the maximum length of imprisonment which shall be as follows: (1) For murder in the second degree life without the possibility of parole; (2) For a class A felony indeterminate life term of imprisonment; (3) For a class B felony

indeterminate twenty-year term of imprisonment; and (4) For a class C felony indeterminate ten-year term of imprisonment.

The minimum length of imprisonment for sections 2, 3, and 4 shall be determined by the Hawai'i paroling authority in accordance with [HRS §] 706-669. Effective June 22, 2006, the legislature amended HRS §§ 706-661 and -662, see 2006 Haw. Sess. L. Act 230, §§ 23, 24, and 54 at 1012-13, 1025, to address concerns raised by the Hawai'i Judicial Council that Hawaii's extended term sentencing scheme faced challenges in federal court that it violated a defendant's right to a jury trial, protected under the sixth amendment to the United States Constitution, as articulated in *Apprendi v. New Jersey*, 530 U.S. 466 (2000), and its progeny.

See Report of the Committee to Conduct a Comprehensive Review of the Hawai'i Penal Code at 271-27q (2005); Sen. Stand. Comm. Rep. No. 3215, in 2006 Senate Journal, at 1557; Hse. Stand. Comm. Rep. No. 665-06, in 2006 House Journal, at 1359.

The amended version of HRS § 706-661 provided in relevant part: The court may sentence a person who satisfies the criteria for any of the categories set forth in [HRS §] 706-662 to an extended term of imprisonment, which shall have a maximum length as follows: (1) For murder in the second degree life without the possibility of parole; (2) For a class A felony indeterminate life term of imprisonment; (3) For a class B felony indeterminate twenty-year term of imprisonment; and (4) For a class C felony indeterminate ten-year term of imprisonment.

In exercising its discretion on whether to impose the extended term of imprisonment or to use other available sentencing options, the court shall consider whether the extended term is necessary for the protection of the public and whether the extended term is necessary in light of the other factors set forth in [HRS §] 706-606. When ordering an extended term sentence, the court shall impose the maximum length of imprisonment..

(Emphasis added.) Effective June 30, 2007, the amended version of HRS § 706-661 expired and the Supp. 2003 version, *supra* this note, was reenacted. See 2006 Haw. Sess. L. Act 230, § 54 at 1025. Finally, effective October 31, 2007, the legislature amended HRS §706-661 as part of its reform of the state's extended term sentencing laws to bring them into compliance with the requirements of *Apprendi* and its progeny.

HRS § 606-661 was amended to read: Extended terms of imprisonment. The court may sentence a person who satisfies the criteria for any of the categories set forth in [HRS §] 706-662[, *infra* note 3,] to an extended term of imprisonment, which shall have the maximum length as follows: (1) For murder in the second degree life without the possibility of parole; (2) For a class A felony indeterminate life term of imprisonment; (3) For a class B felony indeterminate twenty-year term of imprisonment; and (4) For a class C felony indeterminate ten-year term of imprisonment.

When ordering an extended term sentence, the court shall impose the maximum length of imprisonment. The minimum length of imprisonment for an extended term sentence under paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) shall be determined by the Hawai'i paroling authority in accordance with [HRS §] 706-669. H.B. 2, 24th Leg., Second Spec. Sess.

(2007), available at http://capitol.hawaii.gov/splsession2007b/bills/HB2_.htm (enacted as Act 1 on October 31, 2007), see <http://capitol.hawaii.gov/sitel/archives/2007b/getstatus2.asp?billno=HB2>.

[2] In 2005, HRS § 706-662 provided in relevant part: A convicted defendant may be subject to an extended term of imprisonment under [HRS §] 706-661, if the convicted satisfies one or more of the following criteria: (1) The defendant is a persistent offender whose imprisonment for an extended term is necessary for protection of the public.

The court shall not make this finding unless the defendant has previously been convicted of two felonies committed at different times when the defendant was eighteen years of age or older. In section 24 of Act 230, effective June 22, 2006, the legislature amended HRS § 706-662 to address the same alleged constitutional infirmities discussed *supra* in note 1.

Act 230 amended HRS § 706-662 to provide in relevant part: A defendant who has been convicted of a felony qualifies for an extended term of imprisonment under [HRS §] 706-661 if the convicted defendant satisfies one or more of the following criteria: (1) The defendant is a persistent offender in that the defendant has previously been convicted of two felonies committed at different times when the defendant was eighteen years of age or older; Effective June 30, 2007, the amended version of HRS § 706-662 expired and the Supp. 2005 version, *supra* this note, was reenacted.

See 2006 Haw. Sess. L. Act 230, § 54 at 1025. Effective October 31, 2007, the legislature again amended HRS § 706-662 as part of its reform of the state's extended sentencing scheme to bring it into compliance with *Apprendi* and *Cunningham v. California*, 549 U.S. ___, 127 S. Ct. 856 (2007).

The amended version of HRS § 706-662 provides in relevant part: Criteria for extended terms of imprisonment: A defendant who has been convicted of a felony may be subject to an extended term of imprisonment under [HRS §] 706-661[, see *supra* note 1,] if it is proven beyond a reasonable doubt that an extended term of imprisonment is necessary for the protection of the public and that the convicted defendant satisfies one or more of the following criteria: (1) The defendant is a persistent offender in that the defendant has previously been convicted of two or more felonies committed at different times when the defendant was eighteen years of age or older.

H.B. 2, 24th Leg., Second Spec. Sess. (2007), available at <http://capitol.hawaii.gov/splsession2007b/bills/HB2.htm> (enacted as Act 1 on October 31, 2007), see <http://capitol.hawaii.gov/sitel/archives/2007b/getstatus2.asp?billno=HB2>.

