

No. 20200917-SC

In The
Utah Supreme Court

STATE OF UTAH,
Appellee,

v.

STEPHEN RIPPEY,
Appellant.

Brief of Amicus Curiae
Utah Indigent Appellant Defense Division
in Support of Appellant Stephen Rippey

Sean Reyes (7969)
Utah Attorney General
160 East 300 South
6th Floor
P.O. Box 140854
Salt Lake City, UT 84114
(801) 366-0180

Counsel for Appellee

Ann M. Taliaferro (8776)
Brown, Bradshaw & Moffat
422 North 300 West
Salt Lake City, UT 84103
(801) 532-5297

Counsel for Mr. Rippey

Benjamin Miller (17720)
Debra M. Nelson (9176)
Utah Indigent Appellate
Defense Division
370 E. South Temple
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
(385) 270-1650

Counsel for Amicus Curiae

FILED
UTAH APPELLATE COURTS

NOV 01 2022

Table of Contents

Table of Authorities.....	ii
Consent for Amicus Filing	1
Interests of Amicus Curiae	1
Introduction	3
Argument.....	4
I. The Plea Withdrawal Statute is unconstitutional as it sacrifices the constitutional rights of nearly everyone convicted in Utah in the name of alleged efficiency.	4
A. The history of the Plea Withdrawal Statute has been the persistent chipping away at people’s access to meaningful review.	6
B. A review of the postconviction process shows why it fails to offer those who plead guilty a meaningful chance to review their case.	9
C. Denying people who plead guilty an opportunity with counsel for meaningful review is no minor technicality.	16
D. Data, not anecdotes, shows the depth of the shortcomings in the PWS.....	19
Conclusion.....	28
Addenda	32

Table of Authorities

CASES

<i>Armstrong v. Manzo</i> , 380 U.S. 545 (1965)-----	9
<i>Boykin v. Alabama</i> , 395 U.S. 238 (1969)-----	7
<i>Class v. United States</i> , 138 S. Ct. 798 (2018)-----	15
<i>Davila v. Davis</i> , 137 S. Ct. 2058 (2017)-----	19-20
<i>DeWolfe v. Richmond</i> , 76 A.3d 962 (Md. 2012)-----	22, 24
<i>Douglas v. California</i> , 372 U.S. 353 (1963)-----	4, 28-29
<i>Garza v. Idaho</i> , 139 S. Ct. 738 (2019)-----	13
<i>Gideon v. Wainwright</i> , 372 U.S. 335 (1963)-----	5, 29
<i>Godinez v. Moran</i> , 509 U.S. 389 (1993)-----	12
<i>Griffin v. Illinois</i> , 351 U.S. 12 (1956)-----	28-29
<i>Herring v. New York</i> , 422 U.S. 853 (1975)-----	15
<i>Lafler v. Cooper</i> , 566 U.S. 156 (2012)-----	19

<i>Lee v. United States</i> , 137 S. Ct. 1958 (2017) -----	19
<i>Matthews v. Eldridge</i> , 424 U.S. 319 (1976)-----	9
<i>McCleskey v. Kemp</i> , 481 U.S. 279 (1987)-----	24
<i>Padilla v. Kentucky</i> , 559 U.S. 356 (2010)-----	11-12, 26
<i>Pleasant Grove v. Terry</i> , 2020 UT 69, 478 P.3d 1026-----	19
<i>Roe v. Flores-Ortega</i> , 528 U.S. 470 (2000)-----	12
<i>Ross v. Moffitt</i> , 417 U.S. 600 (1974)-----	2, 5, 29
<i>State v. Gibbons</i> , 740 P.2d 1309 (Utah 1987)-----	7-8, 24
<i>State v. Maestas</i> , 2002 UT 123, 63 P.3d 621 -----	26
<i>Trevino v. Thaler</i> , 569 U.S. 413 (2013)-----	20
<i>United States v. Ash</i> , 413 U.S. 300 (1973)-----	15
<i>United States v. Lovelace</i> , 565 F.3d 1080 (8th Cir. 2009) -----	12
<i>United States v. Olson</i> , 880 F.3d 873 (7th Cir. 2018)-----	12

<i>United States v. Palmer</i> , 456 F.3d 484 (5th Cir. 2006)	12
<i>United States v. Velazquez</i> , 855 F.3d 1021 (9th Cir. 2017)	12
<i>Wilde v. Wyoming</i> , 362 U.S. 607 (1960)	12
<i>Witjaksono v. Holder</i> , 573 F.3d 968 (10th Cir. 2009)	2

STATUTES

Utah Code § 77-13-6	9
Utah Code § 77-13-6 (1982)	7
Utah Code § 77-13-6 (1994)	9
Utah Code § 77-13-6 (2004)	8-9
Utah Code § 78B-22-903	1
Utah Code § 78B-9-109	1, 13

OTHER AUTHORITIES

Nikolaus Albright, <i>Class v. United States: An Imperfect Application of the Menna-Blackledge Doctrine to Post Guilty Plea Constitutional Claims</i> , 78 Md. L. Rev. 382 (2019)	25
Gregory Dyer, <i>Criminal Defendants’ Waiver of the Right to Appeal: An Unacceptable Condition of a Negotiated Sentence or Plea Bargain</i> , 65 Notre Dame L. Rev. 64 (1990)	25

Nathan Marigoni, *Unrepresented and Untimely: The PCRA's
Disservice to Indigent Prisoners*, 2013 Utah L. Rev. OnLaw
(2013) -----23

RULES AND GUIDELINES

Utah R. Crim. P. 11 ----- 8, 15

Consent for Amicus Filing

This Court granted permission for amicus briefing on April 27, 2022.

Interests of Amicus Curiae

The IADD is tasked with ensuring all indigent people convicted of adult crimes in Utah's third through sixth class counties have effective appellate representation. Utah Code § 78B-22-903. And recently, IADD became statutorily eligible to be appointed by district courts to represent people in postconviction proceedings throughout the state. But a court can only appoint IADD, or pro bono counsel, if a person manages to file a pro se petition, if the person asks for counsel, and if the court decides any claims should not be summarily dismissed as frivolous. Utah Code § 78B-9-109(1)(a). And that decision is purely discretionary.

What this means is that every person who pleads guilty in Utah must begin the postconviction process without counsel—a process that should be geared toward protecting important constitutional rights. The reality is that the vast majority of people are never appointed counsel, leaving the person to stand alone against the Attorney General's Office and its trained, experienced attorneys.

This case concerns IADD because it protects Utahn’s right to meaningful appellate review with the guaranteed assistance of counsel—even a person who pleads guilty. *See, e.g., Witjaksono v. Holder*, 573 F.3d 968, 974 (10th Cir. 2009) (“An elementary component of due process is the right to meaningful appellate review[.]”). The U.S. Supreme Court has held that meaningful review entails the right to counsel to provide a person—including those who plead guilty—“access to the higher court” with the help of counsel. *Ross v. Moffitt*, 417 U.S. 600, 604-05 (1974). Yet Utah’s plea withdrawal scheme denies indigent people who plead guilty any meaningful opportunity for review by a higher court. The current Plea Withdrawal Statute as it works with the postconviction process, cannot pass constitutional muster.

Introduction

Utah's Postconviction Remedies Act (PCRA) provides a person's sole state remedy after a direct appeal has been exhausted. Those pursuing PCRA must comprehend the numerous hurdles spanning the Act's 20-plus pages. The practical result is that the PCRA denies access to justice for most people convicted of a crime in Utah. Data since 2016 shows that almost 90% of PCRA petitions have been dismissed. That number climbs to nearly 99% for pro se petitions filed almost exclusively by indigent people.

However, if a person is convicted at a trial, at least that person can seek appellate review of their conviction by filing a direct appeal with the assistance of counsel. It is only after full appellate review of the trial proceedings has been afforded, and the conviction affirmed that the case is funneled through the PCRA.

For those who plead guilty, the PCRA represents the first and only chance for review. This is because of the strictures of the Plea Withdrawal Statute. Once sentenced, other than a challenge to the legality of the sentence itself, the person has no right to appeal, no right to counsel, and no meaningful opportunity for review.

The PWS leaves indigent people with “merely a meaningless ritual” to raise challenges to their convictions. *Douglas v. California*, 372 U.S. 353, 358 (1963). It requires indigent people to navigate the complexities of the statutory requirements alone. Specifically, a pro se individual is left: 1) to understand what legal errors may exist without the benefit of discovery or an investigation; 2) to file a timely pro se petition that meets the heightened pleading standards; 3) to hope it survives an initial court screening; and, 4) to rely on a court using its discretion to then appoint counsel.

The PWS abandons the indigent to proceed without counsel in all but the rarest instances. This result renders the PWS antithetical to any notion of justice. It renders the statute unconstitutional. This Court should so hold.

Argument

I. The Plea Withdrawal Statute sacrifices the constitutional rights of most people convicted of crimes in Utah in the name of alleged efficiency.

The Plea Withdrawal Statute leaves people with only one chance to raise any legal challenge to the constitutionality or sufficiency of a plea. Affluent people who plead guilty can retain counsel to advise them and file any relevant petition. But for

people who are indigent—representing the vast majority of people who plead guilty—the PWS denies them any meaningful opportunity to challenge their plea. They are not provided counsel but are abandoned to navigate a convoluted postconviction process, where 99% of pro se petitions are denied.

What the PWS does in practice is “cut off” the ability of an indigent person to challenge a plea “while leaving open avenues of relief to anyone more affluent. *Ross v. Moffitt*, 417 U.S. 600, 610-11 (1974). And that is what the U.S. Supreme Court has said that states “cannot” do. *Id.* While states need not provide counsel at every stage, “[u]nfairness results” when “indigent[]” people are “singled out” and “denied meaningful access” to review “because of their poverty.” *Id.* at 610-11 (1974).

The landmark *Gideon v. Wainwright* decision rested on the “obvious truth” that lawyers are “necessities, not luxuries” in the criminal legal system. 372 U.S. 335, 344 (1963). *See also Ross*, 417 U.S. at 610-11 (people after a conviction need counsel “not as a shield” but as a “sword” to be able to pursue any meritorious reasons for challenging guilt). And lawyers are a necessity for indigent people who plead guilty, no different than for someone who goes to trial or is affluent. The PWS denies indigent people

this necessity. This Court should now right that wrong by ruling that the PWS is unconstitutional.

A. The history of the Plea Withdrawal Statute has been the persistent chipping away at people's access to meaningful review.

The history of the PWS encompasses a decades-long shift of implementing stricter requirements on people who plead guilty. The result has been a process that precludes indigent people from having the guiding hand of counsel to understand their case, leaving them with little chance to understand if there are possible legal issues following a guilty plea, let alone to be in a position to properly raise these issues.

The limitations of the PWS have developed as if guilty pleas could never be unknowingly or involuntarily entered, be based on insufficient evidence or improper advice, or be the result of a false accusation or false confession. But those assumptions are wrong. The PWS, as it works with the PCRA, may result in a quickening of the criminal legal system's assembly line. But that result has been achieved at the expense of due process, fundamental fairness, and the constitution.

As of 1982, there was no time limit on when a person could withdraw a guilty plea. A person was permitted to withdraw a

guilty plea simply “upon a showing of good cause” and “with leave of court.” Utah Code § 77-13-6 (1982). In *State v. Gibbons*, 740 P.2d 1309, 1312-13 (Utah 1987), when a case reached this Court where the defendant had not filed a motion to withdraw in the district court, this Court remanded to allow the defendant to do so.

At the time, Rule 11(e) of the Utah Rules of Criminal Procedure stated that a court must ensure a plea is entered knowingly and voluntarily, with an understanding of the rights being given up and being informed of the possible minimum and maximum sentence. This Court explained that Rule 11(e) “squarely places on trial courts the burden of ensuring that constitutional and Rule 11(e) requirements are complied with when a guilty plea is entered.” *Gibbons*, 740 P.2d at 1312 (citing *Boykin v. Alabama*, 395 U.S. 238, 243-44 (1969)).

In *Boykin*, the U.S. Supreme Court stated: “What is at stake for an accused facing [punishment] demands” that “courts are capable of canvassing the matter with the accused to make sure he has a full understanding of what the plea connotes and of its consequences.” 395 U.S. at 243-44. Accordingly, this Court once held that strict compliance with Rule 11(e) was required, recognizing that doing so “may take additional time, but

constitutional rights may not be sacrificed in the name of judicial economy.” *Gibbons*, 740 P.2d at 1314.

Over time, however, judicial economy has surged ahead of constitutional rights in our rules and jurisprudence. First, strict compliance with Rule 11(e) was cast aside. It was replaced with the more difficult standard of “record as a whole,” as it was decided courts could be let off the hook for failing to ensure a plea was constitutional. Language was added to the rule, which stands today, stating, “**Strict compliance not necessary.** Compliance with this rule will be determined by examining the record as a whole. Any variance from procedures required by this rule which do not affect substantial rights will be disregarded. Failure to comply with this rule is not, by itself, sufficient grounds for a collateral attack on a guilty plea.” Utah R. Crim. P. 11(l).

Other changes further scaled back protections for those who plead guilty. With modifications to Rule 11 came changes to the PWS. In 2003, the “good cause” language to withdraw a plea was stricken. Now, a person could withdraw “only upon leave of the court and a showing that it was not knowing and voluntarily made.” Utah Code § 77-13-6 (2004). Time limitations were again reduced, prohibiting a motion to withdraw from being filed after

sentencing. *Compare* Utah Code § 77-13-6 (2004) (“A request to withdraw a plea of guilty or not contest ... shall be made by motion before sentence is announced.”), *with* Utah Code § 77-13-6 (1994) (reducing the time frame for filing a motion to withdraw to 30 days). Failure to file a motion to withdraw within these limitations bars claims from appellate review, except through the PCRA.

B. By restricting review of pleas to the postconviction process, the PWS fails to offer indigent people who plead guilty a meaningful chance to review their case.

Currently, the PWS shuts off all chances for a person to challenge a guilty plea in a criminal court setting with counsel the moment the person is sentenced. *See* Utah Code § 77-13-6(c) (all challenges to a plea not made before sentencing “shall be pursued” only through the Postconviction Remedies Act, which is governed by civil rules of procedure). By sending people who plead guilty to postconviction to raise any challenge, the PWS sets people up for failure. *See Matthews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319, 333 (1976) (“The fundamental requirement of due process is the opportunity to be heard ‘at a meaningful time and in a meaningful manner.’”) (quoting *Armstrong v. Manzo*, 380 U.S. 545, 552 (1965)).

Perhaps people who are affluent may be able to hire an attorney to review their case. But for those who are indigent—the overwhelming majority of all people convicted—they are left out. Though the statute points to postconviction to raise any claims outside of the legality of the sentence, it amounts to a meaningless ritual for people without access to counsel.

A review of how the process typically unfolds demonstrates why.

If there is a valid reason to challenge a plea, the person pleading guilty likely received ineffective assistance of counsel. At a minimum, the reason is likely one the attorney should have recognized but failed to do so. Under the PWS, challenging the plea mandates the challenge to be raised before sentencing. But to do so requires the attorney to have realized one's ineffectiveness or an error otherwise missed and make the realization before sentencing. Otherwise, the indigent person who pled guilty loses the right to have the assistance of counsel the moment sentence is imposed.

If not raised before sentencing, the person's only option to challenge any aspect of the plea, other than the legality of the sentence, is restricted to postconviction. But again, the only advice

that person would have received thus far would almost certainly have been from that same attorney who failed to recognize or raise the issue in the first place. Once sentenced, not only is the person left with just the postconviction process, but appointed counsel has likely since withdrawn, leaving the indigent person on one's own to traverse the complexities of the PCRA.

Consider that without counsel or means to hire an attorney, the person would need to understand the relevant law and how it relates to the case's facts. A person with money may be able to consult an attorney. But for an indigent person, who is likely incarcerated and lacks access to essential documents such as the transcripts and the court record, it is unreasonable to conclude that they can understand how to identify and raise issues that may have impacted the legality and constitutionality of the plea.

For example, in *Padilla v. Kentucky*, 559 U.S. 356, 369 (2010), the U.S. Supreme Court said that failure to advise a person who pleaded guilty that deportation would result from the conviction was ineffective assistance of counsel. The Court also discussed how failing to properly advise a person pleading guilty of direct and collateral consequences can also fall below the “constitutionally ‘reasonable professional assistance’ required

under *Strickland [v. Washington]*, 466 U.S. 668, 689 (1984).” *Padilla*, 559 U.S. at 365. In Utah, people who plead guilty but are not properly advised of immigration or other critical consequences will likely remain unaware that their guilty pleas were unconstitutional if they do not know of the holding in *Padilla* and similar case law.

The same holds true for every valid reason a person may challenge a plea. These issues include, but are not limited to, insufficient evidence to support the plea, *see United States v. Palmer*, 456 F.3d 484, 489 (5th Cir. 2006); an unknowing or involuntary plea, *see United States v. Olson*, 880 F.3d 873, 880-81 (7th Cir. 2018); government breach of the terms of the plea agreement, *see United States v. Lovelace*, 565 F.3d 1080, 1087 (8th Cir. 2009); failure to disclose exculpatory evidence, *see Wilde v. Wyoming*, 362 U.S. 607 (1960); failure to conduct a proper competency evaluation, *see Godinez v. Moran*, 509 U.S. 389, 396-97 (1993); failure to properly advise about the waiver of appellate rights, *see United States v. Velazquez*, 855 F.3d 1021, 1033 (9th Cir. 2017). Also, people who plead guilty may have received ineffective assistance of counsel if an attorney failed to file a notice of appeal, *see Roe v. Flores-Ortega*, 528 U.S. 470, 483 (2000), even

if the person in the plea waived the right to appeal. *See Garza v. Idaho*, 139 S. Ct. 738, 746 (2019).

Next, even if the person can recognize that a legal and constitutional basis exists for reversal, the person—when indigent, incarcerated, and unrepresented—must understand the intricacies of the Postconviction Remedies Act. An act that encompasses an entire chapter of the Utah Code. *See Utah Code* § 78B-9-109 et. seq.

Specifically, the person must recognize:

- what the relevant burden of proof is, § 78B-9-104,
- what issues are precluded, § 78B-9-106,
- and exactly how much time there is to file the petition based on the confusing definition of when a clock starts and stops. § 78B-9-107.

At that stage, even if a person manages to file a pro se petition and ask for counsel, no grounds exist under the statute for a court to appoint counsel. Instead, a court must first review the pro se petition and decide if any of the issues presented have possible merit and are not otherwise procedurally barred. Only at that point is a court given any discretion to appoint counsel. A court can, and most often does, deny that request. *See Utah Code* § 78B-9-109(1)(a).

To highlight how meaningless a ritual postconviction is for people who plead guilty and have been denied access to an attorney to assist with raising any issues, picture the following scenario. A person pleads guilty and is sentenced to prison. While in prison, without access to counsel and legal training, the person must first know to look to the PCRA. The person must also understand the possible issues available to raise to challenge a plea. The person then has to comprehend the filing requirements and time restrictions and present the issues in a way that a court can understand. If the issue is not presented correctly, if it is filed one day late, or if any other procedural hurdle is not perfectly cleared, the court can deny the petition as frivolous or dismiss it outright. With their cadre of attorneys, the AG gets a chance to file a response, urging the court to grant summary judgment. And then, even if the person's petition survives initial review, a court would be within its discretion to deny a request for counsel.

It is nonsensical to think an indigent person, most likely incarcerated, is offered a meaningful chance to raise a challenge to a plea under the statute's current framework. The above is not some rare instance but rather the way the PWS, in conjunction with the PCRA, operates every single time for every indigent

person who pleads guilty. Further, it is not even assured that the district court, when accepting the plea, properly advised a person of available rights because the “strict compliance” requirement was removed from Rule 11(e).

The U.S. Supreme Court has said that “[t]he very premise of our adversary system of criminal justice is that partisan advocacy on both sides of a case will best promote the ultimate objective that the guilty can be convicted and the innocent go free.” *Herring v. New York*, 422 U.S. 853, 862 (1975). A person’s liberty relies on a fair and meaningful opportunity to present one’s case in the face of “the intricacies of the law and the advocacy of the public prosecutor.” *United States v. Ash*, 413 U.S. 300, 309 (1973). But under the PWS, indigent people must overcome the intricacies of the law and the rigors of the PCRA on their own, no matter if their constitutional rights have been violated. That is not what our adversarial system of justice was meant to be. *See Class v. United States*, 138 S. Ct. 798, 803 (2018) (reiterating that even a person who pleads guilty does not forego possible constitutional challenges to the conviction).

C. Denying people who plead guilty an opportunity for meaningful review with counsel is no minor technicality.

It is a fact that innocent people plead guilty. According to the National Registry of Exonerations, over 25% (813 of 3217) of all exonerations since 1989 followed a guilty plea.¹ Of those 813:

- 447 involved perjured or false accusations (55%);
- 409 involved police or prosecutor misconduct (slightly over 50%);
- and 87 involved a false confession (11%).

For these exonerations to come to light, and the wrongful convictions to be righted, the person had to be able to uncover the facts, evidence, and legal basis to prove their innocence. Yet, with the PWS, an indigent person is not given the opportunity for counsel to assist them with starting the review process. And even if not a wrongful conviction but an unconstitutional one, the PWS offers a person no help.

¹ See Nat'l Registry of Exonerations: Detailed View (last visited August 24, 2022), available at <https://www.law.umich.edu/special/exoneration/Pages/detailist.aspx>. In preparing this brief, undersigned counsel realized that percentages of wrongful convictions from guilty pleas contained in the Motion for Leave to File Amicus Brief were unintentionally incorrect.

If there is a trial and a guilty verdict results, the person—whether indigent or not—is entitled to appellate counsel. Guaranteed counsel would review the entire record and identify issues that can be raised on appeal. And though not a sufficient substitute for appointed counsel at post-conviction, appellate counsel could provide a person guidance on existing issues that, though they might not be able to be raised on direct appeal, could be pursued in postconviction.

Conversely, the indigent person who pleads guilty does not have the same opportunity to have counsel review the record and provide advice relating to prejudicial errors that may have occurred during the proceedings. The contention that the individual should be aware of these errors before sentencing is a fallacy. It takes time to recognize, understand, develop, and present sufficient legal arguments to establish that a person's conviction was wrongful or unconstitutional. Of the 813 exonerations after a guilty plea in the National Registry of Exoneration Database, it took a combined 7,030 years for those exonerations to be established, an average of over 8.5 years per case. Stated simply, these errors were not raised or corrected before sentencing.

These exonerations also required the knowledge and expertise of counsel, which, as discussed, the PWS precludes.

One of the 813 exoneration cases came from Utah—the case of Kevin Peterson, who pled no contest in 1990 to second-degree sexual abuse.² After one year in prison, he was released on parole, but parole was revoked shortly after when he refused to admit to the crimes. He was ordered to serve the remainder of his entire 15-year term. Five years after he was released from prison, Mr. Peterson was finally able to prove his innocence through affidavits from his children.

It would be unreasonable and incorrect to view the one Utah wrongful conviction as a sign that the procedures here are sufficient. Wrongful convictions can occur for numerous reasons but, to be uncovered, they almost always require zealous representation and investigation. Both of which are denied to every indigent person who pleads guilty in Utah. It is naïve to think that Mr. Peterson is the only person in Utah to have pled guilty but be innocent. It is equally naïve to believe there are no

² See Nat'l Registry of Exonerations, Kevin Peterson (last visited Aug. 24, 2022), available at <https://www.law.umich.edu/special/exoneration/Pages/casetail.aspx?caseid=4099>. See Addendum A for complete list.

innocent people in the state’s prisons who have pled guilty. But even if it was just one person, that is one person too many. “After all, Blackstone’s ratio—the basis for our presumption of innocence and the core principle of our criminal justice system—tells us that ‘[i]t is better that ten guilty persons escape than one innocent suffer.’” *Pleasant Grove v. Terry*, 2020 UT 69, ¶25, 478 P.3d 1026 (citing 4 William Blackstone, Commentaries *352).

When the PWS denies people meaningful access to counsel and meaningful access to review, it means people are left to languish who may have been wrongfully convicted or who may have unconstitutional convictions. It should be a priority for this Court to correct that injustice.

D. Data, not anecdotes, shows the depth of the shortcomings in the PWS.

The Sixth Amendment guarantees a person the effective assistance of counsel at all “critical stages of a criminal proceeding,’ including when [the person] enters a guilty plea.” *Lee v. United States*, 137 S. Ct. 1958, 1964 (2017)) (quoting *Lafler v. Cooper*, 566 U.S. 156, 165 (2012)). In *Davila v. Davis*, the U.S. Supreme Court reiterated that a “meritorious claim[]” of ineffective assistance of counsel should “receive review by *at least*

one state or federal court.” 137 S. Ct. 2058, 2067 (2017) (emphasis added). Further, the Court said that such a claim cannot “escape review altogether” merely because a person lacked adequate assistance of counsel during any state-court collateral appeal. *Id.* But here in Utah, people who plead guilty can receive ineffective assistance of counsel but, if indigent, it is extremely likely the claim will escape review because the PWS denies the person access to the assistance of counsel.

Data on postconviction petitions shows that any person filing a petition pro se has almost no chance of the case being reviewed on the merits, let alone being successful. *See Trevino v. Thaler*, 569 U.S. 413, 429 (2013) (holding where a “state procedural framework, by reason of its design and operation, makes it highly unlikely in a typical case that a [person] will have a meaningful opportunity to raise a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel” then procedural default will not limit that person’s ability to pursue the claim in federal habeas proceedings). According to data from the Administrative Office of the Courts, 205 people filed pro se PCRA petitions between 2016 and 2021.³ Of those 205, 44% did

³ *See* Addendum B for complete data.

not ask for counsel (91). It is possible some did not ask because they did not want counsel; but the more likely assumption is they did not ask because they did not know they could or assumed no counsel would be appointed.

Of those who did ask for counsel to be appointed, those requests did not lead to much better results. Only 15 people—out of 114 requests—had counsel appointed. And regardless of whether counsel was ever appointed, the data shows that petitions initially filed pro se had essentially no chance of success. Of all the pro se petitions filed in those five years, **nearly 99% were denied**. It would be unreasonable to assume that had these people been provided counsel at the outset, there would still be such abysmal results.

Further, of all the cases where relief was denied, nearly 30% were denied because the petition never reached the point where a court had the discretion to appoint counsel, and nearly 40% did not survive the state's motion for summary judgment. Troublingly, 20% of pro se petitions were denied because a person could not pay the filing fee. That is denying indigent people access to justice.

In comparison, people who filed initial petitions with the assistance of counsel had their petitions granted 40% of the time

(35 out of 87). *See generally DeWolfe v. Richmond*, 76 A.3d 962, 977 (Md. 2012) (finding a right to appointed counsel at initial appearances under the state constitution, in part, because of evidence showing that unrepresented people were “more likely to have more perfunctory hearings,” less likely to be released pretrial, and more likely to have higher bail).

Figure 1:

Total PCRA petitions 2016-21	
Total Filed	318
Total Filed Pro Se	205 (64.4%)
Total Decided (as of 8/1/22)	267
Total Granted	37 (13.8%)
Total Dismissed	230 (86.1%)

Figure 2:

Results of Pro Se PCRA petitions 2016-21	
Total	205
Asked for an attorney	114
Denied an attorney	99 (86.8%)
Appointed an attorney	15 (13.1%)
Total Decided (as of 8/1/22)	180
Total Granted	2 (1.1%) ⁴
Total Dismissed	178 (98.9%)

⁴ Both times where a pro se postconviction petition was granted it was done by stipulation with the state due to uncontested error.

Figure 3

Comparison between pro se and attorney filed petitions		
	Pro Se	Attorney Filed
Filed	205	113
Decided	180	87
Granted	1.11%	40.2%
Dismissed	98.89%	59.8%
Stage of process where dismissed:		
Court's Motion to Dismiss based on procedure	8.43%	5.8%
Frivolity Review	22.4%	7.7%
Failure to Pay Fee	20.8%	0%
State's Motion for Summary Judgment	30.9%	53.6%
State's Motion to Dismiss	2.81%	11.5%
Other	14.04%	19.23%

The data shows existing problems of the PCRA, which is not the specific issue before this Court.⁵ But when the PCRA, with all its shortcomings, is the only opportunity a person who pleads guilty has to raise any non-sentencing challenges in their case, these numbers show that people who plead guilty in Utah are

⁵ See generally Nathan Marigoni, *Unrepresented and Untimely: The PCRA's Disservice to Indigent Prisoners*, 2013 Utah L. Rev. OnLaw, 6-11 (2013) (detailing the many ways in which the PCRA fails to provide meaningful opportunities to indigent incarcerated people).

being denied their right to meaningful review of their case. In particular, when a person is indigent and has no opportunity or right to have counsel appointed to assist with the process, the PCRA is no opportunity at all. The 99% denial rate speaks volumes as to the unconstitutionality of the procedures afforded to indigent people to challenge their pleas, given that a pro se PCRA petition is their only option due to the strictures of the PWS.

The most likely argument supporting the PWS in its current form is that it is needed for “finality” and judicial efficiency. But even viewing those arguments in their best light, they amount to nothing more than “a fear of too much justice.” *McCleskey v. Kemp*, 481 U.S. 279, 339 (1987) (Brennan, J. dissenting). Unsaid in such an argument is that there may be people who pled guilty with unconstitutional convictions whose case never make it to court but would if the procedures were properly in place to provide counsel.

This Court should remember what it said in *Gibbons* that efficiency should never supersede the constitution. *Gibbons*, 740 P.2d at 1314. *See also DeWolfe*, 76 A.3d at 979-980 (refusing to approve denying an indigent person’s right to counsel because it may impose a “substantial burden” to enforce). Because the “importance” of upholding fairness in the criminal legal system to

individuals who have pled guilty “greatly outweighs whatever efficiency the system” may receive by restricting the rights of those who accept guilty pleas, it should be ensured that indigent people have meaningful access and opportunities to “correct injustices.” Gregory Dyer, *Criminal Defendants’ Waiver of the Right to Appeal: An Unacceptable Condition of a Negotiated Sentence or Plea Bargain*, 65 Notre Dame L. Rev. 649, 660-61 (1990). See also Nikolaus Albright, *Class v. United States: An Imperfect Application of the Menna-Blackledge Doctrine to Post Guilty Plea Constitutional Claims*, 78 Md. L. Rev. 382, 410 (2019) (the state’s interest in “conserving interest” and “finality must yield to the defendant’s liberty interests”).

Moreover, such efficiency-related arguments and concerns about floodgates of litigation to support the current format of the PWS lack any evidence of being accurate other than possibly anecdotal, and should be quickly dispensed with by this Court. To paraphrase an old saying, the road of bad criminal policies is paved with anecdotes.

First, people pleading guilty nearly always admit guilt. Seeking to withdraw a plea, even if granted, does not present some windfall. At best the person would have the plea reversed in a case

where in court, under oath, the person admitted guilt to the exact charge, and any statements made during allocution could be used for impeachment. *See State v. Maestas*, 2002 UT 123, ¶56, n.9, 63 P.3d 621. Also, a plea should represent not a one-sided deal but an agreement between two sides. When the procedures are followed properly and a person goes through the process with the guaranteed effective assistance of counsel, the notion there are legions of people with buyer's remorse does not stand up to reality.

Second, the U.S. Supreme Court addressed such a claim in its *Padilla* decision. The Court explained that in the 25 years since it first applied *Strickland* to guilty pleas, “pleas are less frequently the subject of collateral challenges than convictions obtained after a trial.” 559 U.S. at 372. The Court explained that though guilty pleas account for nearly 95% of all criminal convictions, they made up only 30% of habeas petitions filed. *Id.* As the Court said, this makes sense because the opportunity to withdraw a plea “imposes its own significant limiting principle.” *Id.* A person who withdraws a plea will “lose the benefit of the bargain obtained as a result of the plea. Thus, a different calculus informs whether it is wise to challenge a guilty plea” as compared to a guilty verdict because

“ultimately, the challenge may result in [a] *less favorable* outcome for the defendant.” *Id.* at 373 (emphasis original).

And third, if a person files a pro se petition following a guilty plea—a herculean task for all the reasons detailed above—a court under the current framework still expends its time and resources reviewing it. And the Attorney General’s Office still utilizes its resources to respond if requested to do so by the district court. Providing a person with counsel to assist in the process before a court renders any decision on whether an issue may proceed does not significantly add to the court’s docket or the State’s caseload. It merely provides a person who pleads guilty with a meaningful chance for review. And if that person is indigent, it allows that review to take place with the assistance of counsel, the same as for a non-indigent person. This is what the constitution requires. And it is what the PWS forbids, which is why this Court must declare the PWS unconstitutional.⁶

⁶ This Court can declare a statute unconstitutional without needing to draft the exact response. That is for the legislature. While there are many avenues to correcting the unconstitutional flaws in the PWS, any must include allowing a person at least one meaningful opportunity with counsel, if desired, to raise challenges besides the legality of a sentence. Such could be achieved by not limiting Utah R. App. Pro. 23B

Conclusion

The U.S. Supreme Court has said that “there can be no equal justice when the kind of trial a [person] gets depends on the amount of money [the person] has.” *Griffin v. Illinois*, 351 U.S. 12, 19 (1956). In *Douglas*, it said the same about an appeal. 372 U.S. at 355. For people who plead guilty in Utah, the PWS takes away their appellate rights and leaves indigent people with no meaningful opportunity to present a valid claim. It takes away their opportunity for equal justice.

Unlike someone who can afford to hire an attorney, an indigent person must navigate the process without counsel. Such a result undermines the fairness, integrity, and trust in the

to only ineffective assistance of counsel claims from cases that went to trial. Ineffective assistance can happen any time and there is no rational basis for granting people who go to trial access to the 23B process but not someone who pleads guilty. Or a solution could be ensuring people who plead guilty are fully advised about possible postconviction challenges and then not permitting a district court to deny a pro se PCRA petition or dismiss claims until a person has been appointed counsel. A court should have no discretion to deny a person raising a first challenge access to counsel. Once appointed, any counsel must be provided a reasonable opportunity to file any needed supplemental petition, without limitation to what a person managed to cobble together in a pro se petition.

criminal legal system. This is what cases like *Griffin*, *Douglas*, *Gideon*, and *Ross* declared was unconstitutional.

Thus, this Court should declare the PWS, which precludes people from raising any challenge to a plea other than the sentence in a setting with guaranteed counsel, unconstitutional.

DATED November 1, 2022.

Benjamin Miller

Benjamin Miller (Bar No. 17720)
Debra M. Nelson (Bar No. 9176)
**Utah Indigent Appellate
Defense Division**
370 E. South Temple
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
(385) 270-1650
IADD@utah.gov

Attorneys for Amicus Curiae

Certificate of Compliance

I hereby certify that:

1. This brief complies with the type-volume limitation of Utah Rule of Appellate Procedure 24(f)(1), as applicable to this amicus brief.
2. This brief contains 5752 words, excluding the table of contents, table of authorities, certificate of compliance, certificate of service, and addenda.
3. This brief complies with Utah Rule of Appellate Procedure 27(b) as it has been prepared in a proportionally spaced font using Microsoft Word, Century Schoolbook, 14-pont fount
4. This brief complies with Utah Rule of Appellate Procedure 21 regarding public and private records.

DATED November 1, 2022.

Benjamin Miller

Benjamin Miller
Counsel for Amicus Curiae

Certificate of Service

This is to certify that on November 1, 2022, a true a correct copy of the foregoing *Amicus Brief* was filed by email and concurrently served by email to::

Ann Marie Taliaferro
Brown, Bradshaw & Moffat
422 North 300 West
Salt Lake City, UT 84103
ann@brownbradshaw.com
Counsel for Mr. Rippey

Dain Smoland
Smoland Law
422 North 300 West
Salt Lake City, UT 84103
dain@smolandlaw.com
Counsel for Mr. Rippey

Utah State Attorney General's Office
Appeals Division
160 East 300 South
6th Floor
P.O. Box 140854
Salt Lake City, UT 84114
criminalappeals@agutah.gov

Benjamin Miller

Benjamin Miller

Addenda

Addendum A.....	List of exonerations since 1989 following guilty pleas
Addendum B.....	Administrative Office of the Courts data of post-conviction petitions filed 2016-2021

Addendum A

Last Name	Frst Name	State	Convicted	Exonerated	DNA	False Confession	Perjury/False Accusation	Official Misconduct	IAC
Abbott	Cinque	IL	2008	2022			P/FA	OM	
Acero	Longino	CA	1994	2006					IAC
Adams	Anthony	CA	1996	2001			P/FA	OM	
Adams	Johnathan	GA	2005	2006		FC		OM	
Adams	Demetris	IL	2004	2020			P/FA	OM	
Adams	Cheryl	MA	1989	1993			P/FA		
Adams	Darryl	TX	1992	2017	DNA		P/FA		
Adams	Johnny	TX	2009	2016					
Albritton	Amy	TX	2010	2016					
Alegria	Megan	TX	2011	2020					
Ali	Chauncey	IL	2007	2020			P/FA	OM	
Allen	Crystal	IL	2007	2022			P/FA	OM	
Allen	Crystal	IL	2007	2022			P/FA	OM	
Allen	Landon	IL	2004	2018			P/FA	OM	
Allen	Derrick	NC	1999	2016			P/FA	OM	IAC
Allen	Dennis	TX	2000	2003			P/FA	OM	
Almond	George	IL	2008	2021			P/FA	OM	
Almond	George	IL	2006	2018			P/FA	OM	
Alvarado	Victor	IL	2012	2013			P/FA	OM	
Alvarez	Jesse	CA	1996	2001			P/FA	OM	
Alvarez	Jorge	CA	1996	2001			P/FA	OM	
Alvarez	George	TX	2006	2010			P/FA	OM	
Alvirez	Daniel	F-DC	2011	2012					
Amory	Earl	TX	2009	2016					
Anderson	Deonta	IL	2004	2022			P/FA	OM	
Anderson	Herbert	IL	2004	2022			P/FA	OM	
Anderson	Candice	TX	2007	2014					
Armstrong	Craig	IL	2005	2018					IAC
Armstrong	Craig	IL	2012	2016					IAC
Armstrong	Homer	TX	2014	2015					
Arteaga	Jose	CA	2016	2016	DNA				
Arteaga	Josephine	TX	2014	2015					
Ash	Steven	OR	2012	2016					
Aubain	Naythen	NY	2016	2017			P/FA	OM	
Austin	Kirkdrick	TX	2018	2021			P/FA	OM	IAC
Baddeley	Gabriel	WA	2002	2004		FC			
Bailey	Samuel	CA	1996	1999			P/FA	OM	
Bailey	Jherelle	NJ	2010	2010			P/FA	OM	
Baker	Anthony	IL	2003	2022			P/FA	OM	
Baker	Ben	IL	2006	2016			P/FA	OM	
Baker	Tameeka	NY	2017	2018			P/FA	OM	
Baker	Danziel	TX	2014	2015					
Baker	Terry	TX	2014	2014					
Baldwin	Christopher	TX	2014	2016					
Ballard	Nathaniel	NJ	2008	2010			P/FA	OM	
Baltierrez	Jose	TX	2014	2014					
Baltrip	Henry	TX	2013	2015					IAC
Banks	Medell	AL	2001	2003		FC	P/FA	OM	
Banks	Brian	CA	2003	2012			P/FA		
Barnes	Joel	NJ	2009	2010			P/FA	OM	

Last Name	Frst Name	State	Convicted	Exonerated	DNA	False Confession	Perjury/False Accusation	Official Misconduct	IAC
Barnett	Nathaniel	WV	2008	2021	DNA		P/FA	OM	
Barnett	Phillip	WV	2008	2021	DNA		P/FA	OM	
Barrientos	David	TX	2016	2016					
Barriga	Jose	IL	2013	2020					
Barrios	Diego	CA	1996	2000			P/FA	OM	
Barron	Deandre	IL	2011	2020					
Barrow	James	TX	2000	2003			P/FA	OM	
Barrow	Leroy	TX	2000	2003			P/FA	OM	
Barry	Zachary	TX	2016	2017					
Batts	Rosa Sade	TX	2012	2013					
Beal	Teshama	IL	2005	2022			P/FA	OM	
Beal	Kenneth	TX	2007	2015					
Becerra	Gilbert	NJ	2009	2010			P/FA	OM	
Bell	Jimmie	IL	2004	2022			P/FA	OM	
Bell	Deandre	IL	2007	2018			P/FA	OM	
Bell	Jerrell	TX	2011	2014					
Benard	Troy	TX	2000	2003			P/FA	OM	
Berghoff	Stacey	TX	2014	2014					
Beverly	Shawn	NJ	2008	2010			P/FA	OM	
Birden	Eric	TX	2007	2015					
Bivens	Phillip	MS	1980	2010	DNA	FC	P/FA	OM	
Bivens, Jr.	Darrell Wayne	TX	2013	2013					IAC
Bjerklie	Donna	ND	2005	2006					
Blackmon	James	NC	1988	2019		FC			
Blackshire	James	TX	1995	2009			P/FA	OM	IAC
Blair	Harvey	IL	2005	2018			P/FA	OM	
Bledsoe	Earnest	TX	2008	2015					
Bolden	Percy	IL	2006	2022			P/FA	OM	
Bonners	Catrina	IL	2007	2021			P/FA	OM	
Booker	Larry	CA	1993	2017			P/FA		
Borne	Marcus	IL	2004	2016					
Bostic	Larry	FL	1989	2007	DNA		P/FA		
Boyce	Marlon	IL	2006	2020					
Boyd	Darryl	IL	2005	2022			P/FA	OM	
Bradford	Marcellius	IL	1988	2001	DNA	FC	P/FA	OM	
Bradley	Javon	IL	2008	2022			P/FA	OM	
Bradley	Antwan	IL	2008	2020			P/FA	OM	
Brakes	Warren	IL	2008	2022			P/FA	OM	
Braseel	Adam	TN	2007	2021			P/FA	OM	IAC
Brayboy	Glen	IL	2008	2022			P/FA	OM	
Breeland	Vernell	IL	2004	2022			P/FA	OM	
Brett	Scott	F-WA	2017	2018					IAC
Briggs	Brandy	TX	2000	2006			P/FA		IAC
Brodie	Stephen	TX	1993	2010		FC		OM	
Brooks	Quincy	TX	2017	2017					
Brooks	Gwendolyn	TX	2010	2014					
Broomes	Livingston	NY	2012	2019			P/FA		IAC
Brown	Jason	IL	2008	2022			P/FA	OM	
Brown	Darius	IL	2000	2021					
Brown	Darnell	IL	2013	2020					

Last Name	Frst Name	State	Convicted	Exonerated	DNA	False Confession	Perjury/False Accusation	Official Misconduct	IAC
Brown	Deonte	IL	2010	2020					
Brown	Keith	NC	1993	1999	DNA	FC			
Brown	Donnesia	NY	2016	2017			P/FA	OM	
Brown	Charlotte	TX	2011	2012					
Brown, Jr.	Knolly	NC	2009	2016	DNA				
Bullock	Keith	MN	1992	1992					
Burley	Umar	MD	2011	2018			P/FA	OM	
Burnett-Walk	Spencer	TX	2014	2015					
Bush	Sean	IL	2007	2022			P/FA	OM	
Byars	Barry	TX	2004	2005			P/FA		
Bynum	Jerome	IL	2004	2022			P/FA	OM	
Byrd	Darron	IL	2007	2019			P/FA	OM	
Calderon III	Domingo	TX	2005	2010			P/FA		
Calhoun	Terance	MI	2007	2022	DNA	FC			
Candido	Roberto	CA	1998	2000			P/FA	OM	
Cantu	Humberto	TX	2009	2018					
Cantu	Raul	TX	2005	2005					
Cape	John	TX	2018	2021			P/FA		
Carabajal	Joey	TX	2013	2014					
Cardwell	M. Donald	F-CT	2000	2000			P/FA		
Carnes	Linda	TX	2014	2014					
Carranza	Carlos	CA	1998	2000			P/FA	OM	
Carrillo	Delbert	CA	1998	2000		FC	P/FA	OM	
Carson	Trevonti	IL	2012	2020					
Carter	Raynard	IL	2006	2019			P/FA	OM	
Casas	Jesus	TX	2015	2016					
Castor	Gregory	TX	2014	2014					
Castro	Marvyn	TX	2015	2017					
Cerami	Sean	IL	2012	2013			P/FA	OM	
Charles	Lambert	NY	1993	1998		FC	P/FA		
Chasstion	Donald	TX	2009	2015					
Chavez	Emmanuel	CA	1996	2000		FC	P/FA	OM	
Chavez	China	TX	2014	2014					
Chavez	Moses	TX	2014	2014					
Chew	Andrew	TX	2008	2015					
Christmas	Demond	IL	2003	2020					
Christoph	Dayna	WA	1995	2000		FC		OM	IAC
Clark	Jonel	IL	2010	2020					
Clark	Derek	NV	2012	2017					
Clark	Cleaven	TX	2008	2016					
Clary, Jr.	Dahn	TX	1998	2016			P/FA		
Claybon	Lugene	IL	2007	2022			P/FA	OM	
Claybron	Eson	IL	2006	2022			P/FA	OM	
Cleveland	Jarrel	TX	2012	2022					
Coker	Edgar	VA	2007	2014			P/FA		IAC
Colbert	Walter	TX	2009	2017					
Coleman	Jermaine	IL	2004	2022			P/FA	OM	
Coleman	Laurarence	IL	2008	2022			P/FA	OM	
Coleman	Jermaine	IL	2006	2019			P/FA	OM	
Coleman	Bobby	IL	2005	2018			P/FA	OM	

Last Name	Frst Name	State	Convicted	Exonerated	DNA	False Confession	Perjury/False Accusation	Official Misconduct	IAC
Coleman	Keith	TX	2006	2013					
Collins	Skye	TX	2017	2017					
Colvin	Craig	IL	2004	2018			P/FA	OM	
Coney	Robert Carroll	TX	1966	2004		FC		OM	IAC
Conley	Michael	IL	2007	2022			P/FA	OM	
Contee	Darian	TX	2007	2010					IAC
Conway	Gregory	IL	2002	2020					
Cooper	Marilyn	TX	2000	2003			P/FA	OM	
Cottle	Charles	NJ	2008	2009			P/FA	OM	
Cox	Richard	CA	1985	1991			P/FA	OM	IAC
Crawford	William	IL	2004	2022			P/FA	OM	
Crochon	Joseph	TX	2014	2016					
Cruz-Romero	Carlos	ID	2014	2016					
Cunningham	Dean	TX	2014	2015					IAC
Cunningham	Henry	WA	1994	1999		FC	P/FA	OM	IAC
Curry	Adrian	TX	2007	2016					
Curtis	Joshua	IL	2005	2018			P/FA	OM	
Curtis	Exzavian	TX	2013	2014					
Daigle	Prentice	TX	2007	2016					
Dallas	Peter	FL	1991	1992		FC		OM	
Dardar	Lanchester	TX	2010	2014					
Dauer	Christopher	TX	2013	2018					IAC
Davalos	Luis	CA	1996	2001			P/FA	OM	
Davenport-Fr	Donna	TX	2012	2013					
Davis	Corey	IL	2005	2022			P/FA	OM	
Davis	Patrice	TX	2014	2017					
Davis	Robert	VA	2004	2016		FC	P/FA		
Dean	James	NE	1989	2009	DNA	FC	P/FA	OM	IAC
DeForge	Paul	FL	1989	1989					IAC
Delaney, Jr.	Milton	IL	2008	2018			P/FA	OM	
Demby	Ronald	NJ	2008	2009			P/FA	OM	
Demings	Barry	TX	2008	2015					
Desrouleaux	Clarens	FL	2013	2018		FC	P/FA	OM	
Diaz	Victor	TX	2011	2014					
Dick, Jr.	Joseph	VA	1999	2016		FC	P/FA	OM	
Dickerson	Jermaine	CA	1998	2021			P/FA		IAC
Dillon	Tarenzo	IL	2006	2020					
Dixon	Matthew	IL	2017	2022		FC	P/FA	OM	
Dixon	Bobby Ray	MS	1980	2010	DNA	FC	P/FA	OM	
Dixon	John	NJ	1991	2001	DNA				
Dixon	Christopher	TX	2005	2017				OM	IAC
Dixon	Isaac	TX	2014	2015					
Dobbins	Gregory	IL	2009	2022			P/FA	OM	
Dobbins	Gregory	IL	2004	2019			P/FA	OM	
Duke	Timmy	TX	1992	2018					IAC
Duke	Dale	TX	1992	2011			P/FA	OM	
Dukes	Jerry	TX	2007	2015					
Duncan	Cornelia	TX	2013	2015					
Durall	Willie	TX	2015	2016					
Dyer	Anthony	MI	1991	2017	DNA				

Last Name	Frst Name	State	Convicted	Exonerated	DNA	False Confession	Perjury/False Accusation	Official Misconduct	IAC
Dziubak	Richard Paul	MN	1987	1989			P/FA		
Earnest	Michael	TX	2014	2014					
Easley	Edward	CA	1993	2017			P/FA		
Elsayed	Jessica	IL	2012	2013			P/FA	OM	
Embry	Anthony	AL	1993	1997					
Emerson	Tommy	TX	2009	2016					
Engberg-Lehr	Teresa	IA	1997	1998					
Enriquez	Danielle	IL	2011	2013			P/FA	OM	
Ervin	Armenu	TX	2000	2003			P/FA	OM	
Escobar	Jose	TX	2015	2015					
Estrada	Bryan	IL	2002	2020					
Eubanks	Ronald	TX	1992	2017	DNA		P/FA		
Everett	Harold	WA	1994	1998			P/FA	OM	
Everett	Idella	WA	1994	1998		FC	P/FA	OM	
Ezell	Bobby	IL	2001	2020					
Farris	Christopher	IL	2004	2020			P/FA	OM	
Faust	Benjamin	MO	2016	2018			P/FA		
Fears	Jerome	IL	2009	2022			P/FA	OM	
Fenton	Joey	IL	2011	2022			P/FA	OM	
Fenton	Tyronne	IL	2007	2022			P/FA	OM	
Ferguson	Latanya	TX	2008	2015					
Ferrara	Vincent	F-MA	1992	2006			P/FA	OM	
Fields	Hilliard	TX	1997	2011			P/FA		
Figueroa	Luis	CT	1996	2014	DNA				
Figueroa	Fancy	NY	1997	2004	DNA	FC			
Fisher	Christine	IL	2004	2022			P/FA	OM	
Fitts	Anthony	CO	2018	2019			P/FA		
Flagg	Michael	IL	2002	2022			P/FA	OM	
Flores	Carlos	TX	2010	2015			P/FA	OM	
Flores	Douglas	TX	2014	2014					
Flores, Jr.	Ernesto	TX	2004	2015				OM	IAC
Flowers	Wanda	TX	2015	2015					
Forney	Robert	IL	2007	2018			P/FA	OM	
Forrest	Paul	TX	2012	2018					IAC
Fowler	Michael	TX	2000	2003			P/FA	OM	
Fox	Bretton	TX	2008	2015					
Frazier	Bryheem	NJ	2008	2009			P/FA	OM	
Frederick	Sherri	TX	2010	2012					
Fry	Jason	TX	2000	2003			P/FA	OM	
Fry	Vickie	TX	2000	2003			P/FA	OM	
Fuentes	Israel	TX	2013	2013					
Fuller	D'Andre	IL	2009	2021					
Fuller	D'Andre	IL	2003	2020					
Gaines	Lynie	MI	1990	1997			P/FA		
Gaines	Sean	NY	2016	2017			P/FA	OM	
Gainus	Rhonda	TX	2012	2013					
Garcia	Steven	CA	1997	2000			P/FA	OM	
Garcia	Sergio	IL	2012	2014			P/FA	OM	
Garcia	Louis	TX	2018	2021			P/FA		
Garcia	Adrian	TX	2015	2015					

Last Name	Frst Name	State	Convicted	Exonerated	DNA	False Confession	Perjury/False Accusation	Official Misconduct	IAC
Garibay	Alejandro	TX	2017	2017					
Gariepy	Ronnie Mark	TX	1992	2000		FC	P/FA		
Garrett	Paul Shane	TN	2003	2021	DNA	FC	P/FA	OM	IAC
Garza	Fernando	TX	2013	2020					
Garza	Paul	TX	2009	2018					
Garza	Michael	TX	2014	2014					
Gaston	Jeffrey	TX	2006	2015					
Gates	Dwight	TX	2016	2016					
Gatling	Paul	NY	1964	2016				OM	
Gauthier	Victoria	TX	2013	2015					
Gavin	Willie	WI	1997	2014			P/FA		
Gay	Donald	TX	2019	2021					IAC
Gayles	Anthony	IL	2004	2022			P/FA	OM	
Geri	Haim	F-DC	2011	2012					
Gibbs	Marcus	IL	2007	2017			P/FA	OM	
Gibson	Paul	NJ	2007	2010			P/FA	OM	
Giles	Marc	IL	2003	2021			P/FA	OM	
Gipson	Leonard	IL	2007	2017			P/FA	OM	
Glenn	Clarissa	IL	2006	2016			P/FA	OM	
Glover	Cleon	IL	2006	2018			P/FA	OM	
Gomez	Alfredo	CA	1997	2000		FC	P/FA	OM	
Gonzales-Bar	Juan Carlos	KY	1996	2017	DNA				IAC
Gonzalez	Daniel	CA	2006	2007			P/FA	OM	
Gonzalez	Kathleen	NE	1989	2009	DNA		P/FA	OM	IAC
Goods	Thadeius	IL	2004	2020					
Goodwin	Darnell	IL	2005	2022			P/FA	OM	
Googe	Michael	GA	2008	2015	DNA		P/FA		
Goree	Erica	IL	2006	2022			P/FA	OM	
Graham	William	NJ	2008	2010			P/FA	OM	
Gray	Anthony	MD	1991	1999	DNA	FC	P/FA	OM	IAC
Green	Cassidy	IL	2005	2022					
Green	James	TN	2006	2008			P/FA		
Gregg	Cody	OK	2019	2019					IAC
Gregory	Wassillie	AK	2014	2015			P/FA	OM	
Gresham	Lakiya	IL	2005	2022			P/FA	OM	
Griffith	Jesse	TX	2003	2017			P/FA		
Grimes	Kiko	NV	2013	2017					
Grotton	April	TX	2013	2017					
Guardado	Manuel	CA	1997	2000			P/FA	OM	
Guevara	Cecilia	TX	2014	2015					
Guzman	Stephanie	TX	2015	2015					
Hadaway	Sammy	WI	1996	2018	DNA	FC	P/FA	OM	
Hadley	Clint	TX	2014	2016					
Hall	Darryl	IL	2006	2022			P/FA	OM	
Hall, Jr.	Willie	TX	2000	2003			P/FA	OM	
Hampton	Perry	IL	2006	2019					
Handy-Buford	Willam	TX	2016	2016					
Hansen	Lisa	MI	2006	2006					
Harbin	Phillip	TX	2001	2009					IAC
Harding	Kevin	TX	2009	2017				OM	

Last Name	Frst Name	State	Convicted	Exonerated	DNA	False Confession	Perjury/False Accusation	Official Misconduct	IAC
Harris	Clinton	CA	1996	2000		FC	P/FA	OM	
Harris	Darnell	IL	2008	2021			P/FA	OM	
Harris	Eveless	IL	2007	2021			P/FA	OM	
Harris	Maurice	IL	2006	2021			P/FA	OM	
Harris	Rodney	IL	2002	2013		FC		OM	IAC
Harrison	Stefon	IL	2007	2020			P/FA	OM	
Hart	Anthony	MI	2013	2015					IAC
Hart	Anthony	MI	2014	2015					IAC
Harvey	Sydney	IL	2007	2019			P/FA	OM	
Hayes	Reginald	NV	1985	1999			P/FA		IAC
Hayes	Marlin	OR	2010	2016					
Haynes	Gregory	IL	2007	2022			P/FA	OM	
Haywood	Antonio	IL	2005	2022			P/FA	OM	
Head	Charles	CA	2006	2021					IAC
Hebrard	Alexander	TX	2011	2013					IAC
Heineman	Alex	WI	2017	2019			P/FA		
Heistand	Donald	MI	1989	2002			P/FA	OM	
Henderson	Rickey	IL	2006	2018			P/FA	OM	
Henderson	Robert	NJ	2009	2010			P/FA	OM	
Henderson	Robert	NJ	2007	2009			P/FA	OM	
Henderson, Jr	Cleveland	TX	2000	2003			P/FA	OM	
Hendricks	Sonny	IL	2008	2022			P/FA	OM	
Henly	Brock	OH	2003	2007					IAC
Henry	Mandrell	TX	2000	2003			P/FA	OM	
Henton	Eugene	TX	1984	2006	DNA				
Hernandez	Julian	CA	1998	2000			P/FA	OM	
Hernandez	Miguel	CA	1996	1999			P/FA	OM	
Hernandez	Carlos	TX	2015	2016					
Herrera	Bobby Paiste	CA	1998	2000			P/FA		IAC
Herrera	Eric	TX	2011	2012					
Herron	Tyrone	IL	2007	2021			P/FA	OM	
Hicks	Kenneth	IL	2007	2018			P/FA	OM	
Hicks	Ray	TX	2013	2022		FC	P/FA	OM	
Hines	Jasmyn	TX	2014	2016					
Hinton	Larry	IL	2009	2022			P/FA	OM	
Hinton	Roy	IL	2009	2022			P/FA	OM	
Hobson	Forrest	TX	2019	2021					
Hodges	Devron	TX	2013	2015			P/FA	OM	
Hogans	Terrance	IL	2004	2022			P/FA	OM	
Holloway	Ralph	IL	2012	2021					
Holmes	Dwayne	IL	2007	2022			P/FA	OM	
Holmes	David	IL	2007	2020			P/FA	OM	
Holmes	Phillip	TX	2014	2015					
Holmes III	Charles	CA	2005	2014					IAC
Hooper	John	NY	2013	2015			P/FA	OM	
Horton	Alice	TX	2012	2013					
Hostetler	Daniel	KY	2013	2019		FC		OM	IAC
Howard	Charles	IL	2010	2021					
Howard	Darnell	IL	2007	2021			P/FA	OM	
Hungerford	Jordan	TX	2014	2014					

Last Name	Frst Name	State	Convicted	Exonerated	DNA	False Confession	Perjury/False Accusation	Official Misconduct	IAC
Hunt	Brian	IL	2008	2018			P/FA	OM	
Hurley	Jerry	CA	2017	2017			P/FA		
Hymon	Demetrius	IL	2012	2020					
Irizarry	Julio	NY	2017	2018			P/FA	OM	
Irving	Turrell	NY	2018	2019			P/FA	OM	
Isbell	Teddy	NC	2003	2015	DNA	FC	P/FA	OM	IAC
Islas, Jr.	Francisco	AZ	2013	2013			P/FA	OM	
Ivory	Torrence	IL	2006	2022			P/FA	OM	
Jackson	Martina	CT	2018	2019		FC	P/FA		
Jackson	Joseph	F-NJ	2009	2010			P/FA	OM	
Jackson	Enoch	IL	2008	2021					
Jackson	Commodore	IL	2007	2020					
Jackson	Allen	IL	2006	2017			P/FA	OM	
Jackson	Sammy	MN	2014	2015					
Jackson	Dwayne	NV	2003	2011	DNA				
Jacobs	Wandra	TX	2009	2016					
Jacobs, Jr.	Ralph A.	IN	1991	1993		FC	P/FA	OM	
Jacobson	Nathan	F-CA	2008	2014					
James	Shaun	IL	2009	2020			P/FA	OM	
James	Shaun	IL	2004	2017			P/FA	OM	
Jean-Gilles	Peter	FL	2012	2019		FC	P/FA	OM	
Jeffers	John	IN	1977	2003		FC			
Jefferson	Goleather	IL	2006	2018			P/FA	OM	
Jefferson	Thomas	IL	2005	2017			P/FA	OM	
Jenkins	Jerry Lee	MD	1987	2013	DNA				
Jernigan	James	IL	2004	2021					
Johnson	Bobby	CT	2007	2015		FC	P/FA	OM	IAC
Johnson	Timothy	GA	1984	2013			P/FA		IAC
Johnson	Donald	IL	2005	2022			P/FA	OM	
Johnson	Sherman	IL	2004	2022			P/FA	OM	
Johnson	Trinere	IL	2008	2021			P/FA	OM	
Johnson	Donovan	IL	2012	2020					
Johnson	Zarice	IL	2008	2019			P/FA	OM	
Johnson	Michael	NV	2011	2017					
Johnson	Edward	OK	2009	2011			P/FA	OM	
Johnson	Eddie	TX	2010	2016					
Johnson	Johnathan	TX	2011	2016					
Johnson	Antrone	TX	1996	2009			P/FA	OM	
Johnson III	Robert	TX	2015	2017					
Jones	Joseph	CA	1998	1999			P/FA	OM	
Jones	DeShawn	CO	2011	2015			P/FA		IAC
Jones	Kenrod	IL	2003	2020					
Jones	Melvin	IL	1999	2020					
Jones	Walter	TX	2008	2018					
Jones	Demontre	TX	2016	2016					
Jones	Jesse	TX	2009	2016					
Jones	Michael	TX	2009	2015					
Jones III	Charles	MO	2016	2018			P/FA		
Jordan	DeJuan	TX	2015	2019					IAC
Jordan	DeJuan	TX	2016	2019					IAC

Last Name	Frst Name	State	Convicted	Exonerated	DNA	False Confession	Perjury/False Accusation	Official Misconduct	IAC
Jordan	Queen Esther	TX	2008	2009					
Jordan	Queen Esther	TX	2009	2009					
Kagonvera	Kenneth	NC	2001	2011	DNA	FC	P/FA	OM	IAC
Kaunda	Annie	TX	2004	2020					IAC
Kaver	Brian	IL	2011	2015					
Kelly	Denise	TX	2000	2003			P/FA	OM	
Kelly	Eliga	TX	2000	2003			P/FA	OM	
Kelly, Jr.	William M.	PA	1990	1993	DNA	FC			
Keuylvian	Viken	F-CA	2009	2014			P/FA		
Key	George	IL	2004	2022			P/FA	OM	
King	Susan	KY	2008	2014			P/FA	OM	
Klein	Calvin	TX	1999	2003			P/FA	OM	
Kolhoff	Paul	TX	2017	2020					IAC
Kruppa	Cathy	TX	2006	2016					
LaBolt, Jr.	William	NY	1990	1994			P/FA	OM	
LaFell	Damien	TX	2009	2020					
Landin	Juan	TX	2015	2016					
Lape	Michael Bruce	TX	2012	2013					
Lara	Jose	CA	1997	2000		FC	P/FA	OM	
Lazzell	David	LA	1991	2007			P/FA		
Lea	Joe	CA	2000	2009			P/FA		
Leaks	Marie	IL	2007	2022			P/FA	OM	
Leap	Earnest	MO	1992	2016			P/FA		
Leblanc	David	TX	2014	2014					
Lehmer	Joel	IA	1997	1998					
Lerma	Roumaldo	TX	2014	2015					
Lester	Colton	TX	2014	2020					IAC
Lewis	Earl	IL	2005	2022			P/FA	OM	
Lewis	Sherman	IL	2005	2022			P/FA	OM	
Lewis	Darren	TX	2014	2017			P/FA		
Linan-Juarez	Rexina	TX	2018	2020			P/FA		
Lindsey	Robert	IL	2010	2019			P/FA	OM	
Lipscomb	Russ	IL	2005	2022			P/FA	OM	
Livingston	Joseph	MN	2016	2021					
Lobos	Allan	CA	1996	2000			P/FA	OM	
Lockett	Jesse	IL	2005	2019			P/FA	OM	
Logan	Curtis	NC	2020	2020			P/FA	OM	
Lomax	Larry	IL	2003	2018			P/FA	OM	
Long	James	TX	1994	2019	DNA	FC	P/FA	OM	
Lopez	Steven	NY	1991	2022	DNA	FC	P/FA	OM	
Lopez-Siguen	Carlos	NJ	2004	2012			P/FA		IAC
Love	Corey Anthony	TX	2006	2015					
Loyd	Courtney	TX	2014	2015					
Lozano	Jesus	CA	1997	2000			P/FA	OM	
Lozoya Jr.	Clarence	MN	2017	2019					
Luckovich	Derek	OR	2010	2016					
Lundy	Kevin	IL	2003	2020					
Lunsford	Kacie	TX	2014	2014					
Lynn	Devin	TX	2019	2020					IAC
Mable	Kendrick	TX	2014	2014					

Last Name	Frst Name	State	Convicted	Exonerated	DNA	False Confession	Perjury/False Accusation	Official Misconduct	IAC
Mack	Norman	TX	2005	2006					
Mackley	David	TX	2017	2020					IAC
Madison	Lonnell	IL	2003	2022			P/FA	OM	
Madrid	Jose	CA	1997	2000			P/FA	OM	
Mai	Hien Juan	TX	2012	2014					
Mallet	Steven	TX	2009	2021			P/FA	OM	
Mannava	Venkata	F-MD	2014	2017				OM	
Mansfield	Troy	TX	1993	2016		FC	P/FA	OM	
Maples	David	MI	1995	2006					IAC
Mapp	Derrick	IL	2006	2020			P/FA	OM	
Marshall	Michael	GA	2008	2009	DNA				
Marshall	Ronnie	TN	1990	1996			P/FA	OM	
Marshall	Joseph	TX	2000	2003			P/FA	OM	
Martel	Clayton	TX	2013	2015					
Martin	Kevin	DC	1984	2014	DNA		P/FA	OM	IAC
Martin	Darnell	IL	2004	2022			P/FA	OM	
Martin	Willie	IL	2007	2018			P/FA	OM	
Martin	Rashon	NY	2013	2019			P/FA	OM	
Martin	Mario	TX	2008	2010					
Mata	Laura	TX	1999	2003			P/FA	OM	
Matamoros	Carlos	TX	2015	2016					
Matthews	Brent	F-MD	2011	2017			P/FA	OM	
Matthews	Ernest	NC	1993	2016			P/FA	OM	
Mayberry	David	IL	2006	2020			P/FA	OM	
Mayfield	Barry	TX	2009	2016					
Mays	Anthony	IL	2003	2022			P/FA	OM	
Mays	Anthony	IL	2004	2022			P/FA	OM	
Mays	Anthony	IL	2006	2020			P/FA	OM	
Mazur	Andre	OR	2012	2016					
McAllister	Norman	VT	2017	2019			P/FA		
McAnally	Tamara	CA	2004	2011					
McCallum	Ronald	WI	1993	1997			P/FA		
McCann II	Raymond	MI	2015	2017			P/FA	OM	IAC
McCardle	Da Vontae	TX	2015	2016					
McCoy	Troshawn	IL	1998	2017		FC	P/FA	OM	
McCray	Vincent	TX	2000	2003			P/FA	OM	
McDermott	Christopher	MD	1999	2000			P/FA		
McDonald	Octayvia	IL	2005	2018			P/FA	OM	
McDonald	Leon	TX	2007	2016					
McGee	Samuel	IL	2011	2021					
McGee	Marvin	TX	2014	2015					
McGhee	Curtis	IA	1978	2011			P/FA	OM	IAC
McInnis	Edward	NC	1988	2015	DNA	FC	P/FA		IAC
McKelvey	Michael	TX	2009	2016					
Mena	Enrique	CA	1997	2000		FC	P/FA	OM	
Mendez	Alexandra	TX	2014	2014					
Menendez	Ceaser	CA	1996	2001			P/FA	OM	
Middlebrooks	Chad	TX	2016	2016					
Mills	Damian	NC	2001	2015	DNA	FC	P/FA	OM	IAC
Mines	Calvin	IL	2001	2021					

Last Name	Frst Name	State	Convicted	Exonerated	DNA	False Confession	Perjury/ False Accusation	Official Misconduct	IAC
Miranda	Adam	CA	1983	2009			P/FA	OM	
Mitchel	Albert	NY	2007	2008			P/FA	OM	
Monroe	Harold	TX	2014	2017					
Monroe	Taylor	TX	2015	2015					
Montes	Roy	CA	1996	1999			P/FA	OM	
Mooney	Ideary	IL	2010	2021					
Moore	Elgen	IL	2005	2022			P/FA	OM	
Moore	James	IL	2006	2018			P/FA	OM	
Moore	Kenneth	OH	1995	2004				OM	
Moore	Kenneth	TX	2014	2015					
Morales	Melissa	FL	2018	2019			P/FA	OM	
Morales	Marcos	TX	2016	2018					IAC
Moreno	Noe	NC	2007	2012					IAC
Moreno, Jr.	Tony	CA	2014	2016			P/FA		
Morris	Speciale	CT	2018	2019		FC	P/FA		
Morris	Jermaine	IL	2004	2022			P/FA	OM	
Morris	Jermaine	IL	2006	2021			P/FA	OM	
Morris	Jermaine	IL	2005	2020			P/FA	OM	
Moye	Terrence	IL	2008	2020			P/FA	OM	
Mulero	Marilyn	IL	1993	2022		FC	P/FA	OM	IAC
Muniz	Jose	NY	2015	2017			P/FA	OM	
Munoz	Raul	CA	1996	2000			P/FA	OM	
Nash	Thomas	IL	2004	2022			P/FA	OM	
Nathan	Nicole	IL	2003	2021					
Natividad	Cesar	CA	1996	2000			P/FA	OM	
Nevels	Terrance	IL	2006	2021					
Newell	Lolita	IL	2005	2022			P/FA	OM	
Newman	Lloyd	IL	2007	2021			P/FA	OM	
Nguyen	Chuong	CA	2013	2016			P/FA	OM	
Nguyen	Anthony	TX	2013	2014					
Nile	JaJuan	IL	2008	2020			P/FA	OM	
Nobles	Glen	TX	2013	2015					IAC
Noel	Michael	TX	2014	2014					
Norwood	Matthew	MS	1997	2010					
Nowak	Kevin	TX	2014	2014					
O'Dell	Karen	FL	1998	2000			P/FA	OM	
O'Hearn	Patrick	CA	2018	2021					IAC
O'Neal	Jauan	IL	2007	2018					
Ochoa	James	CA	2005	2006	DNA			OM	
Ochoa	Oscar	CA	1997	2000		FC	P/FA	OM	
Ochoa	Christopher	TX	1989	2002	DNA	FC		OM	
Odom	Teresa	FL	2018	2018			P/FA	OM	
Ogiemwonyi	Zerrick	TX	2014	2015					
Oliva	John	NY	2014	2021			P/FA	OM	
Olivarez	Daniel	TX	2000	2003			P/FA	OM	
Oliver	Ivan	CA	1996	2000			P/FA	OM	
Ollie	George	IL	2004	2018			P/FA	OM	
Ordonez	Felipe	CA	1997	2000			P/FA	OM	
Ortiz	Luis	IL	2000	2003		FC	P/FA	OM	
Ortiz	Josue	NY	2006	2015	DNA	FC		OM	

Last Name	Frst Name	State	Convicted	Exonerated	DNA	False Confession	Perjury/ False Accusation	Official Misconduct	IAC
Owens	Keith	IL	2007	2022			P/FA	OM	
Owens	Ron	IL	2004	2022			P/FA	OM	
Ozzborn	Thomas	NY	2016	2017			P/FA	OM	
Padilla	Fidel	NY	2012	2014				OM	IAC
Pallares	Jose	CA	2005	2008	DNA				
Palmer	John	TX	1985	2020			P/FA		
Parks	Ishameal	IL	2012	2020					
Patel	Jigar	F-MD	2014	2017				OM	
Patel	Vipinkumar	F-MD	2014	2017				OM	
Patrick	Bryant	IL	2005	2021			P/FA	OM	
Patrick	Bryant	IL	2007	2020			P/FA	OM	
Patterson, Jr.	Ronnie	MN	2008	2012					IAC
Payne	Cordero	IL	2006	2019			P/FA	OM	
Pearson	Mister Lucky	IL	2008	2018			P/FA	OM	
Peel	John	FL	2000	2002				OM	
Perez	Jose	CA	2012	2019					
Perez	Duarnis	F-NY	2000	2006				OM	
Perez	Vanessa	TX	2015	2016					
Peters	Gerald	CA	1996	2000			P/FA	OM	
Peters	Harold	TX	2014	2014					
Peterson	Nicholas	MN	2012	2021					
Peterson	Kevin	UT	1990	2012			P/FA	OM	
Pettiford	Antoine	MD	1995	2000			P/FA	OM	
Petty	Jerome	TX	2009	2016					
Pham	Thomas	TX	2015	2015					
Phillips	Michael	TX	1990	2014	DNA				IAC
Pierce	Milyn	TX	2014	2015					
Pihota	Tina	TX	2009	2016			P/FA	OM	IAC
Pines	Frank	TX	2006	2016					
Pitman	Perman	NJ	2007	2010			P/FA	OM	
Pitre	Derick	TX	2014	2014					
Pitts, Jr.	James	TX	1994	2019	DNA	FC	P/FA	OM	
Polk	Eric	TX	2014	2015					
Pope	Graylan	TX	2014	2018					IAC
Potts	Hasaan	IL	2003	2020			P/FA	OM	
Poulos	Michelle	CA	2001	2017			P/FA		
Powell	Bruce	IL	2009	2017			P/FA	OM	
Powell	Kenneth	TX	2000	2003			P/FA	OM	
Prentice	Mark	NY	1989	1995			P/FA	OM	
Prince	Christopher E.	VA	1994	1995			P/FA	OM	
Quiambao-Ho	Camaran	IL	2009	2013			P/FA	OM	
Quintero	Juan	TX	2013	2019			P/FA		IAC
Rainbolt	Thomas	TX	2014	2014					
Raney	Lee	IL	2003	2017			P/FA	OM	
Randolph	James	IL	2004	2022			P/FA	OM	
Randolph	Guy	MA	1991	2008					IAC
Ranes	Thomas	OK	2010	2011			P/FA	OM	
Recendez-Lop	Edgar	TX	2010	2014					
Reno	Ronald	CA	1997	2002					
Reves	George	TX	2013	2015					

Last Name	Frst Name	State	Convicted	Exonerated	DNA	False Confession	Perjury/False Accusation	Official Misconduct	IAC
Rhoades	Nick	IA	2009	2014					IAC
Richardson	Henry	IL	2008	2020					
Ricks	Amber	TX	2016	2016					
Rivera	Simon Angel	TX	2002	2005					IAC
Roberson	Richard	TX	2015	2016					
Roberts	Clifford	IL	2003	2021			P/FA	OM	
Roberts	Rodney	NJ	1996	2014	DNA				
Roberts	Lisa	OR	2004	2014	DNA			OM	IAC
Roberts	Amber	TX	2014	2015					
Robertson	Shakara	TX	1996	2012					
Robinson	Derrick	FL	1989	1991			P/FA		
Robinson	Willie	IL	2005	2021			P/FA	OM	
Robinson	Calvin	IL	2007	2020			P/FA	OM	
Robinson	Robert	NV	2011	2017					
Robinson	Tobaris	TX	2011	2012					
Robinson	Benny	TX	2000	2003			P/FA	OM	
Robinson	Davonn	WI	2006	2010		FC	P/FA		
Rocquemore	Sharron	IL	2017	2021			P/FA	OM	
Rodgers	Esau	TX	2008	2016					
Rodrigues	Stuart	TX	2012	2018					IAC
Rodriguez	Juan	IL	2005	2019			P/FA	OM	
Rodriguez	Danielle	TX	2015	2018					IAC
Rogers	Mandel	TX	1999	2014	DNA				
Rojas	Ruben	CA	1997	1999			P/FA	OM	
Rojas	Carlos	F-AL	1990	2002			P/FA		
Rojo	Christopher	TX	2013	2016					
Romero	Carlos E.	CA	1995	2000			P/FA	OM	
Romero	Carlos	CA	1997	1999			P/FA	OM	
Rounds	Gregory	IL	2003	2021					
Sahagun	Blanca	CA	1997	2000			P/FA	OM	
Salley	Dontaneous	IL	2008	2020					
Samueli	Henry	F-CA	2008	2009				OM	
Sanches	Shimira	TX	2012	2016				OM	
Sanchez	Yareli	TX	2011	2015					IAC
Sanders	Jamell	IL	2006	2017			P/FA	OM	
Sanders	Trina	TX	2014	2015					
Sanders	Derrick	WI	1993	2018			P/FA		IAC
Sanford	Davontae	MI	2008	2016		FC	P/FA	OM	IAC
Santos	Edar Duarte	IL	2002	2003		FC	P/FA	OM	
Saunders	Leonard	IL	2004	2022			P/FA	OM	
Saunders	Frank	IL	2007	2017			P/FA	OM	
Scales	Richard	IL	2005	2022			P/FA	OM	
Schoppe	Carl	CA	2015	2016			P/FA	OM	
Scott	Christopher	IL	2006	2017			P/FA	OM	
Scott	Rachel	TX	2017	2020			P/FA	OM	
Serrano	Jason	NY	2018	2021			P/FA	OM	
Settle	Daniel Roy	TX	1999	2011			P/FA	OM	
Shaffers	Ramone	IL	2002	2020					
Shannon	Rasaan	IL	2005	2022			P/FA	OM	
Sharp	Shainne	IL	1994	2011	DNA	FC	P/FA	OM	

Last Name	Frst Name	State	Convicted	Exonerated	DNA	False Confession	Perjury/False Accusation	Official Misconduct	IAC
Shaw	Willie	NC	2016	2021					IAC
Shelden	Debra	NE	1989	2009	DNA	FC	P/FA		IAC
Shelton	Stephen	IL	2007	2022			P/FA	OM	
Shelton	Michael	TX	1994	2019	DNA	FC	P/FA	OM	
Shelton	Finaye	TX	2000	2003			P/FA	OM	
Shenault, Jr.	Angelo	IL	2006	2018			P/FA	OM	
Shenault, Jr.	Angelo	IL	2008	2018			P/FA	OM	
Shenault, Sr.	Angelo	IL	2004	2018			P/FA	OM	
Shiflett, Jr.	Guy	TX	2014	2020					IAC
Shiflett, Jr.	Guy	TX	2016	2018					IAC
Shomo	Aubrey Ellen	CO	2001	2016			P/FA		
Shull	George Edward	CA	1989	2009					
Silva, Sr.	Juan	WI	2014	2015		FC			
Simmons	Mariah	TX	2016	2016					
Simon	Alstory	IL	1999	2014		FC	P/FA		
Sims	Oliver	IL	2004	2022			P/FA	OM	
Sims	Germin	IL	2010	2019			P/FA	OM	
Skinner	Gregory	TX	2012	2018					IAC
Smith	Tyree	IL	2007	2022			P/FA	OM	
Smith	Zachery	IL	2009	2021					
Smith	Taurus	IL	2004	2017			P/FA	OM	
Smith	Christopher C.	IN	1991	1993		FC	P/FA	OM	
Smith	Byron	TX	2009	2016					
Smith	Duran	TX	2014	2016					
Smith	G'Cobra	TX	2014	2016					
Smith	Marcus Lashur	TX	1995	2012					
Smith	Yolanda	TX	2000	2003			P/FA	OM	
Sosnovske	John	OR	1991	1995			P/FA		
Spencer	Clyde Ray	WA	1985	2010			P/FA	OM	
Spiller	Jonathan	F-DC	2011	2012					
Steese	Fred	NV	1995	2017		FC	P/FA	OM	
Stevenson	Christopher	TX	2019	2021			P/FA	OM	IAC
Stevenson	Macen	TX	2014	2014					
Stewart	Ronald	FL	1985	2019	DNA		P/FA		
Stiers	Donald	TX	2014	2015					
Stingley	Warren	CA	2013	2016			P/FA	OM	
Stokes	Alhummza	IL	2006	2020			P/FA	OM	
Stokes	Jabal	IL	2006	2019			P/FA	OM	
Straughter	Lemuel	IL	2001	2020					
Streeter	Jamal	IL	2011	2020					
Strickland	Romona	TX	2000	2003			P/FA	OM	
Sturgeon	Michael	WI	1997	2000		FC	P/FA	OM	
Suarez	Juan	CA	1997	2000			P/FA	OM	
Sweat	Danny	TX	2009	2015					
Swift	Rubin	PA	2009	2012			P/FA		
Talbert	Carlton	TX	2009	2015					
Tapia	Daniel	CA	1998	2000		FC	P/FA	OM	
Tate	John	IL	2000	2020					
Tate, Jr.	Marcus	TX	2006	2015					
Tatum	Adam	TN	2012	2013			P/FA	OM	

Last Name	Frst Name	State	Convicted	Exonerated	DNA	False Confession	Perjury/False Accusation	Official Misconduct	IAC
Taylor	Ruth	CA	1985	2001			P/FA	OM	IAC
Taylor	Ada JoAnn	NE	1989	2009	DNA	FC	P/FA	OM	IAC
Tedtaotao	Jathan	GU	2014	2015		FC			
Terrell	Aaron	IL	2003	2021					
Thames	Vincent	IL	1998	2012	DNA	FC	P/FA	OM	
Thomas	Walter	IL	2004	2022			P/FA	OM	
Thomas	Henry	IL	2007	2019			P/FA	OM	
Thomas	Nephus	IL	2008	2018			P/FA	OM	
Thomas	Henry	IL	2003	2017			P/FA	OM	
Thomas	Johnathon	TX	2009	2016					
Thomas	Cameron	TX	2014	2014					
Thompson	Joseph	IL	2003	2022			P/FA	OM	
Thompson	Lapon	IL	2007	2018			P/FA	OM	
Thurman	Joe	TX	2014	2014					
Tiller	Chad	TX	2016	2016					
Timofeyev	Mikhail	TX	2010	2021			P/FA		
Tinney	Glenn	OH	1992	2015		FC		OM	
Titus	Kent	TX	2015	2016					
Tong	Alan	TX	2012	2015					
Towery	Timothy	TX	2000	2003			P/FA	OM	
Town	Meredith	WA	1994	2000		FC	P/FA	OM	
Townsend	Anthony	IL	1997	2020					
Trevino	Michael	TX	1993	2012					
Trujillo	Nicolas	TX	2014	2014					
Truong	Chris	TX	2016	2017					
Tuley	Wesley	TX	1997	2003			P/FA		
Tullos	Nancy	F-CA	2008	2010				OM	
Turner	Christopher	IL	2005	2022			P/FA	OM	
Turner	Lamarcus	TX	2015	2022	DNA				
Tuttle	Amber	NV	2012	2017					
Tyson	Herschel	TX	2016	2019					IAC
Tyson	Dequinncy	TX	2012	2015					
Upchurch	Amber	TX	2016	2016					
Upshaw	Fredrick	TX	2014	2015					
Uriostegui	Silvano	TX	2012	2012				OM	
Valdez	Gilbert	TX	1997	2012				OM	IAC
Vanderhorst	Zachary	CA	1974	2021				OM	IAC
Vargas-Cintr	Johnny	MA	2011	2013			P/FA		
Vasquez	Gerardo	TX	2008	2014					
Vasquez	Rogelio	TX	2014	2014					
Vasquez	David	VA	1985	1989	DNA	FC			
Veal	Robert	IL	1994	2011	DNA	FC	P/FA	OM	
Vela	Jesus	TX	2015	2016					IAC
Vinsonhaler	Gary	OR	2012	2016					
Von Krueger	Eric	TX	2013	2016					
Vriones	Rene	CA	1996	2000			P/FA	OM	
Waddy	Alvin	IL	2007	2019			P/FA	OM	
Wahlgren	Ryun	TX	2015	2017					IAC
Wahlgren	Ryun	TX	2015	2017					IAC
Walker	Bruce	IL	2004	2022			P/FA	OM	

Last Name	Frst Name	State	Convicted	Exonerated	DNA	False Confession	Perjury/False Accusation	Official Misconduct	IAC
Walker	David	IL	2007	2022			P/FA	OM	
Walker	Derek	IL	2004	2022			P/FA	OM	
Walker	Danny	IL	2012	2018			P/FA	OM	IAC
Walker	Russell	IL	2007	2017			P/FA	OM	
Walls	Dorian	IL	2005	2022			P/FA	OM	
Ward	Bernard	MD	1989	1994		FC		OM	IAC
Warren	Gregory	IL	2007	2018			P/FA	OM	
Warren	Dawan	IN	1998	2013			P/FA		
Washington	Jermail	IL	2009	2021					
Washington	Wayne	IL	1996	2015		FC	P/FA	OM	
Washington	Michael	WA	2005	2006	DNA	FC			
Watford III	Roy	VA	1978	2018	DNA		P/FA		
Watkins	John	AZ	2004	2010	DNA	FC		OM	
Watkins	Kimberly	IL	2007	2022			P/FA	OM	
Watts	Oneal	NY	2015	2020	DNA		P/FA		
Weakley	Eric	VA	2001	2022		FC	P/FA		
Weathers	Nathaniel	TX	2015	2016					
Weaver	David	NC	2020	2022			P/FA	OM	
Weekly	Isaac	IL	2007	2018			P/FA	OM	
Weldon	Kyle	IA	2015	2017			P/FA	OM	
Wells	Keith	TX	1998	2018					IAC
Wenger	Braden	CA	2015	2016			P/FA		
West	Mark	TX	2014	2014					
Wheeler	Michael	WA	2000	2015					IAC
Wheeler	Michael	WA	2011	2013					IAC
Whirl	Shawn	IL	1991	2015		FC	P/FA	OM	
White	Antoine	IL	2003	2022			P/FA	OM	
White, Jr.	Lionel	IL	2006	2017			P/FA	OM	
White, Sr.	Lionel	IL	2006	2016			P/FA	OM	
Whitehead	Ronnie	TX	2004	2014					
Wilbourn	Kim	IL	2006	2019			P/FA	OM	
Wilbourn	Vondell	IL	2005	2018			P/FA	OM	
Wilcoxson	Robert	NC	2002	2011	DNA		P/FA	OM	IAC
Wilkerson	Mike	MO	2000	2017	DNA	FC		OM	IAC
Wilkins	Theodore	IL	2008	2022			P/FA	OM	
Wilkins	Geary	TX	2013	2014					
Williams	John	IL	2007	2022			P/FA	OM	
Williams	Leroy	IL	2008	2022			P/FA	OM	
Williams	Claudious	IL	2006	2021					
Williams	Vashaun	IL	2004	2020					
Williams	Hayes	LA	1968	1997			P/FA	OM	
Williams	Arthur	TX	2005	2016					
Williams	Alberta	TX	2000	2003			P/FA	OM	
Williams	Michelle	TX	2000	2003			P/FA	OM	
Williams	Danial	VA	1999	2016		FC	P/FA	OM	
Williams, Jr.	Larry	NC	2002	2015	DNA	FC	P/FA	OM	IAC
Willis	Dexter	IL	2004	2022			P/FA	OM	
Willis	Deon	IL	2008	2018			P/FA	OM	IAC
Wilson	Johnny Lee	MO	1987	1995		FC	P/FA	OM	
Winslow	Thomas	NE	1990	2009	DNA	FC	P/FA	OM	

Last Name	Frst Name	State	Convicted	Exonerated	DNA	False Confession	Perjury/ False Accusation	Official Misconduct	IAC
Winston	J'Avarus	TX	2015	2016					
Wise	Martez	IL	2007	2018			P/FA	OM	
Woods	D'Andra	IL	2004	2022			P/FA	OM	
Worthy	Terence	NJ	2004	2005			P/FA	OM	
Wright	Anthony	IL	2007	2022			P/FA	OM	
Wright	Joseph	IL	2005	2022			P/FA	OM	
Wright	Zackary	IL	2002	2021					
Wright	Andree	IL	2005	2018					
Wright	Summer	TX	2013	2015					
Yac-Garcia	Jose	TX	2015	2015					
Young	Gregory	IL	2003	2022			P/FA	OM	
Zambrano	Rafael	CA	1997	2000			P/FA	OM	
Zarzoza	Jonathan	TX	2013	2014					

Addendum B

filing_date	disp_date	disposition	Who filed	Asked for atty?	Appointed atty?	Disposition	Dismissed-at stage	Granted-at stage
1/12/16	10/28/16	Denied	atty			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
1/14/16	6/27/18	Denied	pro se			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
2/11/16	7/31/16	Denied	atty			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
2/11/16	8/19/16	Dismissed	atty			dismissed	state's motion to dismiss	
2/18/16	8/24/16	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
2/18/16	8/30/16	Denied	pro se			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
2/18/16	8/30/16	Denied	pro se			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
2/22/16	8/30/16	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	court's motion to dismiss based on procedure	
2/26/16	10/24/16	Judgment	pro se			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
2/29/16	6/27/19	Granted	pro se			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
3/2/16	6/1/16	Dismissed	atty			dismissed	frivolity review	
3/17/16	9/13/16	Dismsd w/o prejudice	pro se	Y		dismissed	failure to pay fee	
3/22/16	5/27/16	Dismissed	pro se	Y	Y	dismissed	state's summary judgment	
3/28/16	7/7/16	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	failure to pay fee	
4/28/16	6/13/16	Granted	atty			granted		stipulated
4/28/16	10/4/17	Judgment	pro se	Y		dismissed	state's summary judgment	
4/28/16	1/17/18	Dismsd w prejudice	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	state's summary judgment	
5/3/16	8/31/16	Granted	atty			granted		stipulated
5/10/16	3/6/17	Dismsd w/o prejudice	atty			dismissed	failure to serve defendant	

5/11/16	11/10/16	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
5/17/16			pro se	Y	N	dismissed	failure to pay fee	
6/2/16			atty			still open		
7/1/16			pro se	Y	Y	still open		
7/14/16			pro se	Y		still open		
7/18/16	10/13/16	Dismissed	atty			dismissed	frivolity review	
8/8/16	10/26/16	Dismsd w/o prejudice	pro se			dismissed	frivolity review	
8/11/16	12/20/16	Dismissed	atty			withdrawn		
8/16/16	7/23/19	Denied	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	court's motion to dismiss based on procedure	
8/19/16	9/29/16	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	frivolity review	
8/24/16	9/29/16	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	frivolity review	
8/29/16	1/30/17	Dismissed	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	withdrawn	
8/31/16	12/7/16	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	state's motion to dismiss	
9/1/16	10/12/16	Denied	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	frivolity review	
9/7/16	4/27/18	Dismissed	atty			dismissed	state's motion to dismiss on the merits	
9/12/16	12/21/16	Dismsd w/o prejudice	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	failure to pay fee	
9/12/16	2/13/17	Denied	atty			dismissed	evidentiary hearing	
9/16/16	6/6/17	Dismissed	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	failure to pay fee	
9/16/16	2/5/18	Dismsd w/o prejudice	atty			dismissed	failure to serve defendant	
9/20/16	7/19/17	Dismissed	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	state's summary judgment	
10/11/16	4/6/17	Dismsd w prejudice	pro se			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
10/21/16	1/9/18	Dismsd w prejudice	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	state's summary judgment	
10/28/16	11/2/16	Dismissed	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	frivolity review	
10/28/16	1/2/18	Denied	atty			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
10/31/16	4/10/17	Granted	atty			granted		state failed to respond

10/31/16	4/27/17	Remanded	atty			granted		evidentiary hearing
11/4/16	7/7/17	Dismissed	atty			dismissed	state's motion to dismiss on procedure	
11/7/16	4/13/17	Granted	atty			granted		stipulated
11/16/16	12/11/17	Dismissed	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	withdrawn	
11/17/16	1/31/17	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	failure to pay fee	
11/22/16	12/28/17	Judgment	atty			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
12/5/16	2/10/17	Dismissed	pro se			withdrawn		
12/7/16	6/15/17	Granted	atty			granted		stipulated
12/7/16	11/17/17	Granted	atty			granted		stipulated
12/12/16	5/8/17	Granted	atty			granted		stipulated
12/21/16	8/17/17	Granted	atty			granted		stipulated
12/22/16	8/21/17	Judgment	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	state's summary judgment	
1/4/17	2/28/17	Dismissed	atty			dismissed	frivolity review	
1/4/17	5/25/17	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
2/14/17	8/21/18	Dismsd w/o prejudice	atty			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
2/16/17	8/15/17	Dismsd w/o prejudice	atty			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
2/27/17	11/29/17	Dismsd w/o prejudice	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	failure to serve defendant	
3/1/17	7/10/17	Granted	atty			granted		stipulated
3/2/17	10/4/17	Denied	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	state's summary judgment	
3/22/17	2/23/18	Dismsd w/o prejudice	atty			dismissed	withdrawn	
3/29/17			atty			stayed		
3/30/17	4/18/18	Dismissed	atty			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
4/5/17	3/23/18	Dismsd w/o prejudice	pro se			dismissed	petitioner died/missing	
4/11/17	8/1/18	Judgment	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	state's summary judgment	

4/12/17	5/17/17	Dismissed w/o prejudice	pro se			dismissed	incomplete application	
4/24/17	1/3/18	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	incomplete application	
5/4/17	9/8/17	Dismissed w/o prejudice	pro se			dismissed	failure to pay fee	
5/9/17	3/16/18	Dismissed	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	state's summary judgment	
5/12/17			atty			stayed		
5/23/17	1/29/18	Denied	atty			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
6/5/17	4/2/18	Denied	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	state's summary judgment	
6/6/17	4/2/18	Denied	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	state's summary judgment	
6/6/17	4/2/18	Denied	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	state's summary judgment	
6/15/17	4/5/18	Dismissed	pro se	Y	N	withdrawn		
6/15/17	8/14/18	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
6/20/17	7/26/17	Granted	atty			granted		state failed to respond
6/22/17	8/7/19	Denied	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	state's summary judgment	
6/22/17	12/18/19	Granted	atty			granted		evidentiary hearing
6/28/17	8/2/17	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	frivolity review	
6/30/17	3/27/19	Dismissed w prejudice	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	state's summary judgment	
7/10/17	5/16/19	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	failure to pay fee	
8/23/17	9/11/17	Granted	atty			granted		stipulated
9/5/17	9/20/18	Dismissed w prejudice	atty			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
9/7/17	10/29/18	Dismissed	atty			granted		stipulated
9/8/17	2/28/19	Granted	atty			granted		evidentiary hearing
9/14/17	11/8/17	Granted	atty			granted		stipulated

9/22/17	12/1/17	Denied	atty			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
9/25/17	1/10/18	Granted	atty			granted		stipulated
9/25/17	2/16/18	Dismissed	atty			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
10/18/17			pro se			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
10/18/17			pro se			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
10/26/17	12/14/17	Denied	pro se			dismissed	unclear	
11/1/17	1/17/18	Dismsd w/o prejudice	pro se	Y	N	withdrawn		
11/1/17	6/19/19	Dismsd w prejudice	pro se	Y	Y	dismissed	state's summary judgment	
11/2/17	4/17/18	Dismsd w prejudice	atty			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
11/3/17	11/8/18	Granted	atty			granted		stipulated
11/29/17	3/21/18	Dismissed	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	failure to pay fee	
12/1/17	2/13/20	Dismissed	atty			stayed		
12/11/17	10/18/18	Set aside/Withdrawn	atty			withdrawn		
12/14/17	4/20/21	Judgment	pro se			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
12/21/17	3/29/18	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	frivolity review	
12/22/17	8/23/18	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	failure to prosecute	
12/27/17	7/1/19	Granted	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	state's summary judgment	
1/5/18	6/18/18	Dismsd w/o prejudice	pro se			dismissed	failure to serve defendant	
1/16/18	9/4/18	Dismsd w prejudice	atty			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
1/19/18	6/11/18	Dismissed	atty			withdrawn		
1/25/18	11/2/18	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	frivolity review	
2/9/18	8/28/18	Denied	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	state's summary judgment	
2/13/18	7/26/19	Dismsd w/o prejudice	atty			dismissed	failure to prosecute	

2/16/18	5/23/18	Dismsd w/o prejudice	pro se			dismissed	court's motion to dismiss based on procedure	
2/20/18	2/15/19	Dismissed	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	state's summary judgment	
2/27/18	3/20/19	Dismissed	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	state's summary judgment	
3/1/18	4/22/20	Dismissed	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	state's summary judgment	
3/6/18	9/13/18	Dismissed	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	failure to pay fee	
3/22/18	11/29/18	Dismissed	pro se	Y	Y	dismissed	moot	
3/29/18	8/8/19	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	unclear	
4/6/18	1/23/20	Dismsd w prejudice	atty			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
4/20/18	12/11/18	Denied	pro se			dismissed	frivolity review	
4/24/18	7/9/18	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	failure to pay fee	
4/24/18	7/9/18	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	failure to pay fee	
5/1/18	6/13/18	Granted	atty			granted		stipulated
5/7/18	7/9/18	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	failure to pay fee	
5/15/18			atty			still open		
5/16/18	7/26/18	Granted	atty			granted		stipulated
5/18/18	8/8/19	Dismissed	pro se	Y	Y	dismissed	court's motion to dismiss based on procedure	
5/18/18	11/17/21	Dismsd w prejudice	atty			dismissed	stipulated	
5/22/18	1/29/19	Dismsd w prejudice	atty			dismissed	court's motion to dismiss based on procedure	
5/25/18	6/4/18	Dismissed	atty			dismissed	frivolity review	
6/18/18	6/19/18	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	frivolity review	
6/18/18	7/27/18	Dismissed	pro se	N		dismissed	failure to pay fee	
7/25/18	10/31/18	Granted	atty			granted	granted	state failed to respond
7/27/18	12/11/18	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	court's motion to dismiss based on procedure	

7/30/18	4/16/19	Dismissed	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	state's summary judgment	
8/1/18	11/5/18	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	failure to pay fee	
8/6/18			atty			still open		
8/10/18	11/8/19	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	frivolity review	
8/10/18	11/8/19	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	frivolity review	
8/15/18	10/24/18	Dismissed	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	frivolity review	
8/22/18	11/4/21	Dismissed	atty			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
8/29/18	2/4/20	Dismissed w prejudice	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	state's summary judgment	
9/7/18	4/30/21	Dismissed w prejudice	pro se			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
9/13/18	11/21/18	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	frivolity review	
9/28/18	6/17/19	Dismissed	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	frivolity review	
10/4/18			pro se	Y	N	dismissed	frivolity review	
10/12/18	1/28/19	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	failure to pay fee	
11/2/18	11/13/18	Dismissed	atty			granted		stipulated
11/9/18	2/26/19	Dismissed	pro se	Y	Y	dismissed	moot	
11/21/18	3/11/19	Dismissed w/o prejudice	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	failure to pay fee	
12/5/18	6/6/19	Dismissed w/o prejudice	pro se			dismissed	failure to serve defendant	
1/4/19	8/26/19	Dismissed w/o prejudice	atty			dismissed	failure to serve defendant	
1/25/19	5/28/19	Dismissed	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	frivolity review	
1/28/19	2/26/19	Dismissed	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	frivolity review	
1/28/19	4/10/19	Granted	atty			granted		stipulated
1/29/19	3/18/19	Dismissed	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	failure to pay fee	
2/1/19	1/7/20	Denied	atty			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
2/4/19	6/3/20	Dismissed w/o prejudice	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	frivolity review	
2/12/19	2/14/19	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	frivolity review	
3/1/19	10/4/19	Dismissed w prejudice	pro se	Y	Y	dismissed	state's summary judgment	
3/1/19			atty			still open		

3/18/19	7/18/19	Dismissed	atty			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
3/20/19	6/26/19	Dismsd w/o prejudice	pro se			dismissed	petitioner died/missing	
3/20/19	7/12/19	Dismissed	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	failure to pay fee	
3/20/19	8/12/19	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	frivolity review	
3/24/19			atty			still open		
3/25/19			pro se	Y	Y	still open		
3/27/19	10/3/19	Dismsd w/o prejudice	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	failure to pay fee	
4/4/19	11/21/19	Dismsd w prejudice	pro se			dismissed	court's motion to dismiss based on procedure	
4/4/19	3/11/20	Dismsd w/o prejudice	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	court's motion to dismiss based on procedure	
4/5/19	4/12/19	Dismissed	atty			withdrawn	filed in wrong court	
4/5/19	12/31/19	Judgment	atty			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
4/12/19	5/20/19	Granted	atty			granted		stipulated
4/17/19	5/1/19	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	frivolity review	
4/26/19	4/26/19	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	frivolity review	
4/26/19	4/30/19	Denied	atty			dismissed	petitioner's motion to dismiss on procedure	
5/1/19	2/8/21	Dismsd w prejudice	atty			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
5/6/19	5/6/19	Dismissed	pro se	N		dismissed	incomplete application	
5/10/19	6/2/20	Denied	pro se	N		dismissed	state's summary judgment	
5/16/19			pro se	Y	N	still open		
5/21/19	9/9/19	Dismsd w/o prejudice	pro se			dismissed	failure to pay fee	
5/23/19	6/4/20	Dismsd w/o prejudice	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	failure to pay fee	
5/24/19	12/10/19	Dismissed	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	state's summary judgment	
5/24/19			pro se	Y	Y	stayed		

5/30/19	6/28/19	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
6/11/19	10/21/20	Denied	pro se	Y	Y	dismissed	evidentiary hearing	
6/19/19			atty			stayed		
7/1/19	8/9/19	Dismissed	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	frivolity review	
7/2/19	8/11/20	Dismissed	atty			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
7/8/19	2/4/21	Denied	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	state's summary judgment	
7/10/19	3/5/20	Denied	atty			dismissed	petitioner's motion to dismiss on procedure	
7/11/19	9/4/19	Dismissed	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	failure to pay fee	
7/15/19	4/27/21	Dismsd w prejudice	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	court's motion to dismiss based on procedure	
7/16/19	8/14/19	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	court's motion to dismiss based on procedure	
7/18/19	7/22/19	Dismissed	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	frivolity review	
7/23/19			pro se	Y	N	dismissed	state's summary judgment	
8/7/19	12/5/19	Granted	atty			granted		not clear
8/12/19	8/24/20	Granted	pro se			granted		stipulated
8/15/19			pro se	Y	Y	still open		
8/20/19			pro se	Y	N	dismissed	frivolity review	
8/26/19	7/31/20	Dismsd w prejudice	pro se			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
8/26/19	8/11/21	Dismsd w/o prejudice	atty			granted		stipulated
9/13/19	8/26/20	Dismsd w prejudice	pro se			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
9/13/19			pro se	Y	N	dismissed	failure to prosecute	
9/19/19	1/21/20	Dismissed	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	failure to pay fee	
9/27/19	1/12/21	Dismsd w prejudice	atty			dismissed	state's summary judgment	

10/8/19	6/25/20	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
10/15/19	1/13/20	Dismissed w/o prejudice	pro se			dismissed	incomplete application	
10/15/19	5/20/20	Dismissed	atty			dismissed	court's motion to dismiss based on procedure	
10/22/19	3/11/20	Dismissed	atty			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
10/30/19			pro se	Y	N	dismissed	frivolity review	
10/30/19			pro se	N		dismissed	filed in wrong court	
11/1/19			pro se	Y	Y	still open		
11/5/19	7/27/20	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	petitioner died/missing	
11/6/19	12/11/19	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	frivolity review	
11/7/19	11/18/19	Granted	atty			granted		stipulated
11/14/19	12/4/20	Dismissed w prejudice	atty			granted		stipulated
11/18/19	3/20/20	Dismissed w/o prejudice	pro se			dismissed	incomplete application	
11/25/19	1/22/20	Denied	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	state's summary judgment	
11/25/19	7/9/20	Dismissed w prejudice	pro se			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
12/2/19			pro se			still open		
12/3/19	2/16/21	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	failure to pay fee	
12/15/19			atty			withdrawn		
12/19/19	3/2/20	Dismissed w/o prejudice	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	failure to pay fee	
12/20/19	1/16/20	Dismissed w/o prejudice	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	incomplete application	
1/6/20	3/24/21	Dismissed w prejudice	pro se			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
1/21/20	1/22/20	Transferred	pro se			granted		stipulated
1/22/20	2/3/20	Granted	atty			granted		stipulated
1/22/20			pro se	Y	N	still open		
2/6/20	9/30/20	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	state's summary judgment	

2/7/20	4/8/20	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	frivolity review	
2/12/20	3/12/20	Dismissed	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	frivolity review	
2/12/20	7/15/21	Dismissed w prejudice	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	state's summary judgment	
3/11/20	3/16/20	Granted	atty			granted		stipulated
3/13/20			pro se			dismissed	moot	
3/16/20	11/6/20	Dismissed	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	failure to pay fee	
3/20/20	10/26/20	Dismissed	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	state's motion to dismiss	
3/20/20	4/28/21	Dismissed w/o prejudice	pro se			still open		
3/24/20	6/1/20	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	unclear	
3/24/20			atty			still open		
3/31/20	1/13/21	Dismissed w prejudice	atty			dismissed	court's motion to dismiss based on procedure	
4/6/20	2/10/21	Dismissed	atty			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
4/6/20	6/30/21	Dismissed	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	state's motion to dismiss	
4/28/20			atty			granted		stipulated
5/4/20			pro se			dismissed	failure to pay fee	
5/15/20			atty			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
5/22/20	8/23/21	Granted	atty			granted		state failed to respond
6/2/20			pro se	Y	N	dismissed	state's summary judgment	
6/5/20	6/29/21	Dismissed	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	withdrawn	
7/9/20			pro se	Y	N	dismissed	failure to pay fee	
7/17/20	8/4/21	Judgment	atty			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
7/22/20	4/29/21	Dismissed w/o prejudice	atty			dismissed	failure to serve defendant	
7/28/20	10/12/20	Dismissed w/o prejudice	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	failure to pay fee	
8/3/20	6/3/21	Dismissed w/o prejudice	atty			dismissed	unclear	
8/4/20	10/6/20	Dismissed w/o prejudice	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	failure to pay fee	

8/5/20	11/20/20	Dismsd w prejudice	atty			dismissed	withdrawn	
8/18/20			pro se	Y	N	dismissed	frivolity review	
8/31/20	2/1/21	Dismissed	atty			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
9/14/20	2/11/21	Dismissed	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	failure to pay fee	
9/29/20	11/10/20	Dismissed	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	frivolity review	
10/1/20			pro se	Y	N	dismissed	court's motion to dismiss based on procedure	
10/9/20			pro se	Y	Y	stayed		
10/15/20	11/11/20	Dismissed	pro se	Y	N	still open		
10/16/20			pro se	Y	N	dismissed	frivolity review	
10/16/20			pro se	Y	Y	dismissed	frivolity review	
10/26/20			pro se	Y	N	still open		
10/27/20	11/4/20	Granted	atty			granted		stipulated
10/30/20			pro se	Y	N	dismissed	frivolity review	
11/9/20			pro se	Y	N	still open		
11/16/20	3/15/21	No Cause of Action	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	unclear	
11/16/20	3/16/21	Dismsd w/o prejudice	pro se	Y		dismissed	failure to pay fee	
11/25/20	3/3/21	Dismissed	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	court's motion to dismiss based on procedure	
11/30/20	1/29/21	Dismsd w/o prejudice	pro se			dismissed	failure to pay fee	
12/7/20	4/13/21	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	court's motion to dismiss based on procedure	
12/8/20			atty			dismissed	state's motion to dismiss on procedure	
12/23/20			pro se			dismissed	failure to pay fee	
1/5/21			pro se	Y	N	dismissed	state's motion to dismiss	
1/19/21	4/21/21	Dismissed	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	failure to pay fee	
1/27/21	7/16/21	Dismissed	atty			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
1/30/21			atty			still open		
2/16/21	3/1/21	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	frivolity review	

2/18/21	5/11/21	Dismissed	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	court's motion to dismiss based on procedure	
2/19/21	9/27/21	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	court's motion to dismiss based on procedure	
2/19/21			pro se	Y		stayed		
2/22/21			atty			still open		
3/9/21	6/23/21	Dismsd w/o prejudice	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	failure to pay fee	
3/9/21			pro se	Y		still open		
3/16/21	6/3/21	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	frivolity review	
4/8/21			atty			still open		
4/9/21	10/29/21	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	state's motion to dismiss	
4/13/21			pro se	Y	Y	stayed		
4/20/21			pro se	Y	N	dismissed	state's summary judgment	
4/21/21			atty			still open		
4/26/21			atty			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
5/4/21	5/7/21	Dismissed	pro se			dismissed	frivolity review	
5/5/21	8/3/21	Dismsd w/o prejudice	atty			withdrawn		
5/13/21			atty			still open		
5/19/21			pro se	Y	N	dismissed	state's summary judgment	
5/26/21	10/27/21	Dismissed	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	frivolity review	
6/24/21			atty			dismissed	failure to serve defendant	
7/9/21			pro se	Y	N	dismissed	state's summary judgment	
7/9/21			atty			granted		stipulated
7/19/21			pro se			dismissed	state's summary judgment	
7/21/21	7/26/21	Dismissed	pro se	Y	N	dismissed	court's motion to dismiss based on procedure	

7/21/21	7/27/21	Denied	pro se			dismissed	frivolity review	
7/30/21			atty			still open		
8/2/21	8/4/21	Granted	atty			granted		stipulated
8/11/21			pro se	Y	N	still open		
9/1/21			pro se			still open		
9/10/21			atty			still open		
10/13/21	10/19/21	Denied	pro se	Y	N	still open		
10/21/21			pro se	Y		still open		
10/27/21			pro se			still open		
10/29/21			atty			still open		
10/29/21			atty			still open		
11/12/21			atty			still open		