

ORIGINAL

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SUPREME COURT

RECEIVED

DEC 8 2014

Certiorari to Orangeburg County

S.C. Supreme Court

Diane Schafer Goodstein, Circuit Court Judge

REGINALD MONTGOMERY,

PETITIONER,

V.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

RESPONDENT

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2014-001288

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

KATHRINE H. HUDGINS
Appellate Defender

South Carolina Commission on Indigent Defense
Division of Appellate Defense
PO Box 11589
Columbia, SC 29211-1589
(803) 734-1343

ATTORNEY FOR PETITIONER

INDEX

INDEX.....1

ISSUE PRESENTED2

STATEMENT3

ARGUMENT

The PCR judge erred in refusing to find appellate counsel ineffective for not raising on direct appeal the trial judge’s failure to declare a mistrial when the State violated the discovery rules by failing to notify the defense that the assistant solicitor showed a photo line-up to witness April Johnson and she identified Petitioner Montgomery5

CONCLUSION9

ISSUE PRESENTED

Did the PCR judge err in refusing to find appellate counsel ineffective for not raising on direct appeal the trial judge's failure to declare a mistrial when the State violated the discovery rules by failing to notify the defense that the assistant solicitor showed a photo line-up to witness April Johnson and she identified Petitioner Montgomery?

STATEMENT

On November 8, 2006, the Orangeburg County Grand Jury indicted Montgomery for armed robbery, indictment #2006-GS-38-2052. On April 3, 2007, Montgomery proceeded to jury trial before the Honorable J.C. Nicholson. Thomas R. Sims represented Montgomery at trial. Brian Jeffries and Kelley Burbage prosecuted the case. The jury returned with a verdict of guilty and Judge Nicholson sentenced Montgomery to twenty two (22) years in prison. A timely notice of intent to appeal was filed and a direct appeal perfected pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S.Ct. 1396 (1967). The issue raised on appeal was whether “[t]he trial judge erred in allowing show-up identification evidence into the case.” On March 9, 2009, the South Carolina Court of Appeals dismissed the appeal. State v. Montgomery, 2009-UP-134 (S.C.Ct.App. filed March 25, 2009).

On February 23, 2010, Montgomery filed an application for post conviction relief. The State filed a return on May 5, 2010. On December 1, 2011, an evidentiary hearing was held before the Honorable Diane S. Goodstein. Belinda Davis-Branch represented Montgomery at the PCR hearing. Mary S. Williams was present on behalf of the State. In a written order signed May 15, 2014, Judge Goodstein denied relief and dismissed the application. A timely notice of intent to appeal was served June 12, 2014. This petition for writ of certiorari follows.

ARGUMENT

The PCR judge erred in refusing to find appellate counsel ineffective for not raising on direct appeal the trial judge's failure to declare a mistrial when the State violated the discovery rules by failing to notify the defense that the assistant solicitor showed a photo line-up to witness April Johnson and she identified Petitioner Montgomery.

In the early morning hours of September 17, 2006, two men robbed the Shell station in Bowman, South Carolina. The clerk recognized one of the men as a former schoolmate but could not remember his name. Later, when meeting with police, the clerk determined that the former schoolmate who robbed him was James Green. (App. p. 149, line 1 – p. 156, line 10).

At trial Green testified as a State's witness. Green testified that on the night in question he, Petitioner Montgomery and Shawon Johnson were walking home from a club when the three discussed robbing a store. (App. p. 119, lines 9-15). According to Green the three went back to Green's house where Johnson said he could not rob the store because he was on probation but he gave a gun Petitioner. (App. p. 121, lines 5-17). Then, according to Green, he and Petitioner left Green's house and robbed the Shell station. Green admitted he had the gun during the robbery. (App. pp. 122-124).

Shawon Johnson's sister April Johnson testified that in the early morning hours of September 17, 2006, James Green came to her house with another man and he asked her for a ride. (App. p. 174, line 1 – p. 177, line 4). April Johnson admitted that she did not recognize Petitioner as the man with Green until the solicitor brought one photo (photo of appellant) to her and asked if this was the man with Green on the morning in question. Only then did Johnson identify Petitioner as the other man with Green. (App. p. 179, line 1 – p. 187, line 12). Trial counsel objected to the one man photo show-up identification because this information was not made known to him prior to trial so that he could have objected and moved to suppress the identification. (App. p. 190, line 16 – p. 199, line 25).

Counsel specifically argued:

My objection is, your Honor, that information that was used in regards to photographs was not provided to me pursuant to the rules of discovery in which I was to be given all of that information. I was given a photographic lineup of, of Cootney, James Green...And with the information on that he that had been signed. I had no knowledge that another lineup, or picture had been shown. The basis for my cross examination in regards to this was the fact that no lineup had been shown, no pictures had been shown, and then to be caught off guard that there are other pictures I have not seen, nor were given the opportunity in order to prepare for my trial of this matter.

(App. p. 191, line 21 – p. 192, lines 1-9). Trial counsel then moved for a mistrial based on the discovery violation. (App. p. 192, lines 12-13).

The assistant solicitor admitted that he showed the witness a photo of Petitioner. (App. p. 193, line 18 – p. 194, lines 1-8). The assistant solicitor seemed to indicate that showing the witness the photograph did not matter because the witness knew Petitioner. (App. p. 194, lines 4-25). Trial counsel then argued that if he had known about the identification procedure employed by the assistant solicitor, he would have moved pre-trial to suppress the identification. (App. p. 195, lines 6-17).

Following a short break, the assistant solicitor advised the trial judge that in fact it was **not** a single photograph that he showed to the witness but rather a six pack photo lineup and from that lineup the witness identified Petitioner. (App. p. 200, lines 2-15). The trial judge then denied the motion for a mistrial. (App. p. 201, lines 1-2). The judge acknowledged that the information should have been turned over pursuant to rule five but instead of granting a mistrial the judge simply gave counsel an opportunity to talk with the witness and recall if necessary. (App. p. 201, lines 4-15). The trial judge erred in refusing to grant a mistrial based on the discovery violation.

During the PCR hearing Petitioner alleged ineffective assistance of appellate counsel. (App. pp. 391-392). In the order of dismissal the PCR judge wrote, “At trial, Counsel argued that he had been unable to request a pre-trial hearing on the lineup as a basis for his mistrial motion and did not pose an objection to the lineup. Appellate Counsel did brief the issue in an Anders brief. However, even if counsel had objected to the in-court identification based on the photo lineup shown to April, Applicant has failed to show that the outcome would have been different.” Trial counsel objected to the identification and moved for a mistrial based on the fact that the State violated the discovery rules by not notifying counsel of the identification. Appellate counsel should have raised the failure to grant the mistrial motion on direct appeal.

Instead, appellate counsel argued that the trial judge erred in “allowing a show-up identification evidence into the case.” The case did not involve a show-up identification. The assistant solicitor showed the witness, April Johnson, a photo line-up containing six photographs, one of which was a photo of the Petitioner. The witness identified Petitioner. The State failed to disclose this information. The issue that should have been raised by appellate counsel on direct appeal was the trial judge’s failure to grant a mistrial based on the State’s violation of the Rule 5, S.C.R.Crim.P. and the rules of discovery.

In Bennett v. State, 383 S.C. 303, 309, 680 S.E.2d 273, 276 (2009) the South Carolina Supreme Court wrote:

A criminal defendant is constitutionally entitled to the effective assistance of appellate counsel. Evitts v. Lucey, 469 U.S. 387, 398, 105 S.Ct. 830, 83 L.Ed.2d 821 (1985). However, counsel is not required to raise every non-frivolous claim, but may select among them in order to maximize the likelihood of a favorable outcome. Smith v. Robbins, 528 U.S. 259, 288, 120 S.Ct. 746, 145 L.Ed.2d 756 (2000). Generally, in analyzing a claim of ineffective assistance of appellate counsel, this Court applies the Strickland

test just as it would when analyzing a claim of ineffective assistance of trial counsel. See Southerland v. State, 337 S.C. 610, 616, 524 S.E.2d 833, 836 (1999). Thus, in this case, we ask 1) whether appellate counsel's performance was deficient, and 2) whether Respondent was prejudiced by appellate counsel's deficient performance.

Appellate counsel was ineffective in failing to raise the meritorious claim that the judge erred in refusing to declare a mistrial based on the State's failure to disclose the fact that April Johnson identified Petitioner from a photo line-up shown to her by the assistant solicitor. Petitioner was prejudiced by appellate counsel's deficient performance. There is a reasonable probability that if appellate counsel had raised the issue in regard to the trial judge's refusal to grant a mistrial based on the State's violation of rule 5, Petitioner would have prevailed on direct appeal and a new trial would have been granted.

As noted by trial counsel in the mistrial motion, his trial preparation and cross examination of witness April Johnson was based on the fact that she had never identified Petitioner as the man with Green on the morning in question. Trial counsel made the mistrial motion at the close of cross examination. Trial counsel's cross examination would have been different had trial counsel been aware of the identification.

Additionally, Rule 5, S.C.R.Crim.P. provides that, "Upon request of the defendant, the prosecution shall permit the defendant to inspect and copy books, papers, documents, photographs, tangible objects, buildings or places, or copies or portions thereof, which are within the possession, custody or control of the prosecution, and which are material to the preparation of his defense or are intended for use by the prosecution as evidence in chief at the trial, or were obtained from or belong to the defendant." The identification of the Petitioner was material to the preparation of the defense and the State should have disclosed the identification pursuant to Rule 5. The trial judge noted that trial counsel made a request pursuant to Rule 5. (App. p. 201, lines 4-8). Allowing trial counsel to


re-cross the witness would not have cured the prejudice to petitioner because it would have further emphasized the identification. A mistrial was warranted based on the State's violation of the rules of discovery.

The identification of Petitioner distinguishes the present case from State v. Scipio, 283 S.C. 124, 126, 322 S.E.2d 15, 17 (1984) where the South Carolina Supreme Court found the trial judge did not abuse his discretion in failing to grant a mistrial when the State failed to disclose a composite sketch because counsel was given the opportunity to cross examine the witness in regard to the sketch. As noted, cross examination would not have cured the prejudice caused by the State's violation of the discovery rules in the present case. The Court in Scipio wrote, "Sanctions for non-compliance with Circuit Court Rule 103 are within the discretion of the trial court and will not be disturbed on appeal absent abuse or prejudice. State v. Bridges, 278 S.C. 447, 298 S.E.2d 212 (1982). This does not relieve a solicitor of the duty under his oath to fully comply with the disclosure rule. We take this opportunity to advise the solicitors to promptly comply with this rule." Id. 283 S.C. at 126, 322 S.E.2d at 17 (1984). The trial judge in the present case abused his discretion in refusing to grant the mistrial. Appellant counsel was ineffective in failing to raise the issue on direct appeal.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above argument, the petition for writ of certiorari should be granted to allow further briefing on the issue.

Respectfully submitted,



Kathrine H. Hudgins
Appellate Defender

ATTORNEY FOR PETITIONER

This 4th day of December, 2014.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SUPREME COURT

Certiorari to Orangeburg County
Diane Schafer Goodstein, Circuit Court Judge

REGINALD MONTGOMERY,

PETITIONER,

V.


STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

RESPONDENT

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2014-001288


CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that a true copy of the petition for writ of certiorari and a copy of the appendix in this case have been served on J. Clayton Mitchell, Esquire, at Rembert Dennis Building, 1000 Assembly Street, Room 519, Columbia, SC 29201 this 8th day of December, 2014.


Kathrine H. Hudgins
Appellate Defender

ATTORNEY FOR PETITIONER

SWORN TO BEFORE ME this 8th day
of December, 2014.


Notary Public for South Carolina (L.S.)

My Commission Expires: October 24, 2021.