STATE OF MICHIGAN IN THE SUPREME COURT

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN, Plaintiff-Appellee,

v

No. 163942

KELWIN DWAYNE EDWARDS, Defendant-Appellant.

COA No. 354647 Wayne Circuit No. 13-000329-01-FC Hon. Cynthia Gray Hathaway Hon. Michael M. Hathaway–resentencing

PLAINTIFF-APPELLEE'S SUPPLEMENTAL ANSWER *ORAL ARGUMENT WAIVED*

KYM L. WORTHY Prosecuting Attorney County of Wayne

JON P. WOJTALA Chief of Research Training, and Appeals

MARGARET GILLIS AYALP (P38297) Assistant Prosecuting Attorney, Appeals 1441 St. Antoine, Office 1105 Detroit, MI 48226 (313) 224-5796 mayalp@waynecounty.com

STATE OF MICHIGAN IN THE SUPREME COURT

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN, Plaintiff-Appellee,

v

No. 163942

KELWIN DWAYNE EDWARDS, Defendant-Appellant.

COA No. 354647 Wayne Circuit No. 13-000329-01-FC Hon. Cynthia Gray Hathaway Hon. Michael M. Hathaway-resentencing

PLAINTIFF-APPELLEE'S SUPPLEMENTAL ANSWER

This Court posed three questions to the parties in its order of July 22, 2022 granting defendant's application for leave to appeal.¹ The order also directed the Clerk to schedule oral argument in this case for the same session of the Court when it will hear oral argument in *People v Johnson* (Docket No. 163073). In the *Johnson* order of July 22, 2022 granting defendant's application for leave to appeal, this Court posed the same three questions verbatim as it did in this case.²

Therefore, in response to the questions this Court posed to the parties, the People of the State of Michigan, through Kym L. Worthy, Prosecuting Attorney, Wayne County, adopt the brief (excluding the counter-statement of facts and proceedings) filed on behalf of the People of the State of Michigan on December 16, 2022 by the Michigan

¹People v Edwards, ____ Mich ___; 976 NW2d 864 (2022) (Docket No. 163942).

²People v Johnson, ____ Mich ___; 976 NW2d 862 (2022) (Docket No. 163073).

Attorney General in *Johnson* (attached in the *Edwards* appendix).³ The arguments supporting the People's position in that case equally apply here, including the discussion of the fatal flaws and omissions in defendant's argument.⁴ Accordingly, the People adopt the Attorney General's brief in *Johnson* and waive oral argument.

³The Attorney General's office has no objection to its brief being adopted here.

⁴For example, as in *Johnson*, defendant here does not cite *Dugan v Ohio*, 277 US 61 (1928). Attorney General's brief, pp 11-13 (*Edwards* Appendix, pp 18b-20b). Further, as in *Johnson*, defendant here has waived any Due Process claim by seeking only to vacate his court costs, not his convictions. Defendant "has not attempted any argument that would reconcile his broad constitutional claim with his narrow request for relief." Attorney General's brief, p 20 (*Edwards* appendix, p 27b).

RELIEF

For the reasons set forth in the People's brief filed by the Attorney General on December 16, 2022 in *People v Johnson* (Docket No. 163073), adopted here, the People ask this Court to hold, consistent with binding US Supreme Court precedent, that MCL 769.1k(1)(b)(*iii*) does not violate due process, and affirm the Court of Appeals decision of November 18, 2021 in the present case, and *People v Johnson*, 336 Mich App 688 (2021). This Court should decline to address the separation-of-powers argument, but, if it does address the argument, it should hold that MCL 769.1k(1)(b)(*iii*) is a permissible delegation of sentencing and taxing power from the legislature to the courts.

Respectfully submitted,

KYM L. WORTHY Prosecuting Attorney County of Wayne

JON P. WOJTALA Chief of Research, Training, and Appeals

<u>/s/ Margaret Gillis Ayalp</u>

Margaret Gillis Ayalp (P38297) Assistant Prosecuting Attorney 1441 St. Antoine, Office 1105 Detroit, Michigan 48226 (313) 224-5796 mayalp@waynecounty.com

Dated: January 4, 2023