

S117235

No. _____

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In re

ROBERT LEWIS, JR.

No. _____

(Related Automatic Appeal
No. S020670

On Habeas Corpus

Los Angeles Superior
Court No. A027897

PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

SUPREME COURT
FILED
JUL 2 2003
Frederick K. Ohlrich Clerk
DEPUTY

SANGER & SWYSEN
Attorneys at Law
Robert M. Sanger, State Bar No. 58214
Catherine J. Swysen, State Bar No. 171929
233 East Carrillo Street, Suite C
Santa Barbara, California 93101
Telephone (805) 962-4887

Attorneys for Petitioner

DEATH PENALTY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES xv

INTRODUCTION 2

VERIFICATION 17

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF
PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS..... 18

STATEMENT OF FACTS 18

 A. The Guilt Phase 18

 B. The Penalty Phase 23

 C. Post-Verdict Proceedings 25

 D. First Direct Appeal and Habeas Corpus Petition 25

 E. Proceedings in the Trial Court on Remand 26

 F. Current Appeal and Habeas Corpus Petition 28

CLAIMS 28

 CLAIM I: INCOMPETENT COUNSEL, RON SLICK, DEPRIVED
 MR. LEWIS OF THE EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF
 COUNSEL, OF THE RIGHT TO PROCEDURAL DUE
 PROCESS OF LAW, OF THE RIGHT TO SUBSTANTIVE
 DUE PROCESS OF LAW, OF THE RIGHT TO A FAIR
 TRIAL, OF THE RIGHT TO EQUAL PROTECTION OF
 THE LAWS, OF THE RIGHT TO GUARANTEED
 PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES AND OF THE RIGHT
 AGAINST CRUEL AND/OR UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT
 UNDER THE FEDERAL AND CALIFORNIA
 CONSTITUTIONS..... 28

 CLAIM II: PETITIONER IS ENTITLED TO HAVE THIS
 SECOND PETITION FOR HABEAS CORPUS
 HEARD..... 37

A.	Petitioner is entitled to have his claims heard because it would violate his rights to Due Process, Equal Protection, and protection against Cruel and/or Unusual Punishment under both federal and California Constitutional provisions to hold him to a standard announced after his initial petition was filed.	39
B.	Even if the Court finds that <i>Clark</i> applies to Petitioner, he is entitled to have his claims heard because he is justified in bringing them in this second petition. . .	40
	1. Petitioner did not know, and could not have known, the facts which give rise to all of the claims contained herein at the time of his initial petition.	41
	a. Petitioner has discovered facts that give rise to the included claims.	41
	b. Petitioner did not know, and could not have known, of these newly-discovered facts at the time of his initial petition because he lacked the funding to perform thorough investigation.	42
	2. Petitioner was unable to present many of his claims at the time of his first petition for writ of habeas corpus.	44
C.	Even if the Court finds that the general rule of <i>Clark</i> applies to Petitioner's claims, he is nonetheless entitled to have them heard because to bar his claims would work a fundamental miscarriage of justice.	47
D.	Petitioner is entitled to have any of his claims heard that are not barred by the <i>Clark</i> rule.	58

CLAIM III: THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY HAS LOST OR DESTROYED HIS FILE AND THE LONG BEACH POLICE HAS DESTROYED ITS FILES, THEREFORE, PETITIONER HAS BEEN PREVENTED FROM REVIEWING MATERIALS TO WHICH HE MAY BE CONSTITUTIONALLY ENTITLED. 59

A. Introduction 59

B. Efforts to Obtain the File of Prior Counsel 61

C. Efforts to Reconstruct the File from Police Records 62

D. Efforts to Reconstruct the File form the Records of the District Attorney. 63

E. The Failure to Preserve the File or any Means to Reconstruct it Violates Petitioner’s Rights to Due Process, Equal Protection, and Protection Against Cruel and/or Unusual Punishment. 65

F. Petitioner is Entitled to Post-Conviction Discovery and Will Seek Leave of This Court to Amend This Petition Upon the Receipt of Same. 68

CLAIM IV: PETITIONER WAS DENIED HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO DUE PROCESS, EQUAL PROTECTION, PROTECTION AGAINST CRUEL AND/OR UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT, AND EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL BECAUSE THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY AND TRIAL COUNSEL HAVE LOST OR DESTROYED THEIR FILES, AND THE LONG BEACH POLICE HAS DESTROYED ITS FILES, DEPRIVING PETITIONER OF A THOROUGH AND MEANINGFUL PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS. 72

CLAIM V: PETITIONER'S CONVICTION, SENTENCE AND CONFINEMENT WERE UNLAWFULLY OBTAINED BECAUSE HE WAS DENIED THE RIGHT TO THE EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL THROUGHOUT THE PRE-TRIAL STAGE OF THE PROCEEDINGS 75

CLAIM VI: PETITIONER WAS DENIED HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS, INCLUDING THE RIGHT TO THE EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL, WHEN TRIAL COUNSEL FAILED TO ADEQUATELY INVESTIGATE AND PREPARE THE GUILT PHASE OF THE TRIAL BY INTERVIEWING LEWIS WONG. 77

CLAIM VII: PETITIONER WAS DENIED HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS, INCLUDING THE RIGHT TO THE EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL, WHEN TRIAL COUNSEL FAILED TO ADEQUATELY INVESTIGATE AND PREPARE THE GUILT PHASE OF THE TRIAL BY DETERMINING WHETHER A MENTAL DEFENSE WAS AVAILABLE. 80

CLAIM VIII: PETITIONER WAS DENIED HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO DUE PROCESS, A FAIR TRIAL, AND THE EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL BY TRIAL COUNSEL'S FAILURE TO FULLY PREPARE AND PRESENT HIS DEFENSE OF ALIBI. .. 82

CLAIM IX: PETITIONER WAS DENIED HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO DUE PROCESS, A FAIR TRIAL, AND THE EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL WHEN TRIAL COUNSEL CONCEDED HIS ALIBI DEFENSE DURING CLOSING ARGUMENT. 85

CLAIM X: THE TRIAL COURT ERRED IN GIVING CERTAIN JURY INSTRUCTIONS DURING THE GUILT PHASE OF THE TRIAL AND IT WAS AND IT WAS INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL TO FAIL TO OBJECT TO SAID INSTRUCTIONS. 87

A.	The trial court erred in instructing the jury that they could consider possession of recently stolen property to permit an inference of guilt of murder.	88
B.	CALJIC 2.22 (1975 Revision) was unconstitutional as given in that it lessened the prosecution's burden of proof.	90
C.	The trial court failed to instruct on the defense theory that more than one person was involved in the crime.	91
D.	The court failed to instruct under CALJIC 8.80 regarding the intent to kill.	92
CLAIM XI: TRIAL COUNSEL'S FAILURE TO CONDUCT MEANINGFUL VOIR DIRE WAS INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL AND DEPRIVED PETITIONER OF A CONSTITUTIONALLY GUARANTEED IMPARTIAL JURY		
		93
CLAIM XII: TRIAL COUNSEL'S FAILURE TO COMPETENTLY MOVE TO CHALLENGE POTENTIAL JURORS FOR CAUSE OR TO COMPETENTLY EXERCISE PEREMPTORY CHALLENGES WAS INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL AND DEPRIVED PETITIONER OF A CONSTITUTIONALLY GUARANTEED IMPARTIAL JURY.		
		99
CLAIM XIII: THE ROBBERY SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE PROVISION PURSUANT TO WHICH PETITIONER WAS DETERMINED TO BE DEATH-ELIGIBLE IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL		
		101

CLAIM XIV: TRIAL COUNSEL’S FAILURE TO INTRODUCE ANY MEANINGFUL MITIGATING EVIDENCE RESULTED IN AN UNRELIABLE SENTENCE IN VIOLATION OF THE CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT CLAUSE OF THE EIGHTH AMENDMENT TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AND THE CRUEL OR UNUSUAL CLAUSE OF ARTICLE I, SECTION 17 OF THE CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION 104

- A. Facts 106
- B. Ron Slick Failed in His Duty to Present Mitigating Evidence of a Life Duty Time of Trauma, Mental Retardation and Learning Disabilities 125
- C. Ron Slick Failed in His Duty to Present Good Character Evidence 130
- D. Petitioner Was Prejudiced by Trial Counsel Failure to Present Mitigating Evidence 132

CLAIM XV: TRIAL COUNSEL’S FAILURE TO INVESTIGATE AND PRESENT MITIGATING EVIDENCE REGARDING PETITIONER’S MENTAL RETARDATION AND LEARNING DISABILITIES WAS INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL UNDER BOTH THE FEDERAL AND STATE CONSTITUTIONS 136

- A. Facts 136
- B. Trial Counsel’s Failure to Investigate and Present Evidence of Serious Brain Dysfunction and Mental Retardation in Mitigation Constitutes Ineffective Assistance of Counsel 160
- C. Trial Counsel’s Counsel Failure to Find Any Necessary Expert and Present Them with the Relevant Information Constitutes Ineffective Assistance of Counsel. 161

- D. Trial Counsel’s Failure to Present Expert Testimony Explaining the Significance of the Serious Brain Dysfunction and Mental Retardation Constitutes Ineffective Assistance of Counsel. 165
- E. Petitioner Was Prejudiced by Trial Counsel Failure to Present Evidence of Serious Brain Dysfunction, Mental Retardation and by its Failure to Present Expert Testimony Explaining its Significance 165

CLAIM XVI: TRIAL COUNSEL’S FAILURE TO INVESTIGATE AND PRESENT MITIGATING EVIDENCE REGARDING THE IMPACT OF PETITIONER’S INSTITUTIONALIZATION WAS INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL 167

- A. Facts 167
- B. Trial Counsel’s Failure to Investigate and Present Evidence of the Impact of Juvenile Institutionalization on Petitioner and Explain its Significance Through Expert Testimony Constitutes Ineffective Assistance of Counsel. 177

CLAIM XVII: PETITIONER WAS DENIED HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO DUE PROCESS, A FAIR TRIAL, THE EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL, AND PROTECTION FROM CRUEL AND/OR UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT BY THE COURT’S FAILURE TO INSTRUCT THE JURY AS TO THE TRUE NATURE OF LIFE WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE AND HIS TRIAL ATTORNEY’S FAILURE TO SO OBJECT. 178

CLAIM XVIII: THE EXECUTION OF PETITIONER WOULD CONSTITUTE CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT IN THAT PETITIONER IS MENTALLY RETARDED WITHIN THE MEANING OF THE ATKINS DECISION 180

- A. The Execution of the Mentally Retarded Constitutes Cruel and Unusual Punishment 180

B. Petitioner Is Mentally Retarded	181
CLAIM XIX: THE FAILURE OF THE COURT TO ALLOW PROPORTIONALITY REVIEW VIOLATES THE RIGHTS TO SUBSTANTIVE DUE PROCESS AS WELL AS THE RIGHT AGAINST CRUEL/OR AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT UNDER THE UNITED STATES AND CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTIONS	183
CLAIM XX: IF SUBSTANTIVE DUE PROCESS AND THE RIGHT AGAINST CRUEL AND/OR UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT DID NOT REQUIRE PROPORTIONALITY REVIEW, THE RIGHT TO EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS AND TO THE PRIVILEGES, AND IMMUNITIES UNDER THE UNITED STATES AND CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTIONS REQUIRE THAT PEOPLE FACING THE PENALTY OF DEATH BE TREATED EQUALLY TO PEOPLE FACING MONETARY FINES.	187
CLAIM XXI: PETITIONER RAISED ISSUES ON DIRECT APPEAL AND, TO THE EXTENT THAT THEY ARE NOT PROPERLY RAISED ON APPEAL, PETITIONER RAISES THOSE ISSUES IN THIS PETITION	187
CLAIM XXII: PETITIONER WAS DENIED DUE PROCESS AND EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAW BY THE TRIAL COURT'S REFUSAL TO CONSIDER OR PERMIT PRESENTATION OF EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF A MOTION TO STRIKE THE SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE FINDING	188
A. Introduction	188
B. A Defendant Who Has Been Sentenced to Death Has the Right to Move the Court to Strike the Special Circumstance Pursuant to Penal Code Section 1385 and <i>People v. Williams</i> (1981) 30 Cal.3d 470	189

- C. Not Allowing Petitioner to Move the Court to Strike the Special Circumstance on Remand Where Defendants in Non-capital Cases Are Allowed to Do So Is a Denial of Equal Protection of the Law. . . . 191
- D. The Trial Court’s Refusal to Hold a Williams Hearing Deprived Petitioner of His Constitutional Right to Due Process of Law and to a Fair, Reliable and Individualized Capital Sentencing under the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, and Article I, Sections 7 and 17 of the California Constitution. 192
- E. A Williams Hearing Would Be of Particular Significance in this Case Where the Trial Counsel Did Little Preparation and Presented So Little Evidence.194

CLAIM XXIII: PETITIONER WAS DENIED HIS EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS TO DUE PROCESS OF LAW AND TO A FAIR, RELIABLE, AND INDIVIDUALIZED CAPITAL SENTENCING DETERMINATION WHEN THE TRIAL COURT DENIED HIM THE OPPORTUNITY TO PRESENT RELEVANT MITIGATING EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF A SENTENCE LESS THAN DEATH. 195

- A. Introduction 196
- B. Petitioner Offered to Present Relevant Additional Mitigating Evidence 197
- C. The Trial Court Violated Petitioner’s Eighth and Fourteenth Amendment Rights When it Precluded Him from Presenting the Additional Mitigating Evidence197
- D. Evidence of Good Post Judgment Maturation in Prison Is a Category of Evidence Relevant to the Choice Between Life and Death Which Was Not Available at Trial and Could Not Have Been Presented. 200

- E. The Trial Court’s Refusal to Allow Petitioner to Present Additional Mitigating Evidence Violates His Constitutional Right to Equal Protection of the Laws. 202
- F. Failure to Allow the Presentation of Additional Mitigating Evidence Is Reversible 203

CLAIM XXIV: PETITIONER’S RIGHTS TO DUE PROCESS, EQUAL PROTECTION, A FAIR TRIAL, AND PROTECTION FROM CRUEL AND/OR UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT - AS GUARANTEED BY THE FIFTH, SIXTH, EIGHTH, AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION AND ARTICLE I, SECTIONS 1, 7, 15, 16, 17, 24, AND 31 - WERE VIOLATED BECAUSE THE DEATH PENALTY JURY INSTRUCTIONS ARE UNCONSTITUTIONALLY VAGUE AND INCAPABLE OF BEING UNDERSTOOD BY JURORS 204

CLAIM XXV: PETITIONER WAS DENIED FUNDAMENTAL DUE PROCESS OF LAW WHEN THE TRIAL COURT DENIED HIS REQUEST FOR PRE-SENTENCING DISCOVERY 210

- A. Introduction 210
- B. Discovery Was Relevant to the Williams Motion and the Automatic Motion to Modify the Death Verdict. 212
- C. The Trial Court Had the Authority to Order Pre-sentence Discovery. 213
- D. Denial of Discovery Violates the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments Mandate That Procedures Be Followed to Ensure Reliability of Any Determination That Death Is the Appropriate Sentence. 213

CLAIM XXVI: THE DEATH PENALTY IS WRONG AND THE COURT SHOULD SAY SO NOW 214

A.	Introduction	214
B.	The Death Penalty Is Wrong	215
C.	This Court Would Not Be Alone in Coming to the Conclusion That Killing of Prisoners Wrong	216
	CLAIM XXVII: CALIFORNIA'S DEATH PENALTY STATUTE, AS INTERPRETED BY THIS COURT AND APPLIED AT PETITIONERS TRIAL, VIOLATES THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION.	222
A.	Petitioner's Death Penalty Is Invalid Because § 190.2 Is Impermissibly Broad.	223
B.	Petitioner's Death Penalty Is Invalid Because § 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.	227
C.	California's Death Penalty Statute Contains No Safeguards to Avoid Arbitrary And Capricious Sentencing, And Therefore Violates The Eighth And Fourteenth Amendments to The United States Constitution.	234
1.	The Trial Court's Failure To Instruct The Jury on Any Penalty Phase Burden of Proof Violated Petitioner's Constitutional Rights To Due Process And Equal Protection Of The Laws, And To Not Be Subjected to Cruel And Unusual Punishment.	235
2.	Beyond a Reasonable Doubt Is the Appropriate Burden of Proof for Factors Relied on to Impose a Death Sentence, for Finding that Aggravating Factors Outweigh Mitigating Factors, and for Finding that Death Is the Appropriate Sentence.	237

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.	240
4.	California Law Violates The Sixth, Eighth And Fourteenth Amendments To The United States Constitution By Failing To Require Unanimous Jury Agreement On Aggravating Factors. . .	242
	a. <u>Jury Agreement</u>	242
	b. <u>Jury Unanimity</u>	244
5.	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. . .	249
6.	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.	251
7.	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 Factor In Aggravation Unless Found to Be True Beyond a Reasonable Doubt By A Unanimous Jury.	256

8.	The Use of Restrictive Adjectives in the List of Potential Mitigating Factors Impermissibly Acted as Barriers to Consideration of Mitigation by Petitioner's Jury.	257
9.	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.	257
D.	Even If The Absence of The Previously Addressed Procedural Safeguards Did Not Render California's Death Penalty Scheme Constitutionally Inadequate to Ensure Reliability And Guard Against Arbitrary Capital Sentencing, The Denial of Those Safeguards to Capital Defendants Violates The Constitutional Guarantee of Equal Protection of The Laws.	259
E.	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.	277
CLAIM XXVIII: THE PENALTY OF DEATH AND EXECUTION IN CALIFORNIA ARE ARBITRARILY AND CAPRICIOUSLY IMPOSED DEPENDING ON THE COUNTY IN WHICH THE DEFENDANT IS CHARGED, IN VIOLATION OF THE RIGHT TO EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAW		269
CLAIM XXIX: PETITIONER'S CONVICTION AND DEATH SENTENCE VIOLATE INTERNATIONAL LAW		272
CLAIM XXX: EXECUTION FOLLOWING LENGTHY CONFINEMENT UNDER SENTENCE OF DEATH WOULD CONSTITUTE CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT IN VIOLATION OF PETITIONER'S STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS AND INTERNATIONAL LAW		281

CLAIM XXXI: PETITIONER CANNOT BE LAWFULLY
EXECUTED BECAUSE THE METHOD OF EXECUTION
IN CALIFORNIA IS FORBIDDEN BY STATE, FEDERAL
AND INTERNATIONAL
LAW 289

CLAIM XXXII: PETITIONER'S CONVICTIONS AND DEATH
SENTENCE MUST BE VACATED BECAUSE OF THE
CUMULATIVE EFFECT OF ALL THE ERRORS AND
CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATIONS SHOWN IN THIS
PETITION AND IN PETITIONER'S AUTOMATIC
APPEALS AND PRIOR PETITION 303

CONCLUSION 307

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

United States Supreme Court

<i>Addington v. Texas</i> (1979), 441 U.S. 418, 423-424	239
<i>Ake v. Oklahoma</i> (1985) 470 U.S. 68	33, 162
<i>Apprendi v. New Jersey</i> (2000) 530 U.S. 466	239, 245, 256
<i>Arizona v. Fulminante</i> (1991) 499 U.S. 279, 286	204
<i>Atkins v. Virginia</i> (2002) 536 U.S. 304	44, 54, 180, 181, 182, 255
<i>Barclay v. Florida</i> (1983) 463 U.S. 969, 951	255, 306
<i>Beck v. Alabama</i> , 447 U.S. at 625	207, 264
<i>BMW of North American., Inc. v Gore</i> (1996) 517 U.S. 559	183, 184
<i>Bowsher v. Synar</i> (1986) 478 U.S. 714	276, 278
<i>Boyde v. California</i> (1990) 494 U.S. 370, 380	126
<i>Brady v. Maryland</i> (1963) 373 U.S. 83	60, 62, 212
<i>Brown v. Louisiana</i> (1980) 447 U.S. 323, 334	245
<i>Bullington v. Missouri</i> 451 U.S. 430	239, 247
<i>Bush v. Gore</i> (2000) 531 U.S. 98	46, 266, 270, 271, 272
<i>Caldwell v. Mississippi</i> (1985) 472 U.S. 320, 341	248
<i>California v. Brown</i> (1987) 479 U.S. 538, 543	249
<i>California v. Ramos</i> (1983) 463 U.S. 992, 998-999	264
<i>Callins v. Collins</i> (1994) 510 U.S. 1141, 1145	218, 219, 279
<i>Chambers v. Mississippi</i> (1973) 410 U.S. 284	33

<i>Chapman v. California</i> (1967) 386 U.S. 18	203, 204, 248
<i>Chessman v. Teets</i> (1957) 354 U.S. 156	282, 287
<i>Clinton v. City of New York</i> (1998) 524 U.S. 417	276, 278
<i>Coker v. Georgia</i> (1977) 433 U.S. 584, 596	253, 262
<i>Coleman v. Alabama</i> (1970) 399 U.S. 1, 7-10	75, 286
<i>Cooper Indus., Inc. v Leatherman Tool Group</i> (2001) 532 U.S. 424	183, 184
<i>Eddings v. Oklahoma</i> (1983) 455 U.S. 104, 115	198, 201, 236, 241, 259, 271
<i>Enmund v. Florida</i> (1982) 458 U.S. 782, 796	253, 263
<i>Estelle v. Gamble</i> (1976) 429 U.S. 97, 106	301
<i>Estelle v. Williams</i> (1976) 425 U.S. 501, 505	60
<i>Fahy v. Connecticut</i> (1963) 375 U.S. 85, 86-87	248
<i>Ford v. Wainwright</i> (1986) 477 U.S. 399	97, 180, 255, 263, 264
<i>Furman v. Georgia</i> (1972) 408 U.S. 238	103, 209, 218, 226, 253, 256, 268, 285, 286
<i>Gardner v. Florida</i> (1977) 430 U.S. 349, 358	33, 245, 264
<i>Giglio v. United States</i> (1972) 405 U.S. 150, 154	66
<i>Glass v. Louisiana</i> (1985) 471 U.S. 1080, 1086	302
<i>Godfrey v. Georgia</i> (1980) 446 U.S. 420, 427	223
<i>Green v. Georgia</i> (1979) 442 U.S. 95	33

<i>Gregg v. Georgia</i> (1976) 428 U.S. 153	244, 249, 253, 254, 256, 259, 264, 270, 285, 286, 302
<i>Griffin v. United States</i> (1991) 502 U.S. 46, 51	240, 243
<i>Harmelin v. Michigan</i> (1991) 501 U.S. 957, 994	246, 250, 264
<i>Herring v. New York</i> (1975) 422 U.S. 853, 862	86
<i>Hicks v. Oklahoma</i> , (1980) 447 U.S. 343, 346	205, 210, 241, 242
<i>Hilton v. Guyot</i> (1895) 159 U.S. 113, 227	268, 269
<i>Hitchcock v. Dugger</i> (1987) 481 U.S. 393, 398-99	198, 248
<i>Holbrook v. Flynn</i> (1986) 475 U.S. 560	60
<i>Honda Motor Co. v. Oberg</i> (1994) 512 US 415	45, 183
<i>Imbler v. Patchman</i> (1976) 424 U.S. 409, 472	67
<i>In re Medley</i> (1890) 134 U.S. 160, 172	284
<i>In re Winship</i> (1970) 397 U.S. 358	235
<i>INS v. Chadha</i> (1983) 462 U.S. 919	276, 278
<i>Irvin v. Dowd</i> (1961) 366 U.S. 717, 722	93
<i>Jecker, Torre & Co. v. Montgomery</i> (1855) 59 U.S.110, 112	269
<i>Johnson v. Mississippi</i> (1988) 486 U.S. 578	60, 199, 245, 256, 258
<i>Jurek v. Texas</i> (1976) 428 U.S. 262, 276	33, 270
<i>Kinsella v. United States</i> (1960) 361 U.S. 234, 255-256	264
<i>Kirby v. Illinois</i> (1972) 406 U.S. 682, 689	75

<i>Knight v. Florida</i> (1998) 528 U.S. 990	282, 283
<i>Kyles v. Whitney</i> (1995) 514 U.S. 419	60, 66, 67
<i>Lackey v. Texas</i> (1995) 514 U.S. 1045	282, 283, 284, 286
<i>Lockett v. Ohio</i> (1978) 438 U.S. 586	33, 198, 201, 203, 218, 245, 257, 264, 265
<i>Martin v. Waddell's Lessee</i> (1842) 41 U.S. [16 Pet.] 367, 409	268
<i>Maynard v. Cartwright</i> (1988) 486 U.S. 356, 363	234
<i>McCleskey v. Kemp</i> (1987) 481 U.S. 279, 305	262, 263, 270
<i>McDonough Power Equip, Inc. v. Greenwood</i> (1984) 464 U.S. 548, 554	97
<i>Miller v. United States</i> (1871) 78 U.S. [11 Wall.] 268	268, 269
<i>Mills v. Maryland</i> (1988) 486 U.S. 367, 387	198, 199, 241, 250, 257
<i>Monge v. California</i> (1998) 524 U.S. 721, 732	238, 239, 245, 246, 247, 259, 264, 265, 266
<i>Moore v. Nebraska</i> (1999) 528 U.S. 990	282
<i>Murray's Lessee v. Hoboken Land and Improvement Co.</i> (1855) 59 U.S. 272	240, 243, 264
<i>Napue v. Illinois</i> (1959) 360 U.S. 264, 269	66
<i>Pennsylvania v. Ritchie</i> (1987) 480 U.S. 39, 61-65	60
<i>Penry v. Lynaugh</i> (1989) 492 U.S. 302, 328	198
<i>Proffitt v. Florida</i> (1976) 428 U.S. 242, 260	241, 252, 270
<i>Pulley v. Harris</i> (1984) 465 U.S. 37	185, 186, 227, 252, 255

<i>Ramdass v. Angelone</i> (2000) 530 U.S. 156	179
<i>Reid v. Covert</i> (1957) 354 U.S. 1, 77	264
<i>Ring v. Arizona</i> (2002) 538 U.S. 584	239
<i>Robinson v. California</i> (1962) 370 U.S. 660.)	292
<i>Sabariego v. Maverick</i> (1888) 124 U.S. 261, 291-292	268
<i>Santosky v. Kramer</i> (1982) 455 U.S. 745, 754-767	235, 238
<i>Satterwhite v. Texas</i> (1987) 486 U.S. 393, 258-259	248
<i>Schad v. Arizona</i> (1991) 501 U.S. 624, 633	243
<i>Shafer v. South Carolina</i> (2001) 532 U.S. 36, 51	178
<i>Simmons v. South Carolina</i> (1994) 512 U.S. 154 .. 179, 191, 193, 194, 199	
<i>Skinner v. Oklahoma</i> (1942) 316 U.S. 535, 541	260
<i>Skipper v. South Carolina</i> (1985) 476 U.S. 1	193, 198, 200, 201
<i>Smith v. Hopper</i> (1978) 436 U.S. 950	218
<i>Smith v. Phillips</i> (1982) 455 U.S. 209, 225	96
<i>Stanford v. Kentucky</i> (1989) 492 U.S. 361, 389	267, 280
<i>State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. v Campbell</i> (2003) U.S. 123 S.Ct. 1513	183
<i>Strickland v. Washington</i> (1984) 466 U.S. 668	33, 34, 36, 75, 77, 80, 81, 105, 133, 166, 246, 247, 265
<i>Stringer v. Black</i> (1992) 503 U.S. 222, 235.	258
<i>Sullivan v. Louisiana</i> (1993) 508 U.S. 275	236, 242, 248

<i>Taylor v. Kentucky</i> (1978) 436 U.S. 478, 486-488	304
<i>The Paquete Habana</i> (1900) 175 U.S. 677, 700	273, 274, 278
<i>Thompson v. Oklahoma</i> (1988) 487 U.S. 815, 821, 830-3	253, 267
<i>Townsend v. Sain</i> (1963) 372 U.S. 293, 313-316	249
<i>Trop v. Dulles</i> (1958) 356 U.S. 86, 102	260, 268, 302
<i>Tuilaepa v. California</i> , (1994) 512 U.S. 967	208, 229, 249, 259
<i>Turner v. Murray</i> (1986) 476 U.S. 28	264
<i>United States v. Bagley</i> (1985) 473 U.S. 667	60, 65, 66
<i>United States v. Bajakajian</i> (1998) 524 U.S. 321	183, 184
<i>United States v. Gaudin</i> (1995) 515 U.S. 506, 522-523	248
<i>Wainwright v. Witt</i> (1985) 469 U.S. 412, 424	97
<i>Walton v. Arizona</i> (1990) 497 U.S. 639	239
<i>Wiggins v. Smith</i> (2003) __ U.S. __, 2003 U.S. LEXIS 5014 ...	33, 34, 104
<i>Williams v. Taylor</i> (2000) 120 S.Ct. 1495, 1516	104, 129
<i>Woodson v. North Carolina</i> (1976) 428 U.S. 280	213, 258, 264
<i>Zant v. Stephens</i> (1983) 462 U.S. 862, 884-885 .	33, 60, 224, 258, 264, 302

Federal Circuit Courts

<i>Abebe-Jira v. Negenso</i> (11th Cir. 1996) 72 F.3d 844	273
<i>Ainsworth v. Woodford</i> (2001) 268 F.3d 868	126, 127
<i>Bagley v. Lumpkin</i> (9th Cir. 1986) 798 F.2d 1297	66

<i>Battenfield v. Gibson</i> (10th Cir. 2001) 236 F.3d 1215, 1229	126
<i>Bean v. Calderon</i> (1998) 163 F.3d 1073, 1080.	133, 134, 162, 166
<i>Blanco v. Singletary</i> (11 th Cir. 1991) 943 F.2d 1477, 1502	35
<i>Bonin v. Calderon</i> (9th Cir. 1996) 77 F.3d 1155, 1163	291
<i>Brown v. Myers</i> (9th Cir. 1998) 137 F.3d 1154, 1157	135
<i>Campbell v. Wood</i> (9th Cir. 1994) 18 F.3d 662, 709-11	302
<i>Caro v. Calderon</i> (9th Cir. 1999) 165 F.3d 1223 ...	35, 126, 161, 165, 239
<i>Ceja v. Stewart</i> (9th Cir. 1998) 97 F.3d 1246	283, 384, 285, 204
<i>Charfauros v. Board of Elections</i> (9th Cir., 2001) 249 F.3d 941, 951	266
<i>Creech v. Arave</i> (9th Cir. 1991) 947 F.2d 873	200
<i>Douglas v. Woodford</i> (9th Cir. 2003) 316 F.3d 1079, 1085	80
<i>Dyer v. Calderon</i> (9th Cir. 1998) 151 F.3d 970, 973	93
<i>Fierro v. Gomez</i> (9th Cir. 1996) 77 F.3d 301	290, 291
<i>Filartiga v. Pena-Irala</i> (2d Cir. 1980) 630 F.2d 876	273, 274, 281
<i>Harris v. Wood</i> (9th Cir. 1995) 64 F.3d 1432, 1438-1439	304
<i>Hendricks v. Calderon</i> (9th Cir. 1995) 70 F.3d 1032	80, 160
<i>Horton v. Zant</i> (11 th Cir. 1991) 941 F.2d 1449, 1462	33, 36
<i>In re Gay</i> (1998) 19 Cal.4th 771, 826	305
<i>Jackson v. Calderon</i> (9th Cir. 2000) 211 F.3d 1148, 1162	160
<i>Jackson v. Dugger</i> (11th Cir. 1991) 931 F.2d 712	131

<i>Jackson v. Herring</i> (11th Cir. 1995) 42 F.3d 1350, 1369	131
<i>Jennings v. Woodford</i> (9th Cir. 2002) 290 F.3d 1006, 1014	80, 81
<i>Kadic v. Karadzic</i> (2nd Cir. 1995) 70 F.3d 232	281
<i>Karis v. Calderon</i> (9th Cir. 2002) 283 F.3d 1117, 1135	126, 128
<i>Lisenbee v. Henry</i> (9th Cir. 1999) 166 F.3d 997, 998-1000	90
<i>Lord v. Wood</i> (9 th Cir. 1999) 184 F.3d 1083, 1093-1095	35
<i>Ma v. Ashcroft</i> (9th Cir. 2001) 257 F.3d 1095, 1114	275
<i>Mak v. Blodgett</i> (9th Cir. 1992) 970 F.2d 614, 619	126, 304
<i>Martinez v. City of Los Angeles</i> (9th Cir. 1998) 141 F.3d 1373, 1384	280
<i>Maryland Correctional Adjustment Center</i> (4 th Cir. 1992) 970 F.2d 1355, 1358	36
<i>Mayfield v. Woodford</i> (9 th Cir. 2001) 270 F.3d 915, 927	104, 177
<i>McDowell v. Calderon</i> , (9th Cir. 1997) 130 F.3d 833	206
<i>McKenzie v. Day</i> (9th Cir. 1995) 57 F.3d 1461, 1466-1467	283, 284
<i>Myers v. Ylst</i> (9th Cir. 1990) 897 F.2d 417, 421 .. 191, 203, 241, 246, 250	
<i>Richmond v. Lewis</i> (9th Cir. 1990) 948 F.2d 1473	287
<i>Silva v. Woodford</i> (9th Cir. 2002) 279 F.3d 825, 838	129
<i>Suniga v. Bunnell</i> (1993) 998 F.2d 664, 668-670	248
<i>Thomas v. Goldsmith</i> (9th Cir. 1992) 979 F.2d 746, 749-750	67
<i>United States v. Allsup</i> (9th Cir. 1977) 566 F.2d 68,71	97, 98
<i>United States v. DeCoster</i> (D.C. Cir. 1973) 487 F.2d 1197, 1202	34

<i>United States v. Eubanks</i> (1979) 591 F.2d 513, 517	98
<i>United States v. Frederick</i> (9th Cir. 1996) 78 F.3d 1370, 1381	304
<i>United States v. Gonzalez</i> (9th Cir. 2000) 214 F.3d 1109, 1112	97
<i>United States v. Green</i> (9th Cir. 1981) 648 F.2d 587, 597	304
<i>United States v. Pace</i> (9th Cir. 1987) 833 F.2d 1307, 1310	75
<i>United States v. Parker</i> (6th Cir. 1993) 997 F.2d 219, 222	306
<i>United States v. Payne</i> (2nd Cir. 1995) 63 F.3d 200, 1208	67
<i>United States v. Sepulveda</i> (1st Cir. 1993) 15 F.3d 1161, 1196	304
<i>United States v. Tory</i> (9th Cir. 1995) 52 F.3d 207, 211	306
<i>United States v. Wallace</i> (9th Cir. 1988) 848 F.2d 1464, 1476	304, 305
<i>Wade v. Calderon</i> (9th Cir. 1994) 29 F.3d 1312, 1319	226
<i>Walker v. Engle</i> (6th Cir. 1983) 703 F.2d 903, 962.)	306
<i>Wallace v. Stewart</i> (9th Cir. 1999) 184 F.3d 1112, 1117	35
 <u>California Supreme Court</u>	
<i>In re Brown</i> (1998) 17 Cal.4th 873, 879	67
<i>In re Clark</i> (1993) 5 Cal.4th 750, 773	38-60
<i>In re Cordero</i> (1988) 46 Cal.3d at 161, 179-180	33, 34
<i>In re Ferguson</i> (1971) 5 Cal.3d 525, 531	212
<i>In re Fields</i> (1990) 51 Cal.3d 1063, 1069	34
<i>In re Gallego</i> (1998) 18 Cal.4th 825, 828-29	43, 44
<i>In re Hall</i> (1981) 30 Cal.3d 408, 426	34, 35