

MASSACHUSETTS SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT

Commonwealth v. Stevie Jaiman

473 Mass. 1021 (2016) · No. SJC-11888 · Decided February 3, 2016

SUMMARY

The Supreme Judicial Court considers whether a defendant who defaulted by failing to appear remained "on release" for purposes of bail revocation under G. L. c. 276, § 58, when later charged with a new crime. Relying on its contemporaneous decision in Commonwealth v. Morales, the court concludes that the defendant remained on release and that the lower court had authority to revoke bail. The case was remanded for further proceedings consistent with that conclusion.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court
JURISDICTION	Massachusetts
DECIDED	February 3, 2016
DOCKET	SJC-11888
DISPOSITION	remanded
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The Commonwealth petitioned the county court under G. L. c. 211, § 3, after a Boston Municipal Court judge denied its motion to revoke the defendant's bail. A single justice reserved and reported the matter to the full Supreme Judicial Court.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published opinion
PARTIES	Commonwealth v. Stevie Jaiman

TOPICS

- bail
- statutory interpretation
- appellate procedure
- criminal procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- criminal procedure
- bail
- appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether a court may revoke a defendant's bail under G. L. c. 276, § 58, sixth par., when the defendant was released, failed to appear and defaulted, and was later charged with committing a new crime while the default warrant remained outstanding.

HOLDINGS

1. A defendant in these circumstances remains "on release" for purposes of the bail-revocation statute, and a judge has authority to revoke the defendant's bail when the defendant is later charged with committing a new crime during the period of release.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Jaiman was arraigned in the Boston Municipal Court on drug and firearm charges, received the statutory bail-revocation warning, and was released on personal recognizance. He failed to appear at a pretrial hearing, was found in default, and became subject to an outstanding default warrant. While the warrant remained outstanding, he was charged with aggravated statutory rape. The court denied bail revocation on the ground that Jaiman was no longer "on release" after defaulting.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Boston Municipal Court released Jaiman on personal recognizance after arraignment and issued a default warrant when he failed to appear at a pretrial hearing. After he was charged with a new offense while the warrant remained outstanding, the court denied the Commonwealth's motion to revoke bail under G. L. c. 276, § 58, sixth par., set bail in the new matter, and imposed release conditions. The Commonwealth sought extraordinary relief in the county court, and the single justice reserved and reported the issue to the full court.

DISPOSITION

remanded

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The case was remanded to the county court, where the single justice was directed to enter an order vacating the lower court's ruling and remanding the matter to the lower court for further proceedings consistent with the opinion.

CASES CITED

- Commonwealth v. Morales, 473 Mass. (2016)

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

NOTICE: All slip opinions and orders are subject to formal revision and are superseded by the advance sheets and bound volumes of the Official Reports. If you find a typographical error or other formal error, please notify the Reporter of Decisions, Supreme Judicial Court, John Adams Courthouse, 1 Pemberton Square, Suite 2500, Boston, MA, 02108-1750; (617) 557- 1030; SJCReporter@sjc.state.ma.us SJC-11888 COMMONWEALTH vs. STEVIE JAIMAN.

February 3, 2016. Bail. Supreme Judicial Court, Superintendence of inferior courts. This case is before us on a reservation and report from a single justice of the county court. It concerns the same single issue that we address in *Commonwealth v. Morales*, 473 Mass. (2016), also decided today: whether a court has the authority to revoke a defendant's bail pursuant to G. L. c. 276, § 58, where the defendant was "on release," defaulted by failing to appear, and later was charged with committing a new crime.

On January 19, 2011, the defendant was arraigned in the Boston Municipal Court on charges of possession with intent to distribute marijuana, G. L. c. 94C, § 32C (a), possession with intent to distribute marijuana in a school zone, G. L. c. 94C, § 32J, and possession of a firearm without a firearm identification card, G. L. c. 269, § 10 (h).

The court gave the defendant the bail revocation warning pursuant to G. L. c. 276, § 58, and released him on personal recognizance. After he failed to appear at a pretrial hearing, the court found him to be in default and issued a default warrant.

The warrant was still outstanding when the defendant was charged with a new crime, aggravated statutory rape, in violation of G. L. c. 265, § 23A, in April, 2015. At his arraignment on the new charges, the court denied the Commonwealth's motion to revoke the defendant's bail on the ground that he was not subject to bail revocation under G. L. c. 276, § 58, sixth par.

Because the defendant defaulted in the prior matter, he was no longer "on release," and therefore did not commit the new crime "during said period of release." The court did not take any action on the outstanding default warrant.

In the new matter, the court set bail in the amount of \$10,000, and imposed conditions on his release. The Commonwealth subsequently filed a petition pursuant to G. L. c. 211, § 3, in the county court seeking relief from the denial of its motion to revoke the defendant's bail.

The single justice reserved and reported the matter to the full court. In *Morales*, 473 Mass. at, we address the reasons why we interpret G. L. c. 276, § 58, sixth par., to mean that a defendant such as one in the circumstances presented here is still "on release" for purposes of bail revocation and why a judge therefore has the authority to revoke the defendant's bail.

For the reasons there stated, and as in that case, we remand the case to the county court where the single justice is directed to enter an order vacating the lower court's ruling and remanding the matter to that court for further proceedings consistent with this opinion. So ordered. Donna Jalbert Patalano, Assistant District Attorney, for the Commonwealth. Justin Kyle Brown, Committee for Public Counsel Services, for the defendant.