IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

GLENN PAYTON, JR.

VS.

NO. 2009-KA-00332-COA

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

APPELLEE

APPELLANT

BRIEF FOR THE APPELLEE

THE STATE DOES NOT REQUEST ORAL ARGUMENT.

JIM HOOD, ATTORNEY GENERAL

BY: CHARLES W. MARIS, JR. ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL MISSISSIPPI BAR NO.

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	i
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	1
SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT	1
ARGUMENT	2

PROPOSITION:

CONCLUSION		•••••	• • • • • • • • • • •	 • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	3
CERTIFICATE	OF SERVICE			 	4

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>CASES</u>

Lindsey v. State, 939 So.2d 743 (Miss.2005)1, 2	,
Smith v. Robbins, 528 U.S. 259 (2000) 2	r

<u>RULE</u>

Rule 3.1, Miss. Rules Prof	Conduct	3
----------------------------	---------	---

ŗ.

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

GLENN PAYTON, JR.

APPELLANT

NO. 2009-KA-00332-COA

VS.

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

APPELLEE

BRIEF FOR APPELLEE

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Glenn Payton, Jr. ["Payton"] was convicted in the Circuit Court of Forrest County, Honorable Robert B. Helfrich, Circuit Judge, presiding, of the crime of statutory rape. The Court thereafter sentenced him to serve a term of thirty years in the custody of the Mississippi Department of Corrections. (C.P. 48-49) Aggrieved of the judgment thus entered against him, Payton appealed. His defense counsel filed a brief pursuant to the holding of *Lindsey v. State*, 939 So.2d 743 (Miss.2005), after which Payton was given time to file a *pro se* supplemental brief. He filed such a brief on June 10, 2009.

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT

Pursuant to the procedure outlined in *Lindsey v. State*, 939 So.2d 743 (Miss.2005), this Court at this point must determine whether this case presents any arguable issue, and, if so, order defense counsel to file a supplemental brief which addresses said issue.

1

ARGUMENT

PREPOSITION

THE STATE RESPECTFULLY SUBMITS THAT THIS COURT SHOULD DETERMINE AT THIS JUNCTURE WHETHER PAYTON'S'S *PRO SE* SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF OR THE RECORD IN THIS CASE PRESENTS ANY ARGUABLE ISSUE.

Counsel for Payton filed in this Court a brief stating that he had diligently searched the record in this case and had concluded that there are no arguable issues supporting the appeal, that is, that there are no non-frivolous issues to present to this Court. Counsel also confirmed that he had mailed a copy of his brief to Payton and had advised him of his right to file a *pro se* brief. Finally, counsel asserted that he "stands ready to prepare supplemental memoranda of law on any issues requested by the Court." Brief for Appellant at 2-3. Payton has now filed a *pro se* supplemental brief in this Court, claiming five alleged issues.

Pursuant to *Lindsey v. State*, 939 So.2d 743 (Miss.2005), citing *Smith v. Robbins*, 528 U.S. 259 (2000), the State respectfully submits that this Court now must review Payton's supplemental brief as well as the record to determine whether defense counsel should be required to file a supplemental brief on behalf of Payton. If the Court finds the existence of any arguable issue, regardless of the probability of Payton's success on appeal, this Court should order defense counsel to file a supplemental brief. The State then would respond to defense counsel's supplemental brief. Without finding that there are no arguable, that is, non-frivolous issues, this Court should not consider the merits of any issues it finds, lest it run afoul of Payton's's right to be represented by counsel on appeal. On the other hand, this Court should only order defense counsel to brief issues which it has determined to be arguable, that is, non-frivolous, lest it require defense counsel to violate the Rules of Professional Conduct, which prohibit counsel from arguing frivolous issues in

court. Rule 3.1, Miss. Rules Prof. Conduct.¹

If this Court finds the existence of no arguable issues, then under *Lindsey*, it should simply affirm the judgment entered in the court below. *Bradshaw v. State*, 6 So.3d 1123 (Miss.2009); *Neal v. State*, 5 So.3d 1166 (Miss.App. 2009).

CONCLUSION

The State submits that in accordance with the procedure outlined in *Lindsey*, this Court must determine from Payton's *pro se* supplemental brief, as well as the record in this case, whether any arguable issue exists, and if so, order defense counsel to file a supplemental brief on behalf of his client. If no arguable issue is found, this Court should simply affirm the judgment below.

Respectfully submitted,

JIM HOOD, ATTORNEY GENERAL

BY:

CHARLES W. MARIS, JR. ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL MISSISSIPPI BAR NO.

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

¹"A lawyer shall not bring or defend a proceeding, or assert or controvert an issue therein, unless there is a basis in law and in fact for doing so that is not frivolous, which includes a good faith argument for an extension, modification or reversal of existing law. A lawyer for the defendant in a criminal proceeding, or the respondent in a proceeding that could result in incarceration, may nevertheless so defend the proceeding as to require that every element of the case be established."

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Charles W. Maris, Jr., 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 Robert B. Helfrich Circuit Court Judge P. O. Box 309 Hattiesburg, MS 39403

Honorable Jon Mark Weathers District Attorney P. O. Box 166 Hattiesburg, MS 39403-0166

George T. Holmes, Esq. Mississippi Office of Indigent Appeals 301 N. Lamar Street, Suite 210 Jackson, Mississippi 39201

> Glenn Payton MDOC # 78467 S.M.C.I., B-2,A-Zone Leakesville, MS 39451

This the 24th day of June, 2009.

CHARLES W. MARIŠ, JR. ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

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