



Senators Holly J. Mitchell and Lara

SB 1393 Five-Year Fair and Just Sentencing Reform

THIS BILL

SB 1393 is a moderate reform that would increase the fairness of the justice system. The bill amends Penal Code Sections 667 and 1385 to restore the court's discretion, in the interest of justice and at the time of sentencing, to strike sentence enhancements for prior serious felony convictions, when a person is currently charged with a serious felony. Allowing judicial discretion is consistent with other sentence enhancement laws and retains existing sanctions for serious crimes.

BACKGROUND

California has some of the most severe sentence enhancements for prior convictions in the nation. As of 2016, 79% of people under California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) custody had some kind of sentence enhancement attached to their base sentence; 25% had three or more enhancements stacked on top of each other. One of the most frequently used is the five-year enhancement for prior convictions of serious offenses, which is applied consecutively for each prior conviction. This enhancement is often served in addition to lengthy sentence enhancements already imposed under the Three Strikes Law, which doubles or triples the length of a base sentence, or adds 25-years-to-life, for the same prior convictions.

These mandatory sentencing enhancements have resulted in a rigid and arbitrary system that has meted out punishments that are severely disproportionate to the person's culpability and that do not serve the interests of justice or public safety. Further, there is no conclusive evidence that sentence enhancements benefit public safety. Despite not making our community safer, sentence enhancements are a significant burden on California taxpayers and communities: each additional year that is applied costs California taxpayers upwards of

\$70,000 dollars per incarcerated person. By reducing the use of unnecessary enhancements,

California can divest from expensive and ineffective policies of mass incarceration and invest in our communities.

California voters have made a resounding cultural shift away from prioritizing excessive incarceration in favor of less harsher sentences, expanded reentry services, prevention and community reinvestment. In 2016, voters overwhelmingly passed Proposition 57, which allows judges rather than prosecutors to determine whether youth are tried as adults. Californians strongly believe in the importance of judicial discretion and its role of creating a fair justice system.

In 2017, the same shift was conveyed by the California legislature with the passage of SB 620 (Bradford) which added judicial discretion in the application sentencing enhancements for prior convictions involving guns.

Sentencing enhancements for prior convictions result in extreme periods of incarceration and have been the primary drivers of prison overcrowding. The California prison system remains under Federal oversight for unconstitutional and overcrowded conditions. The ongoing prison overcrowding litigation indicates that prison capacity and related issues concerning conditions of confinement remain unresolved.

SOLUTION

Nationwide, there is growing bipartisan support for reforming long and ineffective prison sentences. California law mandates an extra five years for every prior conviction for a serious offense when a person is charged with a serious offense. While most sentence enhancements can be declined if the judge believes they are unjust in a specific case, these enhancements are mandatory in all cases — judges are forbidden from tailoring these sentences to an individual's case and culpability. Trial courts should retain the discretion to dismiss sentencing enhancements for

prior offenses based on the facts of the case in order to further the interest of justice.

SPONSORS

ACLU (American Civil Liberties Union)
CHIRLA (Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights)
CA Coalition for Women Prisoners
Californians United for a Responsible Budget
Ella Baker Center
Drug Policy Alliance
Friends Committee on Legislation
Pillars of the Community
Tides Advocacy
Women's Foundation of CA, Women's Policy
Institute

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Bridget Kolakosky bridget.kolakosky@sen.ca.gov
Office of Senator Holly J. Mitchell
(916) 651-4030



SENATE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

Senator Nancy Skinner, Chair
2017 - 2018 Regular

Bill No:	SB 1393	Hearing Date:	April 3, 2018
Author:	Mitchell		
Version:	February 16, 2018		
Urgency:	No	Fiscal:	Yes
Consultant:	SC		

Subject: *Sentencing*

HISTORY

Source: American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of California
The Advocacy Fund
California Coalition for Women Prisoners
Californians United for a Responsible Budget
Drug Policy Alliance
Ella Baker Center
Friends Committee on Legislation of California
Pillars of the Community
Women's Foundation of California

Prior Legislation: SB 180 (Mitchell), Ch. 677, Stats. 2017
SB 620 (Bradford), Ch. 682, Stats. 2017
SB 966 (Mitchell), 2015-2016, failed Assembly Public Safety Committee

Support: Access Support Network; Alameda County Public Defender's Office; Alliance San Diego; American Friends Service Committee; California Association of Alcohol and Drug Program Executives; California Catholic Conference; California Immigrant Policy Center; California Public Defenders Association; Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice; Coleman Advocates for Children & Youth; Contra Costa County Racial Justice Coalition; Courage Campaign; Crossroads, Inc.; Daily Kos; Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Academic Middle School; Felony Murder Elimination Project; Harm Reduction Coalition; Harm Reduction Services; HealthRIGHT 360; Immigrant Legal Resource Center; Justice Now; Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights; Legal Services for Prisoners with Children; Los Angeles Regional Reentry Partnership; A New Way of Life Reentry Project; Oakland Rising; Prison Renaissance; Public Health Justice Collective; Restaurant Opportunities Centers of California; Riverside Temple Beth El; Root & Rebound; Rubicon Programs; San Diego Immigrant Rights Consortium; San Francisco Public Defenders Office; Showing up for Racial Justice; St. James Infirmary; Successful Reentry; Tarzana Treatment Centers, Inc.; W. Hayward Burns Institute; Western Center on Law and Poverty; White People for Black Lives/Showing Up for Racial Justice – Los Angeles; several individuals

Opposition: Association for Los Angeles Deputy Sheriffs; California District Attorneys Association; California State Sheriffs' Association; Los Angeles Police Protective League; Peace Officers Research Association of California

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to allow a court, in the interest of justice, to strike or dismiss a prior serious felony conviction which otherwise adds an enhancement of 5 years for each prior conviction of a serious felony.

Existing law states that any person convicted of a serious felony who previously has been convicted of a serious felony, as defined, shall receive, in addition to the sentence imposed by the court for the present offense, a five-year enhancement for each such prior conviction. The terms of the present offense and each enhancement shall run consecutively. (Pen. Code § 667, subd. (a)(1).)

Existing law provides that if a defendant has one prior serious and/or violent felony conviction, as defined, that has been pled and proved, the determinate term or minimum term for an indeterminate term shall be twice the term otherwise provided as punishment for the current felony conviction. (Pen. Code, § 667, subd. (e)(1).)

Existing law provides that if a defendant has two or more prior serious and/or violent felony convictions, as defined, that have been pled and proved, the term for the current felony conviction shall be an indeterminate term of life imprisonment as specified. (Pen. Code, § 667, subd. (e)(2).)

Existing law specifies that the total amount of credits that may be awarded to a person convicted of a serious felony shall not exceed 20% of the total term of imprisonment imposed and shall not accrue until the defendant is physically placed in the state prison. (Pen. Code, § 667, subd. (c)(5).)

Existing law authorizes a judge or magistrate, either of his or her own motion or upon the application of the prosecuting attorney, and in furtherance of justice, to order an action to be dismissed, as specified. (Pen. Code, § 1385, subd. (a).)

Existing law prohibits a judge from striking any prior conviction of a serious felony for purposes of enhancement of a sentence. (Pen. Code, § 1385, subd. (b).)

This bill deletes the prohibition against striking any prior serious felony convictions for purposes of enhancing a sentence.

COMMENTS

1. Need for This Bill

According to the author:

Nearly every sentence enhancement in California can be dismissed at the time of sentencing if the judge finds that doing so would serve the interest of justice. However, under existing law people with current and prior serious felony convictions receive a mandatory five-year enhancement. As a result, judges lack the discretion to tailor these sentences based on the facts of the case, the defendant's history and culpability or other potential mitigating factors. This has resulted in mandatory additional terms for thousands of individuals incarcerated throughout California's prisons. This rigid and arbitrary system has meted out punishments that are disproportionate to the offense, which does not serve the interests of justice, public safety, or communities.

SB1393 amends Penal Code Sections 667 and 1385 by restoring the court's discretion, in the interest of justice, to strike a five-year sentence enhancement for each prior serious felony conviction on a person's record, when a person is currently convicted of a serious felony. Allowing judicial discretion is consistent with other sentence enhancement laws and retains existing penalties for serious crimes.

2. Sentencing Enhancements

Existing law contains a variety of enhancements that can be used to increase the term of imprisonment a defendant will serve. Multiple enhancements can be imposed in a single case. Enhancements can range from adding a specified number of years to a person's sentence, or doubling a person's sentence or even converting a determinate sentence into a life sentence.

According to a recent Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) publication on enhancements,

Overall, California has more than 100 separate code sections that enhance sentences based on the current offense or the offender's record. For example, using a firearm while committing a violent and/or sexual felony adds anywhere from 10 to 25 years. A gang-related felony results in 2 to 10 additional years, depending upon the seriousness of the offense.

As of September 2016, 79.9% of prisoners in institutions operated by the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) had some kind of sentence enhancement; 25.5% had three or more.

(Sentence Enhancements: Next Target of Corrections Reform? PPIC (Sept. 2017) <http://www.ppic.org/blog/sentence-enhancements-next-target-corrections-reform/> [as of Mar. 21, 2018].) CDCR data indicates that, as of December 1, 2017, there were 19,677 sentences that included the 5-year enhancement.

This bill provides the judge with discretion to strike a prior serious felony conviction in appropriate circumstances in the interests of justice. The judge retains the ability to continue imposing the enhancement where the additional punishment is warranted. The reasons for the dismissal must be stated orally on the record. If requested by either party, the reasons must also be set forth in a written minute order. (Pen. Code, § 1385, subd. (a).) Where the trial court's action lacks reason, it may be invalidated as an abuse of discretion. (See *People v. Williams*, (1998) 17 Cal.4th 148, 159.) For example, in *Williams*, the Court found that the trial court improperly struck the prior felony because the defendant could not be deemed "outside the spirit" of the three strikes law – i.e., the trial court's order fell outside the bounds of reason under the applicable law and the relevant facts. (*Id.* at pp. 161, 162-165.)

Striking a prior conviction pursuant to Penal Code section 1385 does not wipe out the prior conviction, or prevent that conviction from being considered in connection with later convictions; it simply means that the judge made a determination that, in the interest of justice, the defendant should not be required to be sentenced to a statutorily increased penalty. (*People v. Ortega* (2000) 84 Cal.App.4th 659, 666.)

3. Legislative History

Penal Code section 1385 gives discretion to judges to strike or dismiss a prior conviction or added punishment. The California Supreme Court has ruled that even if a statute prescribing a particular sentence uses the term "shall," this is insufficient to evidence an intent that the trial court was precluded from exercising such discretionary powers. (See *People v. Williams* (1981) 30 Cal.3d 470.) In *Williams*, the Court reviewed the history and purpose of Penal Code section 1385:

The trial court's power to dismiss an action has been recognized by statute since the first session of the Legislature in 1850. The rules of criminal procedure enacted in that session included the provision that "[the] Court may, either of its own motion, or upon the application of the District Attorney, and in furtherance of justice, order any action, after indictment, to be dismissed; but in such case the reasons of the dismissal shall be set forth in the order, which must be entered on the minutes." (Stats. 1850, ch. 119, § 629, p. 323.) With slight changes, this provision became section 1385 when the Penal Code was enacted in 1872.

. . . .

"A determination whether to dismiss in the interests of justice after a verdict involves a balancing of many factors, including the weighing of the evidence indicative of guilt or innocence, the nature of the crime involved, the fact that the defendant has or has not been incarcerated in prison awaiting trial and the length of such incarceration, the possible harassment and burdens imposed upon the defendant by a retrial, and the likelihood, if any, that additional evidence will be presented upon a retrial. When the balance falls clearly in favor of the defendant, a trial court not only may but should exercise the powers granted to him by the Legislature and grant a dismissal in the interests of justice." (*People v. Superior Court of Marin County (Howard)* (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 491, 505.)

The court also discussed the policy served by [the section at issue in the case]. "Mandatory, arbitrary or rigid sentencing procedures invariably lead to unjust results. Society receives maximum protection when the penalty, treatment or disposition of the offender is tailored to the individual case. Only the trial judge has the knowledge, ability and tools at hand to properly individualize the treatment of the offender. Subject always to legislative control and appellate review, trial courts should be afforded maximum leeway in fitting the punishment to the offender." (*People v. Dorsey* (1972) 28 Cal.App3d 15, 18.)

(*People v. Williams, supra*, 30 Cal.3d at 479-482.) The Court then looked to the legislative intent and found that there was no indication of contrary legislative intent and thus held that absent a clear expression of legislative intent in this regard, a sentencing statute will not be construed to abrogate a trial court's general section 1385 power to strike. (*Id.* at p. 482.)

Similarly, in *People v. Fritz* (1985) 40 Cal.3d 227, the California Supreme Court held that although the language of Penal Code section 667, subdivision (a)(1) is mandatory – "[any] person convicted of a serious felony . . . shall receive . . . a five-year enhancement for each such

prior conviction" – such language did not eliminate the court's ability under Penal Code section 1385 to strike or dismiss a conviction in the interests of justice. The Court found that neither Penal Code section 667 or article I, section 28, both enacted by the voters as part of Proposition 8 in the June 1982 election, contained express language eliminating this discretion nor was there anything in the ballot analysis or arguments which were before the voters that suggests such a purpose. (*Id.* at pp. 230-231.)

In 1986, the California Legislature passed, and the governor signed into law, a bill to abrogate *Fritz* by specifically restricting the authority of the trial court to strike prior convictions of serious felonies when imposing an enhancement under Section 667 of the Penal Code. (Chapter 85, Statutes of 1986.) This bill deletes this restriction and returns the court's discretion to strike prior serious felony convictions for purposes of the 5-year enhancement.

4. Argument in Support

Drug Policy Alliance, a sponsor of this bill, writes:

SB 1393 is a modest, incremental reform that corrects a costly inconsistency in state law. The bill will provide for judicial discretion in sentencing a person convicted for a second or subsequent serious offense. Current law inappropriately ties a judge's hands, requiring that the court, when imposing a sentence for a serious felony, in addition and consecutive to the term imposed for that serious felony, to impose an additional 5-year enhancement for each prior conviction of a serious felony. This is above and in addition to "strike enhancements" that may also be applied to persons who have been previously convicted of a serious offense.

California law generally authorizes a judge, in the interests of justice, to order an action dismissed. SB 1393 will return to the court, appropriate authority to sentence

according to the facts of the case, in the interests of justice. It does not affect the base sentence, or [any] another enhancements. It allows the judge to impose the five-year enhancement if they believe it to be just and necessary.

5. Argument in Opposition

The Peace Officers Research Association of California opposes this bill:

Current law requires the court, when imposing a sentence for a serious felony, in addition and consecutive to the term imposed for that serious felony, to impose a 5-year enhancement for each prior conviction of a serious felony. Existing law generally authorizes a judge, in the interests of justice, to order an action dismissed, but precludes a judge from striking any prior serious felony conviction in connection with imposition of the 5-year enhancement. This bill would delete the restriction prohibiting a judge from striking a prior serious felony conviction in connection with imposition of the 5-year enhancement described above and would make conforming changes.

-- END --

On Your Letterhead**Date**

Senator Holly Mitchell
State Capitol, Room 5080
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Support for SB 1393 (Mitchell) Fair and Just Sentencing Reform

Dear Senator Mitchell,

On behalf of **YOUR ORGANIZATION NAME**, I write in strong support of SB 1393, the Fair and Just Sentencing Reform Act. SB 1393 (Mitchell) amends Penal Code Sections 667 and 1385 by restoring the court's discretion, in the interest of justice, to strike a five-year sentence enhancement for each prior serious felony conviction on a person's record, when a person is currently convicted of a serious felony. Allowing judicial discretion is consistent with other sentence enhancement laws and retains existing penalties for serious crimes.

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF YOUR ORGANIZATION

Nearly every sentence enhancement in California can be dismissed if the judge believes they are unjust in a specific case. But for people with current and prior serious felonies, for which people receive a mandatory five extra years for each prior, judges are forbidden from tailoring a sentence to an individual's case and culpability. This has resulted in mandatory terms for thousands of individuals incarcerated throughout California's prisons. This rigid and arbitrary system has meted out punishments that are disproportionate to the offense and do not serve the interests of justice, public safety, or communities.

SB 1393 (Mitchell) does not repeal any existing enhancements for serious felonies. Rather, SB 1393 allows judges to impose or not impose the sentence enhancement if it is in the interest of justice, helping to ensure that incarcerated Californians do not serve unnecessarily long sentences.

The voters recognized the importance of judicial discretion in overwhelmingly passing Proposition 57, which allowed a judge, rather than the prosecutor, to decide whether a youth should be tried as an adult. The state legislature followed suit in passing SB 620 (Bradford), which allowed judicial discretion in the application of gun enhancements.

California now has the regrettable distinction of meting out some of the longest sentences in the nation, driven largely by sentencing enhancements for prior convictions. The California prison system remains under Federal oversight for overcrowded conditions. The ongoing prison overcrowding litigation indicates that prison capacity and related issues concerning conditions of confinement remain unresolved.

For these reasons, among others, our organization strongly supports SB 1393 (Mitchell), the Fair and Just Sentencing Reform Act, an urgently needed reform.

Respectfully,

YOUR NAME
TITLE, ORGANIZATION

Cc:

Email letters to: Romarilyn Ralston, California Coalition for Women Prisoners,
wpicriminaljustice2018@gmail.com

Fax letters to: Stella Choe, Counsel Senate Committee on Public Safety, (916) 445-4688

CC: Honorable Holly J. Mitchell, California State Senate; Honorable Ricardo Lara, California State Senate (Joint Author); Honorable Ash Kalra, California State Assembly (Principle Co-Author); Honorable Joel Anderson, California State Senate (Committee Member); Honorable Steven Bradford, California State Senate (Committee Member); Honorable Hannah-Beth Jackson, California State Senate (Committee Member); Honorable Jeff Stone, California State Senate (Committee Member); Honorable Scott D. Wiener, California State Senate (Committee Member)