# IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF MISSISSIPE OF

DERRICK POSS

٧.

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

FILED

NOV - 3 2008

Office of the Clerk
Supreme Court
Court of Appeals

APPELLANT

2008-CP-1686-COA

CAUSE NUMBER-CRO3-777(PF)L

APPELLEE

## CERTIFICATE OF INTERESTED PERSONS

THE UNDERSIGNED COUNSEL OF RECORD CERTIFIES THAT THE FOLLOWING LISTED PERSONS HAVE AN INTEREST IN THE OUTCOME OF THIS CASE. THESE REPRESENTATIONS ARE MADE IN ORDER THAT THE JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME COURT AND/OR JUDGES OF THE COURTSOF APPEALS MAY EVALUATE POSSIBLE DISQUALIFICATION OR RECUSAL.

1).HON.JIM HOOD, ATTORNEY GENERAL
P.O. BOX 220
JACKSON, MS 39205

2).HON.JOHN YOUNG, DISTRICT ATT.

P.O. BOX 212
CORINTH,MS 38834

ATTORNEY OF RECORD,

APPELLANT, PRO SE

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# PAGE NUMBER:

CERTIFICATE OF INTERESTED PERSONS	-I
TABLE OF CONTENTS	-II
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	-III
STATEMENT OF ISSUE	- 1
STATEMENT OF CASE	- 2
SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT	- 3
ARGUMENT	- 4-5
CONCLUSION	- 6
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	- 7

# TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES:	PAGE NUMBER:
GRUBB V. STATE, 584 SO.2d 786, 789 (MISS. 1991)	4
IVY V. STATE,731 So.2d 601,603(MISS.1999)	4
KIRK V. STATE,798 So.2d 345,346(MISS.2000)	<del>4</del>
LUCKETT V. STATE, 582 So. 2d 428, 430 (MISS. 1991)	4-5
LYLE V. STATE,756 S0.2d 1,2(6)(MISS.CT.APP.1999)	5
MCGLEACHIE V. STATE,840 So.2d 108,110(MISS.CT.APP.2002)	4
SMITH V. STATE, 477 So.2d 191,195-96(MISS.1985)	4
SNEED V. STATE, 722 So.2d 1255,1257(7)(MISS.1998)	4
STEVENSON V. STATE, 674, 501;505 (MISS. 1996)	<del></del> 4
TWILLIE V. STATE,892 So.2d 187,191(12) (MISS.2004)	5
WEAVER V. STATE, 2001, 785 So. 2d 1085	5
MISSISSIPPI STATUTES:	
47-7-3 M.C.A	1-2
97-3-79 M.C.A	2
99-39-5(2)(SUPP.2004)M.C.A	4

I. WHETHER THE CIRCUIT COURT ERRED BY DISMISSING APPELLANTS MOTION

FOR POST-CONVICTION AS PROCEDURALLY BARRED AS A SUCCESSIVE MOTION

WHEN APPELLANT IS UNCONSTITUTIONALLY DETAINED AND IMPRISONED ON AN

ILLEGAL SENTENCE BECAUSE THE APPELLANT'S SENTENCE INVOLVES AN EX

POST FACTO RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION OF SECTION 47-7-3 MISS.CODE

OF 1972 AS AMENDED BY SENATE BILL #2680,2004.

#### STATEMENT OF CASE

ON OR ABOUT THE 5TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2003, APPELLANT WAS ARRESTED AND CHARGED WITH THE CRIME OF ARMED ROBBERY. THEREAFTER, APPELLANT POSS WAS INDICTED ON OR ABOUT THE 22ND DAY OF OCTOBER, 2003, BY A LEE COUNTY GRAND JURY FOR ARMED ROBBERY IN VIOLATION OF SECTION 97-3-79 OF THE MISS.CODE. ON MAY 10,2004, POSS ENTERED A GUILTY PLEA AND WAS AJUDICATED GUILTY. POSS WAS SENTENCED TO A FIFTEEN YEAR SENTENCE. ON JULY 28,2005 POSS FILED A MOTION FOR POST-CONVICTION RELIEF IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF LEE COUNTY, WHICH WAS DISMISSED ON JANUARY 31,2006. POSS ASSERTED CLAIMS OF INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL AND INVOLUNTARY GUILTY PLEA ON THIS POST-CONVICTION MOTION ABOVE. POSS THEN FILED HIS APPEAL TO THE SUPREME COURT/COURT OF APPEALS ON FEBUARY 23,2006. POSS' APPEAL WAS AFFIRMED BY THE COURT OF APPEALS ON MARCH 20,2007. POSS THEN FILED A MOTION FOR REHEARING ON MARCH 27,2007, WHICH WAS DENIED ON JUNE 5,2007.

UPON ONGOING RESEARCH OF CASE LAW, POSS DISCOVERED THE REVISION OF SECTION 47-7-3(2004), WHICH DID NOT BECOME EFFECTIVE UNTIL AFTER POSS WAS SENTENCED.A MISINTERPRETATION OF SECTION 47-7-3(2004) WHICH WAS AMENDED BY SENATE BILL #2680, WAS APPLIED TO POSS' SENTENCEDAND THEREFORE CAUSED HIS ENTIRE SENTENCE TO BE MANDATORY. THIS MADE POSS' SENTENCE BECOME AN EX POST FACTO RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION OF SENATE BILL #2680, BEING APPLIED TO POSS' SENTENCE WHEN POSS COMMITTED HIS CRIME BEFORE THIS LAW WAS PASSED OR CAME INTO EFFECT. POSS FILED A MOTION FOR POST-CONVICTION RELIEF CLAIMING THAT HIS SENTENCE IS ILLEGAL ON JUNE 17,2008. ON AUGUST 11,2008, POSS' MOTION WAS DISMISSED AS BEING PROCEDURALLY BARRED AS A SUCCESSIVE MOTION.

NOW POSS IS APPEALING THE LOWER COURTS DECISION TO THIS COURT FOR REVIEW AND IN HOPETTOADEMONSTRATE THAT HIS SENTENCE IS ILLEGAL, AND THE CLAIM OF ANDILLEGAL SENTENCEDMAY BE WAIVED FROM THE TIME-BAR IF THERE IS A FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT VIOLATED.

## SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT

APPELLANT ARGUES THAT HIS SENTENCE IS ILLEGAL AND VOID, AND THERE ARE EXCEPTIONS
TO PROCEDURAL BARS WHEN ONE'S FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT HAS BEEN VIOLATED. THE LOWER
COURT WRONGFULLY DISMISSED POSS' PETITION FOR POST-CONVICTION BECAUSE THE LOWER
COURT OVERLOOKED THE FACT THAT DUE TO THE ALLEGATION OF AN ILLEGAL SENTENCE, THE
PETITION WAS NOT SUBJECT TO THE TIME-BAR.

## ARGUMENT

I.PETITIONER POSS CONTENDS THAT THERE ARE CERTAIN EXCEPTIONS TO PROCEDURAL BARS INVOLVING TIME AND SUCCESSIVE WRIT BARS.

THERE ARE CERTAIN EXCEPTIONS CARVED OUT TO PROCEDURAL BARS WHERE THERE IS A QUESTION THAT A PARTIES FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS HAVE BEEN VIOLATED. SNEED V. STATE, 722, SO.2d 1255,1257(7) (MISS.1998). "THE RIGHT TO BE FREE FROM AN ILLEGAL SENTENCE HAS BEEN FOUND TO BE FUNDAMENTAL." Id. IN IVY V. STATE, 731 So.2d 601,603(13) (MISS.1999), THE MISSISSIPPI SUPREME COURT REITERATED ITS FORMER RULING THAT "ERRORS AFFECTING THE FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT SUCH AS THE RIGHT TO A LEGAL SENTENCE MAY BE EXCEPTED FROM PROCEDURAL BARS WHICH WOULD OTHERWISE PREVENT THEIR CONSIDERATION."IVY 731 So.2d AT 603 (13), (CITING LUCKETT V. STATE, 582 So. 2d 428, 430 (MISS. 1991). SEE ALSO, SMITH V. STATE,477 So.2d 191,195-96(MISS.1985). IN IVY, THE SUPREME COURT RECOGNIZED THAT THE LOWER COURT WRONGFULLY DISMISSED IVY'S PETITION FOR POST-CONVICTION RELIEF ----BECAUSE THE LOWER COURT OVERLOOKED THE FACT THAT DUE TO THE ALLEGATION OF AN ILLEGAL SENTENCE THE PETITION WAS NOT SUBJECT TO THE TIME-BAR.IVY 731 So.2d 603(14). SEE ALSO, STEVENSON V. STATE, 674 501, 505 (MISS. 1996); GRUBB V. STATE, 584 So2@2dd786, 789 (MISS.1991); LUCKETT V. STATE, 582 So. 2d at 430 AND SMITH 477 So. 2d at 195-96. THE MISSISSIPPI SUPREME COURT HAS HELD THAT THE THREE(3) YEAR STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS IN MISS.CODE ANN. \$99-39-5 (2) (SUPP. 2004) MAY BE WAIVED WHEN A FUNDAMENTAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT IS IMPLICATED. THE MISSISSIPPI SUPREME COURT HAS CONSISTENTLY HELD THAT THE TIME-BAR OF MISS.CODE ANN. \$99-39-5(2)(SUPP. 2004), APPLIES TO A PETITIONER'S POST CONVICTION RELIEF CLAIMS BASED ON INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL AND INVOLUNTARY GUILTY PLEAS.KIRK V. STATE, 798 So. 2d 345, 346 (MISS. 2000), (CITING LUCKETT V. STATE, 582 So.2d 428,429-30(MISS.1991). THE SUPREME COURT HAS HELD THAT THE THREE YEAR STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS MAY BE WAIVED WHEN A FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT IS IMPLICATED. MCGLEACHIE V.STATE,840 So.2d 108,110(MISS.CT APP.2002), SNEED V. STATE,722 So.2d 1255,1257(MISS. 1998). THERE ARE EXCEPTIONS TO THE THREE YEAR LIMITATIONS:

- 1).CASES IN WHICH THE PRISONER CAN DEMONSTRATE THAT THERE HAS BEEN AN INTERVENING DECISION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF EITHER THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI OR THE UNITED STATES WHICH WOULD HAVE ACTUALLY ADVERSELY AFFECTED THE OUTCOME OF HIS SENTENCE OR CONVICTION; OR
- 2). THE PRISONER HAS EVIDENCE NOT REASONABLY DISCOVERABLE AT THE TIME OF TRIAL, WHICH IS OF SUCH NATURE THAT IT WOULD BEYPRACTICALLY CONCLUSIVE THAT HAD SUCH BEEN INTRODUCED AT TRIAL, IT WOULD HAVE CAUSED A DIFFERENT OUTCOME IN THE CONVICTION OR SENTENCE; OR
- 3).CASES IN WHICH THE PRISONER CLAIMS THAT HIS SENTENCE HAS EXPIRED, ILLEGAL, OR HIS PROBATION, PAROLE, OR CONDITIONAL RELEASE HAS BEEN UNLAWFULLY REVOKED.

APPELLANT ARGUES THE TIME-BAR SHOULD NOT BE APPLIED AS THE ERROR HE CLAIMS AFFECT HIS FUNDAMENTAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT. IT IS TRUE THAT WHEN THE FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS OF AN INDIVIDUAL ARE IMPLICATED IN A PETITION FOR POST-CONVICTION RELIEF, THE PROCEDURAL TIME-BAR WILL NOT ALWAYS BE APPLIED TO PRECLUDE REVIEW OF THE CLAIMS.

LUCKETT V. STATE,582 So.2d 428,430 (MISS.1991). HOWEVER, ALLEGATIONS OF AN ILLEGAL SENTENCE WILL BE REVIEWED EVEN IF THEY ARE FILED AFTER THE THREE-YEAR STATUTE DEADLINE. TWILLIE V. STATE,892 So.2d 187 191(12) (MISS.2004). ACCORDING TO MY FUNDAMENTAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO A LEGAL SENTENCE AND THE ABOVE CASE AUTHORITY AND WEAVER V. STATE,2001,785 So.2d 1085. THIS COURT IS ABLE TO REVIEW MY ILLEGAL SENTENCE CLAIM EVEN IF MY POST-CONVICTION MOTION IS SUCCESSIVE. LYLES V. STATE,756 So.2d 1,2 (6) (MISS. CT.APP.1999).

## CONCLUSION

APPELLANT PRAYS THAT THIS HONORABLE COURT REVERSE THE TRIAL COURT'S DISMISSAL OF HIS POST-CONVICTION MOTION AND REMAND FOR SUCH A HEARING TO DETERMINE THE MERITS OF POSS' ILLEGAL SENTENCE CLAIM.

THIS THE 3rd DAY OF MOVEMBER, 2008.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMATTED,

APPELLANT, PRO SE

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT I, THE UNDERSIGNED, HAVE THIS DAY AND DATE MAILED VIA UNITED STATES, POSTAGE PRE-PAID, A TRUE AND CORRECT COPY OF THE FOREGOING AND ATTACHED INSTRUMENTS TO THE FOLLOWING;

1).HON.JIM HOOD, ATTORNEY GENERAL

P.O. BOX 220

JACKSON, MS 39205

2).HON.JOHN YOUNG, DISTRICT ATT.

P.O. BOX 212

CORINTH,MS 38834

THIS THE 3rd DAY OF LOVEMber, 2008.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMETTED,

DERRICK POSS#104788

M.S.P.

P.O. BOX 1057

PARCHMAN, MS 38738