CHERYL J. STURM

ATTORNEY AT LAW
387 Ring Road
Chadds Ford, PA 19317
484-771-2000
Fax: 484-771-2008

307 Loch Lomond Road
Rancho Mirage, CA 92270

Member of the PA Bar

Kindly direct all correspondence to Chadds Ford, Pennsylvania

NEWSLETTER
FEDERAL AND STATE
JULY, 2010

I. NEW SUPREME COURT CASES

Skilling v. United States, 2010 U.S. Lexis 5259 (6/24/10) held that honest services mail fraud under 18 U.S.C. 1346 is limited to its "heartland applications." The Court defined heartland applications as a deprivation of the right to honest services involving bribery or kickback schemes. The Court held that a broader construction of 1346 would render the statute unconstitutionally vague. The Court rejected the government's argument that 1346 covered all cases involving "undisclosed self-dealing by a public official or private employee." This case applies to individuals convicted of mail fraud, wire fraud, bank fraud, or health care fraud where the trial judge instructed the jury that it could convict based on a theory of fraud involving money or property and a theory that it could convict based on the deprivation of the right to honest services.

Holland v. Florida, 2010 U.S. Lexis 4946 (6/14/10) held that Section 2244(d) of the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996, Pub.L. No. 104-134, 110 Stat. 1214 (1996) [the "AEDPA"] is a statute of limitations subject to equitable tolling. Furthermore, the Court stated that there is a rebuttable presumption **in favor of** equitable tolling. Still, a showing of "extraordinary circumstances" is required to justify equitable tolling. What constitutes "extraordinary" is subject to a case-by-case evaluation.

Magwood v. Patterson, 2010 U.S. Lexis 5258 (6/24/10) held that the phrase "second or successive" used in 28 U.S.C. 2244(b) is a term of art. ***Magwood*** held that a habeas corpus petition is not second or successive where there is a "new judgment intervening between the two habeas petitions. In other words, an application for habeas corpus challenging a new judgment is not second or successive. This case changes prior law which held that a prisoner who files a successful 2254 habeas and is resentence may challenge "only the portion of the judgment that arose as a result of the previous successful action." See ***Lang v. United States***, 474 F3d 348, 351 (6th Cir. 2007), ***United States v. Esposito***, 135 F3d 111, 113 (2d Cir. 1997).

II. PAROLE REPRESENTATION

Pennsylvania and a few other states prohibit in-person legal representation in connection with the decision to grant or deny parole. Even so, a person eligible for parole consideration owes it to himself to have a lawyer prepare a memorandum making a balanced presentation of the offense behavior, the history and characteristics of the offender, and a reasoned argument

explaining why early parole will not endanger public safety. Clients interested in this service should get in touch with me.

III. SCOPE OF PRACTICE

My practice encompasses plea negotiations, sentencing consultation, sentencing, preparation of sentencing memoranda, disciplinary problems, parole representation, parole appeals, 2241 habeas corpus petitions, and 2254 habeas corpus petitions, and 2255 motions, direct appeals in all Circuits, Supreme Court practice, treaty transfers, convention transfers, derivative citizenship claims, removal (deportation) proceedings, civil commitments, and other immigration matters. Published cases include but are not limited to the following: ***Harris v. Martin***, 834 F2d 361 (3d Cir. 1987), ***United States vs. Reshenberg***, 893 F2d 1333 (3d Cir. 1989), ***United States v. Calabrese***, 942 F2d 218 (3d Cir. 1991), ***United States vs. Cole***, 813 F2d 43 (3d Cir. 1987), ***United States v. Day***, 969 F2d 39 (3d Cir. 1992), ***Farese v. Luther***, 953 F2d 49 (3d Cir. 1992), ***Schiano v. Luther***, 954 F2d 910 (3d Cir. 1992), ***United States v. Mathews***, 11 F3d 583 (6th Cir. 1993), ***United States v. Nanfro***, 64 F3d 98 (2d Cir. 2005), ***United States v. Henson***, 948 F.Supp. 431 (MDPA 1996), ***United States v. Miller***, 849 F2d 896 (4th Cir. 1988), ***Phifer v. Warden***, 53 F3d 859 (7th Cir. 1995), ***Prioleau v. United States***, 828 F.Supp. 261 (SDNY 1993), ***United States v. Tiller***, 91 F3d 127 (3d Cir. 1996), ***United States v. Eyer***, 113 F3d 470 (3d Cir. 1997), ***United States v. Fields***, 113 F3d 313 (2d Cir. 1997), ***United States vs. DePace***, 120 F3d 233 (11th Cir. 1997), ***United States v. Derrick Williams***, 158 F3d 736 (3d Cir. 1998), ***Paters v. United States***, 159 F3d 1043 (7th Cir. 1998), ***United States v. Conhaim***, 160 F3d 893 (2d Cir. 1998), ***United States v. DiPina***, 178 F3d 68 (1st Cir. 1999), ***In re Weatherwax***, CTA3 No. 99-3550 [Hazel-Atlas independent action is not a second or successive 2255 motion], ***Cullen v. United States***, 194 F3d 401 (2d Cir. 1999), ***Dabelko v. United States***, 211 F3d 1268 (6th Cir. 2000), ***United States vs. Carmichael***, 216 F3d 224 (2d Cir. 2000), ***United States vs. Williams***, 247 F3d 353 (2d Cir. 2001), ***United States ex rel. Bryant v. Warden***, 50 Fed. Appx. 13 (2d Cir. 2002), ***United States v. Peyton***, 12 Fed. Appx 145 (4th Cir. 2001), ***United States vs. Smith***, 348 F3d 545 (6th Cir. 2003), ***Blount v. United States***, 330 F.Supp.2d 493 (EDPA 2004), ***Commonwealth v. Hanna***, 964 A2d 923 (PA Super. 2009). Important unpublished cases include: ***United States v. Garcia-Cintron***, 93CV1771 (EDPA, Gawthrop][2255 granted, sentence reduced], ***United States v. Fazekas***, C.A. No. 94-1542 [WDPA 1994][misclassification as career offender, sentence reduced from 30 years to 10 years], ***Henry Jones v. United States***, 2:90CV 4291 [DNJ, Sarokin, J.][2255 motion granted for ineffective assistance, prisoner released], ***Hearn v. United States***, C.A. 93-464 [WDVA], [misclassification of methamphetamine, sentence reduced from 180 months to 90 months], ***United States v. Richard H. Wilson***, 90 CR169-01, 91 CIV 3326 [EDPA][2255 granted; actual innocence; immediate release], ***United States v. Gevares***, 961 F.Supp. 192 (NDOH, ED 1996)[2255 granted; firearms sentence vacated; government motion to resentence denied], ***United States vs. Cross***, CTA6 No. 03-3562 (sentence vacated, and reduced on remand), ***United States vs. Alexander***, CTA3 No. 96-1696 [sentence reduced, and case remanded for hearing on distinction between cocaine base and crack cocaine], ***United States v. Michaels***, 2001 U.S. Dist. Lexis 19115 (EDPA, Fullam, J.)[term of supervised release reduced], ***United States v. Williams***, 146 Fed. Appx. 656 (2d. Cir. 2002)[sentence vacated and reduced], ***United States v. R. Thomas***, 273 Fed. Appx. 103 (2d Cir. 2008)[sentence vacated and reduced], ***United States v. Matos***, 92 Cr 39-A (EDVA, Ellis, J.)[2255 granted, sentence reduced], ***United States v. Diaz***, Crim. No. 92-78-02 [EDPA][sentence reduced for

miscalculation of criminal history category], ***United States v. Eberly***, 5 F3d 1491 (3d Cir. 1993)[2255 granted, sentence vacated], ***United States v. Forde***, 92-429-A [EDVA, Hilton][2255 granted, life sentence vacated; sentence reduced]; ***United States v. Cruz-Pagan***, 91-0063 [EDPA][2255 granted, life sentence vacated; sentence reduced], ***United States v. Ostreicher***, 91cv 3576 [EDNY, Weinstein, J.][2255 motion vacated, special parole term vacated]; ***United States vs. S. Jones***, 22 F3d 304 (3d Cir. 1994)[2255 granted, sentence vacated]; ***United States vs. S. Jones***, 47 F3d 1162 (3d Cir. 1995)[2255 granted, sentence vacated, sentence reduced]; ***United States ex rel. Maurice Roberts vs. Warden***, 93-CV-1064 [NDNY][Probation Department's imposition of restrictions on employment violated due process], ***Darryl Pierce v. United States***, 89CR176 (MDPA, Rambo, J.)[2255 granted in part, sentence reduced], ***Baron vs. United States***, 97CV290 [DUT][2255 granted, sentence reduced and prisoner released]; ***Simpkins vs. United States***, C.A. 5:01CV12 [NDWVA][2255 granted; failure to properly file 851 special information; sentence reduced]; ***United States vs. Vernon***, 92-340-01 [EDPA, Dalzell,J.] [2255 granted, restitution order vacated and modified], ***United States vs. Cora Love,*** 92-504-16 [EDPA, Giles, C.J.][2255 granted, sentence reduced], ***United States vs. Rosa***, 90-38 [DNJ][2255 granted; sentence reduced]; ***United States vs. Arevalo***, 94CR702, 97 CV 946 [SDFLA, Moreno, J.][2255 granted, sentence reduced]; ***United States vs. H. Cruz***, 93CR341 [SDFLA, Highsmith, J.][2255 granted, sentence reduced]; ***Stocker* vs. *Warden***, 2004 U.S. Dist. Lexis 5395 [EDPA, Giles, C.J.][Habeas corpus granted based on actual innocence], ***United States v. Boggi***, 1997 U.S. Dist. Lexis 14165 (EDPA 1997)[2255 granted, sentence reduced]; ***United States ex rel Shriner v. Warden***, 1:CV03-0481 (MDPA, Rambo, J.) [[2241 habeas granted, sentence reduced], ***Commonwealth v. Keeman Copeland***, [CP 9607-1215 1/3 Greenspan, J.] [PCRA granted based on ineffective assistance of trial and appellate counsel. Conviction for first degree murder vacated. Life sentence vacated], ***Boyd v. Nish et al.,*** 2007 U.S. Dist. Lexis 7176 (EDPA 2007, Tucker, J.)[Section 2254 habeas corpus granted to state prisoner based on ineffective assistance of trial counsel], ***Dockery v. DiGuglielmo, et al.,*** Civil No. 04-6025 (EDPA 2007, Buckwalter, J.)[2254 granted, sentence reduced], ***Jones v. Piazza***, CTA3 No. 07-1868 (3d Cir. 2007)[reversed order denying habeas corpus under 28 U. S.C. 2254; remanded for resentencing], ***United States v. Danon***, Cr. 90-43 (DNJ, Lifland)[treaty transfer to Israel prior to completion of term of imprisonment], ***Commonwealth v. Maurice Jones,*** October Term, 1989, No. 0185-0187 [The Third Circuit Court of Appeals granted habeas corpus. Subsequently, the sentencing judge reduced the sentence], ***United States v. Coleman***, 206 Fed. Appx. 80 (2d Cir. 2006) [remanded for resentencing, sentence reduced], ***United States v. Fermin***, 277 Fed. Appx. 28 (2d Cir. 2008)[Sentence vacated and reduced], ***Commonwealth v. Hanna***, 2009 PA Super. 3 (PA Super. 2009). [Vacated and remanded order denying expungement of criminal record], ***United States v. Omar Mendoza***, 2009 U.S. Dist. Lexis 48720, 2:05 CV 294 (NDTX, Amarillo) [2255 motion granted based on claim of ineffective assistance of trial counsel, sentence reduced to time served]

For more information about representation, please call or write. To find out more information about Cheryl Sturm please visit www.cheryljsturm.com.

The information contained in this newsletter is news you can use but it is not an adequate substitute for legal advice by a well-qualified criminal defense lawyer familiar with the facts and circumstances of a given case.