IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

DEMARIO WALKER

VS.

.l

NO. 2008-CP-1987

APPELLANT

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

APPELLEE

BRIEF FOR THE APPELLEE

APPELLEE DOES NOT REQUEST ORAL ARGUMENT

JIM HOOD, ATTORNEY GENERAL

BY: LAURA H. TEDDER SPECIAL ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL MISSISSIPPI BAR NO. 9530

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL POST OFFICE BOX 220 JACKSON, MS 39205-0220 TELEPHONE: (601) 359-3680

TABLE OF CONTENTS

.•

E OF SERVICE	CERTIFICAT
01	соисглаюи
9	5 TI
October 15, 2007 of two counts of Felony Bad Check in violation of <u>Mississippi</u>)
Walker's parole and/or street time was lawfully revoked due to his conviction on	ARGUMENT .
OF THE CASE	WWNS
OF THE ISSUES	STATEMENT
III	TABLE OF AU

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

EEDERAL CASES

,

•

•

•

<i>L</i> '9 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Morrisey v. Brewer, 408 U.S. 471 (1972)
<i>L</i> · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	(1961) 821 .S.U 686 ,Арул и рдинэМ

STATE CASES

	STATE STATUTES
6 '9 · · · · · · (200	Tupelo Redevelopment Agency v. Gray Corp., 972 So.2d 495, 517 (Miss.20
6 'S · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Riely v. State, 562 So.2d 1206 (Miss. 1990)
L · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Godsey v. Houston, 584 So.2d 389 (Miss. 1991)

Mississippi Code Annotated § 97-19-55

0,7,2,4,.... § .anA shoJ iqqississiM

STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES

 Walker's parole and/or street time was lawfully revoked due to his conviction on October 15, 2007 of two counts of Felony Bad Check in violation of <u>Mississippi Code Annotated</u>

II. Section 47-7-27 of the Mississippi Code of 1972, as amended, is constitutional.

,

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On or about August 15, 2001, the Marion County Grand Jury indicted Demario Walker

on four counts of uttering a forgery, alleging that Walker "did wilfully, unlawfully and feloniously and knowing by falsely attempt utter and publish as true to one Citizens Bank a certain bank check on the account of Eddie J. And Katrina Y. Wilson, Citizens Bank account number 20-15-147 by presenting the said check for payment." (C.P. 10) On or about May 21, 2002, Walker filed a Petition to Enter Plea of guilty to one count of attempted uttering forgery. (C.P. 13) On that same date, a plea hearing was held and Walker formally entered his plea of guilty. (C.P. 25)

On or about June 7, 2002, the trial court entered its Order of Conviction, sentencing

Walker to serve a term of ten (10) years in the custody of the Mississippi Department of Corrections, said sentence to be served under the provisions of <u>Section 47-7-47 of the</u> Program at the Department of Corrections. (C.P. 20) Pursuant to Section 47-7-47, Walker was to successfully complete the program at the Restitution Center, and upon completion of the program to be released to the local probation officer to complete his period of probation. Walker was ordered to complete the requirements of obtain a GED certificate within one (1) year after his release from the Regimented Inmate Discipline Program. (C.P. 21) It was further ordered that his release from the Regimented Inmate Discipline Program. (C.P. 21) It was further ordered that his release from the Regimented Inmate Discipline Program. (C.P. 21) It was further ordered that his release from the Regimented Inmate Discipline Program. (C.P. 21) It was further ordered that his release from the Regimented Inmate Discipline Program. (C.P. 21) It was further ordered that his release from the Regimented Inmate Discipline Program. (C.P. 21) It was further ordered that his release from the Regimented Inmate Discipline Program. (C.P. 21) It was further ordered that his release from the Regimented Inmate Discipline Program. (C.P. 21) Walker was to submit his release from the Regimented Inmate Discipline Program at the restitution center, that Walker was to submit him release from the Regimented Inmate Discipline Program. (C.P. 21) Washer was to submit him release from the Regimented Inmate Discipline Program at the restitution center, that Walker was to submit him release from the Regimented Inmate Discipline Program at the restitution center, that Walker was to submit him release from the Regimented Inmate Discording to the restitution center, that Walker was to submit him set for the test of and tested for any all psychiatric and/or himself to Programs and the restitution center, that Walker was to submit himself to the test of the test of the test of the test o

7

further ordered to successfully complete the Alcohol Chemical Treatment Series (ACTS) program sponsored by the Woodlawn Pentecostal Church. Upon Walker's plea of guilty to Count I, Counts II-IV were nolle prossed. (C.P. 22)

Due to medical reasons, Walker was unable to complete the RID program. On January

and three (3) weeks. Department of Corrections to serve the balance of his sentence, eight (8) years, six (6) months, revoked Walker's five (5) year probation and ordered him into the custody of the Mississippi work, he failed to complete the program. Consequently, the trial court, on February 28, 2003, at the Restitution Center in either Hinds or Jackson County. Due to the Petitioner's refusal to Condition M of the Probation Order stated that Walker shall successfully complete the program weeks, was suspended, and Walker was placed on probation for five (5) years. However, Accordingly, the remaining time of approximately eight (8) years, six (6) months, and three (3). Corrections, and gave him credit towards his original ten(10) year sentence for time served. year, five (5) months, and one (1) week in the custody of the Mississippi Department of condition of that probation. The trial court took notice of the fact that Walker had served one (1) (5) years probation, and making successful completion of the Restitution Center program a Petitioner's Order of Conviction, by suspending the balance of his sentence, placing him on five 30, 2003, the trial court entered an order, to which Walker agreed in open Court, amending the

2007, Walker's parole was revoked, however, he was released again on parole to a Forrest County detainer on September 17, 2007. While on parole, on October 15, 2007, Walker pleaded guilty in the Circuit Court of Forrest County, Mississippi, to two counts of Felony Bad Check in

Walker became eligible for parole, and was released on January 27, 2006. On July 16,

violation of <u>Mississippi Code Annotated 97-19-55</u>. He was sentenced to three (3) years in the custody of the Mississippi Department of Corrections with restitution for Count I, all three years suspended except for time served with remainder served on Post-Release Supervision and for Count II three (3) years suspended except for time served with remainder served on Post-Release Supervision to run consecutive to Count I with restitution.

On January 8, 2008, a Preliminary Revocation Hearing was conduction by the Mississippi

Department of Corrections Parole Board and a Warrant for Retaking Paroled Prisoner, Demario Walker, was issued as a result of his being convicted of these two felonies while on parole. Walker was placed back in MDOC custody on January 14, 2008. Subsequent to his arrest, on violation of his post release supervision; He was arrested by Wilkinson County Sheriff's Department on December 27, 2007 and charged with Attempted Escape of State Inmate and impersonating an Officer.

to <u>Mississippi Code Annotated 47-7-27</u> his parole was revoked based on his new conviction of Felony Bad Checks in Forrest County, Mississippi. The letter also notified him that he had after that time the action would become final. Walker alleges on Februa4ry 26, 2008, he filed an appeal with the MDOC Parole Board, however, there is no documentation of that action. Walker then filed his fourth Post-Conviction Motion pertaining to Marion County Criminal Cause (2) his "street time" was revoked contrary to due process; and (<u>3</u>) Mississippi Code Annotated (2) his "street time." was revoked contrary to due process; and (<u>3</u>) Mississippi Code Annotated

The MDOC Parole Board notified Walker by letter, on February 19, 2008, that pursuant

trial court. The instant appeal ensued.

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT

The trial court correctly noted that Section 47-7-27 has long been upheld by the

Mississippi Supreme Court as being in compliance with Morvissey, thereby providing parolees with the minimum due process rights they are accorded. The trial court held that Walker's due process rights were not violated and that his parole was not unlawfully revoked. The trial court

noted that Walker was convicted of two counts of Felony Bad Checks in Forrest County, Mississippi while he was on parole. Pursuant to <u>Mississippi Code Ann. § 47-7-27</u>, as a result of this conviction, the Parole Board had to immediately revoke his parole. The Parole Board acted in compliance with the statute and offered Walker the opportunity to request a parole hearing. . Therefore, the trial court correctly held that Walker's parole was lawfully revoked and dismissed his Petition for Post-Conviction Relief. Walker's assignment of error is without merit and the ruling of the trial court should be affirmed.

§ 47-7-37 as inhering the minimum due process requirements set forth in Gagnon and Morrissey. The Court further held that "[t]he rule is without exception that when the Court is confronted with a statute a literal construction of which would render it unconstitutional, the Court must adopt such a construction, when reasonably possible, as will save the statute, and at the same time save every savable provision or term in it. The Court therefore held that § 47-7-37 is

In Riely v. State, 562 So.2d 1206 (Miss. 1990), the Mississippi Supreme Court construed

constitutional on it's face. Walker was given an opportunity to request a hearing, and the record reflects no such request aside from Walker's bare assertion in his Motion for Post Conviction Relief. There has been no violation of Walker's due process rights.

Further, Walker cites no authority for his proposition that Section 47-7-27 of the

Mississippi Code of 1972, as amended, is unconstitutional. The failure to cite authority in support of claims of error precludes appellate review of those claims. <u>Tupelo Redevelopment</u> <u>Agency v. Grey, 638</u> So.2d 488, 491 (Miss.1994)) (other citations omitted)). This issue is without merit and the ruling of the trial court should be affirmed.

VBGUMENT

L Walker's parole and/or street time was lawfully revoked due to his conviction on October 15, 2007 of two counts of Felony Bad Check in violation of Mississippi Code Annotated 97-19-55.

Walker argues that he did not have the opportunity to plead and defend against the revocation of his probation due his conviction on October 15, 2007 of two counts of Felony Bad Check in violation of <u>Missrissippi Code Annotated 97-19-55</u>. He argues that he did not have the chance to present evidence as he was arrested and taken to court with no notice. However, the record reflects that Walker was offered the opportunity to submit information, evidence or written testimony regarding his revocation or to request a revocation hearing. (C.P. 155) Due process rights of a parolee have been addressed by the United States Supreme Court Due process rights of a parolee have been addressed by the United States Supreme Court

in Morrisey v. Brewer, 408 U.S. 471 (1972). Morrisey states:

behavior. See Morrissey v. Brewer 408 U.S. at 480-484; and also will be informed by an accurate knowledge of the parolee's based on verifiable facts and that the exercise of discretion will structured to assure that the finding of a parole violation will be guarantees at all. What is needed is an information hearing on the part of the State in revoking parole without any procedural observance of special parole restrictions. . . There is no interest entitled, but on of the conditional liberty properly dependent on individual, not of the absolute liberty to which every citizen is court and sometimes of the executive. Revocations deprives an by and administrative agency, which is sometimes an arm of the imposition of sentence. Supervision is not directed by a court but arises after the end of the criminal prosecution including revocations. Cf. Mempa v. Rvah, 389 U.S. 128 (1967). Parole due a defendant in such a proceeding does not apply to parole part of a criminal prosecution and thus the full panoply of rights We begin with the proposition that the revocation of parole is not

Minimal due process rights have been set out in Morrisey and incorporated into Mississippi statutory law in <u>Miss Code Ann § 47-7-27</u>. Godsey v. Houston, 584 So.2d at 392. Section 47-7-27, Return of violator of parole or earned release supervision; arrest of offender;

(1901, 284 So.2d 389 (Miss, 1901).

revocation of parole; board and hearing officers authorized to administer oaths

witnesses, specifically states:

An offender convicted of a felony while on parole, whether in the State of Mississippi or another state, *shall immediately* have his parole revoked upon presentment of a certified copy of the commitment order to the board." [Emphasis added]

Walker argues that he is unaware of why his parole was revoked and alleges a violation of

due process by not being given the opportunity to present and/or rebut evidence to the Parole is Board. Pursuant to § 47-7-27, if a parolee is convicted of a felony while on parole, his parole is immediately revoked. The Mississippi Parole Board received a Certified True Copy of Walker's Forrest County Order of Conviction on January 8, 2008. By receiving this certified copy of the parole. Both a preliminary revocation hearing and a parole revocation hearing were conducted by the Board an order, the Parole Board's decision was provided to Walker. The State of Mississippi for the Board and a notice of the Board's decision was provided to Walker. The State of Mississippi Parole Board and a notice of the Board's decision was provided to Walker. The State of Mississippi for the Board and a notice of the Board's decision was provided to Walker. The State of Mississippi for the Board or to explain why a revocation hearing was necessary. (C.P. 155) No such written response appears in the record. Walker alleges he made a written appeal, however, is it wholly response appears in the record. Walker alleges he made a written appeal, however, is it wholly within the discretion of the Parole Board as to whether or not a hearing is warranted.

Mississippi Supreme Court as being in compliance with Morvissey, thereby providing parolees with the minimum due process rights they are accorded. The trial court held that Walker's due process rights were not violated and that his parole was not unlawfully revoked. The trial court noted that Walker's due process rights for an the trial court of the trial court by the tri

The trial court correctly noted that Section 47-7-27 has long been upheld by the

8

Mississippi while he was on parole. Pursuant to <u>Mississippi Code Ann. § 47.7.27</u>, as a result of this conviction, the Parole Board had to immediately revoke his parole. The Parole Board acted in compliance with the statute and offered Walker the opportunity to request a parole hearing. . Therefore, the trial court correctly held that Walker's parole was lawfully revoked and dismissed his Petition for Post-Conviction Relief. Walker's assignment of error is without merit and the ruling of the trial court should be affirmed.

II. Section 47-7-27 of the Mississippi Code of 1972, as amended, is constitutional.

In Riely v. State, 562 So.2d 1206 (Miss. 1990), the Mississippi Supreme Court construed

§ 47-7-37 as inhering the minimum due process requirements set forth in Gagnon and Morrissey. The Court further held that "[t]he rule is without exception that when the Court is confronted with a statute a literal construction of which would render it unconstitutional, the Court must time save every savable provision or term in it. The Court therefore held that § 47-7-37 is constitutional on it's face. Walker was given an opportunity to request a hearing, and the record reflects no such request aside from Walker's bare assertion in his Motion for Post Conviction Relief. There has been no violation of Walker's due process rights.

<u>Mississippi Code of 1972</u>, as amended, is unconstitutional. The failure to cite authority in support of claims of error precludes appellate review of those claims. <u>Tupelo Redevelopment</u> <u>Agency v. Gray Corp., 972 So.2d 495, 517 (Miss.1994</u>)(citing Grey v. Grey, 638 So.2d 488, 491 (Miss.1994)) (other citations omitted)).

This issue is without merit and the ruling of the trial court should be affirmed.

6

CONCENSION

The assignments of error presented by the Appellant are without merit and the rulings of

the trial court should be affirmed.

Respectfully submitted,

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI JIM HOOD, ATTORNEY GENERAL

Laura H. Tedder, M.S.B. ¥ 9530 By: VI

Special Assistant Attorney General

LELEPHONE: (601) 359-3680 JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI 39205-0220 POST OFFICE BOX 220 OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Laura H. Tedder, Special Assistant Attorney General for the State of Mississippi, do

hereby certify that I have this day mailed, postage prepaid, a true and correct copy of the above

and foregoing BRIEF FOR THE APPELLEE to the following:

Honorable R. I. Prichard, III Circuit Court Judge P. O. Box 1075 Picayune, MS 39466

Honorable Hal Kittrell District Attorney 500 Courthouse Square, Suite 3 Columbia, MS 39429

Demario Walker, #4625 South Mississippi Correctional Institution (S.M.C.I) Post Office Box 1419 Leakesville, <u>Mississippi 39451</u>

This the 27 th day of July , 2009.

SPECIAL ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL LAURA H. TEDDER ธิบท

LETEDHONE: (01) 329-3080 IVCKSON' WIZZIZZIDDI 39502-0550 DOLLCE BOX 550 OLLICE BOX 550