CHERYL J. STURM Attorney-At-Law 387 Ring Road Chadds Ford, PA 19317 484-771-2000

## NEWSLETTER: FEDERAL AND STATE MARCH, 2020

## I. BRADY DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENT APPLIES TO MATERIAL KNOWN ONLY TO POLICE INVESTIGATORS

Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83, 83 S.Ct. 1194, 10 L.Ed.2d 214 (1963) and Giglio v. United States 405 U.S. 150, 153-54, 92 S.Ct. 763, 31 L.Ed.2d 104 (1972) held that the prosecution's suppression of evidence favorable to the accused violates due process. 373 U.S. at 87. Proving a Brady/Giglio violation is easier said than done. The individual claiming a violation of his right to due process must show the undisclosed evidence was (1) favorable to him either because it was exculpatory or impeaching; (2) material to the defense; and (3) that the prosecution had the materials and failed to disclose them. Kyles v. Whitley, 514 U.S. 419, 434, 115 S.Ct. 1555, 131 L.Ed.2d 490 (1995) held that the *Brady* disclosure rule covers material known only to police investigators even if the prosecutor did not know about evidence or information provided the police investigators are part of the prosecution team. Id. 514 U.S. 437. Prosecutors have a duty to investigate and learn of any favorable evidence known to others acting on behalf of the government. Wearry v. Cain, 136 S.Ct. 1002, 194 L.Ed.2d 78 (2016) reversed a murder conviction for failure on the part of state investigators to produce evidence supporting innocence. The case dealt with the dubious testimony of a single witness corroborated by the suspect testimony of a jailhouse informant. Wearry held that a Brady violation is timely if based on any evidence that is newly discovered. If the new evidence is strong, and the evidence of guilt is weak, then the Brady/Giglio claim has a good chance of success and regardless of timeliness barriers imposed by state or federal statutes. The key to success of a Brady claim in a post-conviction motion or a habeas corpus petition is the discovery of new facts.

## II. SCOPE OF PRACTICE

My practice encompasses plea negotiations, sentencing consultation, sentencing, preparation of sentencing memoranda, disciplinary problems, parole representation, parole appeals, parole memoranda, 2241 habeas corpus petitions, presidential pardons and commutations, state pardons and commutations, 2254 habeas corpus petitions, and 2255 motions, direct appeals in all Circuits, U.S. 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 v. Reshenberg, 893 F2d 1333 (3d Cir. 1989), United States v. Calabrese, 942 F2d 218 (3d Cir. 1991), United States v. 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. Amerman, [2255] granted, sentence reduced) (EDPA 92-498-02) affirmed 14 F3d 49 (2000); United States v. Eyer, 113 F3d 470 (3d Cir. 1997); United States v. Fields, 113 F3d 313 (2d Cir. 1997); United States v. 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), United States v. Almodovar, 100 F.Supp. 2d 301 (EDPA 2000, Ludwig, J.) Dabelko v. United States, 211 F3d 1268 (6th Cir. 2000); United States v. Carmichael, 216 F3d 224 (2d Cir. 2000); United States v. 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 v. 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. Lopez, 93-246-01 (EDPA, Hutton, J.)[2255 granted]; United States v. Garcia-Cintron, 93CV1771 (EDPA, Gawthrop)[2255 granted, sentence reduced]; United States v. Fazekas, C.A. No. 94-1542 [WDPA, Diamond C.J.][2255 motion granted, 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, CA. 93-464 [WDVA], [misclassification of methamphetamine, sentence reduced from 180 months to 90 months], United States v. Richard H. Wilson, 90 CRIM 69-01, 91 CIV 3326 [EDPA, Gawthrop][2255 motion 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 v. Cross, CTA6 No. 03-3562 (sentence vacated, and reduced on remand), United States vs. Alexander, C'TA3 No. 96-1696 [sentence reduced, and case remanded for hearing on distinction between cocaine base and crack cocaine], United States v. Kostrick, 103 F3d 114 (3d Cir. 1996)[848 vacated], United States v. Michaels, 2001 U.S. Dist. Lexis 191 15 (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. 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 [ED VA, Hilton] [2255 granted, life sentence vacated; sentence reduced]; United States v. Cruz-Pagan, 91-006 [EDPA, life sentence vacated; sentence reduced], United States v. Ostreicher, 91 cv 3576 [EDNY, Weinstein, J.] [2255 motion vacated, special parole term vacated]; United States v. S. Jones, 22 F3d 304 (3d Cir. 1994)[2255 granted, sentence vacated]; United States v. S. Jones, 47 F3d 1162 (3d Cir. 1995)[2255 granted, sentence vacated, sentence reduced]; United States ex rel. Maurice Roberts v. 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 v. United States, 97CV290 [DUT][2255 granted, sentence reduced and prisoner released]; Simpkins v. United States, 1999CR22 [NDWV, 2255 granted; failure to properly file 851 special information; sentence reduced]; United States v. Vernon, 92-340-01 [EDPA, Dalzell, J.] [2255 granted, restitution order vacated and modified]; United States v. Cora Love, 92-504-16 [EDPA, Giles, C.J., 2255 motion granted, sentence reduced]; United States v. Rosa, 90-38 [DNJ][2255 granted; sentence reduced]; United States v. Broadus, 91 CR209, 97CV965 [MDNC, Tilley, J.] [2255 granted in part, sentence reduced by 20 years]; United States v. Arevalo, 94CR702, 97 CV 946 [SDFLA, Moreno, J.] [2255 granted, sentence reduced]; United States v. H. Cruz, 93CR341 [SDFLA, Highsmith, J.] [2255 granted, sentence reduced]; Stocker v. Warden, 2004 U.S. Dist. Lexis 5395 [EDPA, Giles, C.J. Habeas corpus granted based on actual innocence, sentence vacated], Stovall v. Warden, 2005 U.S. Dist. Lexis 6758 (EDPA Diamond)[2254 habeas granted in part restoring right to appeal]; Pedretri v. United States, 1996 U.S. Dist. Lexis 6315 (NDNY, McAvoy C.J.)[2255 granted, sentence reduced]; 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, 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, sentence reduced on remand], McKeever v. Warden, 2005 U.S. Dist. Lexis 4714 (EDP A, Diamond, J.) [2254 habeas granted, remanded to state for resentencing], United States v. Futch, CR. 402-232 [SDGA, Savannah Div.] [2255 granted, sentence reduced], 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. Wayne, 2008 U.S. Dist Lexis 52133 (WDPA 2008)[3582(c)(2) motion granted sentence reduced], United States v. Fermin, 277 Fed. Appx. 28 (2d Cir. 2008)[Sentence vacated and reduced], United States v. Manigault, 2010 U.S. App. Lexis 20350 (3d Cir. 2010)[sentence reduced pursuant to 1 8 USC 3582(c)(2) despite career offender classification], Commonwealth v. Hanna, 2009 PA Super. 3 (PA Super. 2009).[Vacated and remanded order denying expungement of criminal record], In re: Fredrick Pereira A 027 489 318: Removal order voided and petitioner allowed to remain in the United States | United States v. Omar Mendoza, 2009 U.S. Dist. Lexis 487205 2:05 CV 294 (NDTX, Amarillo) [2255 motion granted based on claim of ineffective assistance of trial counsel, sentence reduced to time served], United States v. Johnson, 2011 U.S. App. Lexis i 5677 (3d Cir. 2011)[sentence reduced from 360 months to 222 months as a result of a 2255 motion], United States v. Bruce Wayne Mohammed, 94CR17 [WDPA, Cohill, J.][Two 3582(c)(2) motions granted, sentence reduced twice], Commonwealth v. Cherry, 2017 PA Super. 28 (PA Super. 2017), Lambert v. SCI Warden, Greene, 861 F3d 459 (3d Cir. 2017)[habeas granted], Commonwealth v. Henkel, 90 A3d 16 (PA Super. 2014) wherein the Superior Court refused to apply Martinez v. Ryan, 566 U.S. 1, 132 S.Ct. 1309, 182 L.Ed.2d 272

(2012) to claim of ineffective assistance of trial counsel combined with ineffective assistance of PCRA counsel and then see Henkel v, Gilmore, 2015 U.S. Dist. Lexis 124341 (WDPA) [Martinez applied and habeas granted], Jeffries v. United States, 1:15CV814, 1 Crim. 127-01 [MDNC, Schroeder, J. 2255 motion granted for ineffective assistance of trial counsel and ex post facto violation, sentence vacated], Commonwealth v. Fulton, 179 A3d 475 (PA 2018)[warrantless search of cell phone, all evidence suppressed, conviction and sentence vacated], Commonwealth v. Poole, 2018 PA Super Unpub. Lexis 934 (PA Super. 2018)[evidentiary hearing granted to determine the date critical witness recanted testimony not the date he considered recanting testimony], United States v. Teddy Young, Criminal No. 05-56-01, Civ. 10-6836 [Stengel, J. 2255 motion granted based on IAC, sentence reduced], See also United States v. Young, 588 Fed. Appx. 209 (3d Cir. 2015)[Reversed order denying 2255 evidentiary hearing], Commonwealth v. Bickerstaff, 2019 PA Super 51 (held trial counsel ineffective and vacated sentence), Wade v. Monroe County District Attorney, 2019 U.S. Dist. Lexis 79826 (MDPA 2019), Commonwealth v. Blackson, 2019 PA Super Unpub. Lexis 2235 (6/7/19)

For information about representation, please call or write at the phone number or address above or E-Mail sturmtriallaw@gmail.com