

ORIGINAL

NO. 14-733

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

APPEAL FROM
THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR CUYAHOGA COUNTY, OHIO
NO. 100191

STATE OF OHIO,
Plaintiff-Appellee

-vs-

ISSA KONA
Defendant-Appellant

MEMORANDUM IN RESPONSE TO JURISDICTION

Counsel for Plaintiff-Appellee

TIMOTHY J. McGINTY
Cuyahoga County Prosecutor

JAMES M. PRICE (0073356)
DIANE SMILANICK (0019987)
Assistant Prosecuting Attorney
The Justice Center
1200 Ontario Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44113
(216) 443-7800

Counsel for Defendant-Appellant

JOSEPH T. BURKE
MICHEAL G. POLITO
21300 Lorain Road
Fairview Park, Ohio 44126





TABLE OF CONTENTS

WHY THIS FELONY CASE IS NOT A CASE OF GREAT PUBLIC OR GENERAL INTEREST AND DOES NOT INVOLVE A SUBSTANTIAL CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION.....1

STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....2

STATEMENT OF THE FACTS3

LAW AND ARGUMENT4

PROPOSITION OF LAW I (As stated by Appellant):
A written admission of guilt required by a diversion program is the functional equivalent of a guilty plea or no contest plea for purposes of R.C. 2943.031(A).

PROPOSITION OF LAW II (As stated by Appellant):
A noncitizen is required to be advised as to potential immigration consequences pursuant to R.C. 2943.031 when required to provide a written admission of guilt as condition precedent for admission into a pretrial diversion program.

PROPOSITION OF LAW III (As stated by Appellant):
A written admission of guilt is not made knowingly, voluntarily, and intelligently when a noncitizen is not advised of potential immigration consequences.

PROPOSITION OF LAW IV (As stated by Appellant):
A trial court should, pursuant to Crim.R.32.1, withdraw a written admission of guilt thereby vacating the conviction for immigration purposes, where a manifest injustice will otherwise occur.

PROPOSITION OF LAW V (As stated by Appellant):
A trial court has jurisdiction to withdraw a written admission of guilt and vacate the conviction after a dismissal.

CONCLUSION.....10

SERVICE.....11

WHY THIS FELONY CASE IS NOT A CASE OF GREAT PUBLIC OR GENERAL INTEREST AND DOES NOT INVOLVE A SUBSTANTIAL CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION

Appellant has not presented a substantial constitutional questions or any matters of great public or general interest. The threshold determination underlying each of Appellant's propositions of law is that his admission of guilt statement that he made when applying to the pretrial diversion program was the equivalent of entering into a guilty plea. Therefore, Appellant contends that he was entitled to all of the protections that he would have been afforded had he actually entered a plea of guilty, including those under Crim.R. 11 and R.C. 2943.031.

Pretrial diversion programs are governed by R.C. 2935.36, which does not require a trial court to ascertain that a defendant is knowingly, voluntarily, and intelligently entering into a *pretrial diversion program*. Likewise, nothing in R.C. 2943.031 requires a trial court to advise a defendant of the possible immigration consequences of entering into a *pretrial diversion program*. Upon a plain reading of these statutes, it is clear that the Appellant would not have been afforded these protections unless he entered a plea of guilty or no contest.

The State respectfully submits that the Appellant's Propositions of Law do not present substantial constitutional questions or matters of great public or general interest and therefore asks this Honorable Court to decline jurisdiction and to dismiss the instant appeal.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On May 2, 2006, Appellant, Issa Kona, (“Kona”) was indicted by the Cuyahoga County Grand Jury with two counts of Robbery pursuant to R.C. 2911.02. On September 20, 2006, Kona filed a motion asking to be referred for the Cuyahoga County Pretrial Diversion Program. The trial court granted Kona’s motion on October 26, 2006. As a part of the application for the diversion program, Kona was required to complete a written admission of guilt statement.

Kona successfully completed the pretrial diversion program and his case was dismissed at the state’s request on May 2, 2007. R.C. 2935.36(D). Kona immediately filed a motion to have his record expunged, which the court granted without opposition.¹

On July 29, 2008, Kona filed a motion to unseal his record after he was informed that his admission of guilt, which was required for acceptance into the pretrial diversion program, exposed him to deportation. On September 9, 2008, the trial court granted Kona’s motion over the state’s objection.

On October 20, 2008, Kona filed a *Motion to Vacate Plea*. However, the state was not served. On March 6, 2009, Kona filed an amended *Motion to Withdraw Plea, Vacate Judgment* and requesting an oral hearing. The state filed a response in opposition to the motion on March 25, 2009.

On June 26, 2013, after a number of pre-trials, the trial court held a hearing on the motion, and on July 2, 2013, the motion was denied.

Kona appealed, and on March 27, 2014, the Eighth District affirmed the decision of the trial court. *State v. Kona* 2014 WL 1340566 (Ohio App. 8th Dist.), 2014-Ohio-1242. Kona filed Notice of Appeal and a Memorandum in Support of Jurisdiction in this Court on May 9, 2014.

¹ May 4, 2007.

The state respectfully submits that none of the issues presented by the Appellant meet the threshold criteria for Supreme Court review.

STATEMENT OF THE FACTS

Kona successfully completed the Cuyahoga County Pretrial Diversion Program. As agreed, the state asked the trial court to dismiss the case against Kona, and the trial court issued a judgment entry consistent with the state's recommendation. Appellant subsequently filed a *Motion for Expungement of Record*, which the court granted on May 4, 2007. A year later, Kona filed a motion to unseal his record, which the court granted.

Five years after the court unsealed Kona's record, a hearing was held on a motion that Kona filed under the title "*Amended Motion to Withdraw Plea, Vacate Judgment*." (Tr. 2-37.) At the hearing, Kona's attorney stated that the admission of guilt made by Kona to enter the pretrial diversion program was tantamount to a guilty plea. (Tr. 5.)

Kona's attorney acknowledged that Kona did not have a conviction, but asserted that from the perspective of the immigration authorities, Kona had a conviction, notwithstanding the state's dismissal of the case. (Tr. 6.)

Defense counsel maintained that, from the perspective of immigration authorities, Kona's admission operated as a guilty plea and conviction. Therefore, he argued that Kona was entitled to all of the protections that he would have been afforded had he actually entered a plea of guilty, including those protections under Crim.R. 11 and R.C. 2943.031. (Tr. 5-7.)

In response, the trial court stated, "[o]f course, here with successful completion of diversion, there is no conviction. And, as a matter of fact, if there is an arrest on the record, the defendant becomes eligible to immediately seek expungement of that arrest on the record" (Tr. 10.) Kona's attorney replied, "I would agree with you, Your Honor, but immigration is a little

different” (Tr. 11.) The court asked “what puts a judge on notice that down the road from the date of the filing of the diversion packet there may be some consequence that was unintended or perhaps even unforeseen?” (Tr. 12-13.)

The state noted that R.C. 2935.36, which governs pretrial diversion programs, do not require a trial court to ensure that a defendant knowingly, voluntarily, and intelligently enters into a pretrial diversion program. Furthermore, R.C. 2943.031 does not require a trial court to advise a defendant entering into a pretrial diversion program of possible immigration consequences. Kona was not entitled to these protections because he did not enter a plea of guilty or no contest. Hence, the state argued, the trial court was not required to follow Crim.R. 11 and R.C. 2943.031.

On July 2, 2013, the trial court denied Kona’s motion to withdraw plea and vacate. Kona appealed and on March 27, 2014, the Eighth District Court of Appeals affirmed the decision of the trial court. *State v. Kona* 2014 WL 1340566 (Ohio App. 8th Dist.), 2014-Ohio-1242.

LAW AND ARGUMENT

PROPOSITION OF LAW I (As stated by Appellant):

A written admission of guilt required by a diversion program is the functional equivalent of a guilty plea or no contest plea for purposes of R.C. 2943.031(A).

Pretrial diversion programs are governed by R.C. 2935.36, which provides that:

“The prosecuting attorney may establish pre-trial diversion programs for adults who are accused of committing criminal offenses and whom the prosecuting attorney believes probably will not offend again. The prosecuting attorney may require, as a condition of an accused's participation in the program, the accused to pay a reasonable fee for supervision services that include, but are not limited to, monitoring and drug testing. The programs shall be operated pursuant to written standards approved by journal entry by the presiding judge or, in courts with only one judge, the judge of the court of common pleas[.]” R.C. 2935.36(A).

Pursuant to R.C. 2935.36(B), an accused entering a pretrial diversion program must:

(1) Waive, in writing and contingent upon the accused's successful completion of the program, the accused's right to a speedy trial, the preliminary hearing, the time period within which the grand jury may consider an indictment against the accused, and arraignment, unless the hearing, indictment, or arraignment has already occurred;

(2) Agree, in writing, to the tolling while in the program of all periods of limitation established by statutes or rules of court, that are applicable to the offense with which the accused is charged and to the conditions of the diversion program established by the prosecuting attorney;

(3) Agree, in writing, to pay any reasonable fee for supervision services established by the prosecuting attorney.

In addition, the statute requires that:

(C) The trial court, upon the application of the prosecuting attorney, shall order the release from confinement of any accused who has agreed to enter a pre-trial diversion program and shall discharge and release any existing bail and release any sureties on recognizances and shall release the accused on a recognizance bond conditioned upon the accused's compliance with the terms of the diversion program. * * *

(D) If the accused satisfactorily completes the diversion program, the prosecuting attorney shall recommend to the trial court that the charges against the accused be dismissed, and the court, upon the recommendation of the prosecuting attorney, shall dismiss the charges. If the accused chooses not to enter the prosecuting attorney's di-ersion program, or if the accused violates the conditions of the agreement pursuant to which the accused has been released, the accused may be brought to trial upon the charges in the manner provided by law, and the waiver executed pursuant to division (B)(1) of this section shall be void on the date the accused is removed from the program for the violation. R.C. 2935.36(C) and (D).

At the time Kona applied to the Cuyahoga County Pretrial Diversion Program, the accused was required "to provide a complete, accurate, and truthful statement concerning your present criminal charge(s). This statement must admit to the crimes for which you are charged." Kona maintains that this admission was tantamount to a guilty plea, requiring the trial court to ensure that he was admitting to the crimes voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently pursuant to

Crim.R. 11, and because he was not a United States citizen, a voluntary, knowing, and intelligent plea would require the court to advise him pursuant to R.C. 2943.031.

Statutory Interpretation

Kona's asserts that R.C. 2943.031 should be interpreted to govern admissions of guilt statements that are part of the diversion program application process. The court of appeals rejected Kona's analysis, stating, "[T]here is nothing in the statute that requires a trial court to ensure that a defendant knowingly, voluntarily, and intelligently enters into a pretrial diversion program. Nor is there anything in R.C. 2943.031 that requires a trial court to advise a defendant of possible immigration consequences if that defendant is entering into a pretrial diversion program. Upon a plain reading of these statutes, it is clear that Kona would have only been afforded these protections had he entered a plea of guilty or no contest." *Kona* at ¶19.

The cornerstone of statutory interpretation is legislative intent. *State ex rel. Francis v. Sours*, 143 Ohio St. 120, 124, 53 N.E.2d 1021 (1944). In order to determine legislative intent, it is a cardinal rule of statutory construction that a court must first look to the language of the statute itself. *Provident Bank v. Wood*, 36 Ohio St.2d 101, 105, 304 N.E.2d 378 (1973). "If the meaning of the statute is unambiguous and definite, it must be applied as written and no further interpretation is necessary." *State ex rel. Savarese v. Buckeye Local School Dist. Bd. of Edn.*, 74 Ohio St.3d 543, 545, 660 N.E.2d 463 (1996).

A court may interpret a statute only where the words of the statute are ambiguous. *State ex rel. Celebrezze v. Allen Cty. Bd. of Commrs.*, 32 Ohio St.3d 24, 27, 512 N.E.2d 332 (1987). Ambiguity exists if the language is susceptible of more than one reasonable interpretation. *State ex rel. Toledo Edison Co. v. Clyde*, 76 Ohio St.3d 508, 513, 668 N.E.2d 498 (1996).

R.C. 2943.031(A) unambiguously states:

Except as provided in division (B) of this section, prior to accepting a plea of guilty or a plea of no contest to an indictment, information, or complaint charging a felony or a misdemeanor other than a minor misdemeanor if the defendant previously has not been convicted of or pleaded guilty to a minor misdemeanor, the court shall address the defendant personally, provide the following advisement to the defendant that shall be entered in the record of the court, and determine that the defendant understands the advisement... (Emphasis added)

If the meaning of the statute is unambiguous and definite, (as is the meaning of R.C. 2943.031), it must be applied as written and no further interpretation is necessary. *Savarese v. Buckeye Local School Dist. Bd. of Edn.*, 74 Ohio St.3d 543, 660 N.E.2d 463, 106 Ed. Law Rep. 871, 1996 -Ohio- 291, at 545; *State ex rel. Herman v. Klopfleisch* (1995), 72 Ohio St.3d 581, 584, 651 N.E.2d 995, 997.

Because the trial court did not accept a plea of guilty or a plea of no contest to an indictment, information, or complaint charging a felony or misdemeanor from Kona, the court of appeals properly affirmed the trial court's determination that R.C. 2943.031 did not apply. Because Kona's first proposition of law is without merit, propositions two through five are obviated.

PROPOSITION OF LAW II (As stated by Appellant):

A noncitizen is required to be advised as to potential immigration consequences pursuant to R.C. 2943.031 when required to provide a written admission of guilt as condition precedent for admission into a pretrial diversion program.

As formerly stated, nothing in R.C. 2943.031 (or R.C. 2935.36) requires a trial court to ensure that a defendant is knowingly, voluntarily, and intelligently entering into a pretrial diversion program. Therefore, R.C. 2943.031 does not apply. Accordingly, Kona's second proposition of law is without merit.

PROPOSITION OF LAW III (As stated by Appellant):

A written admission of guilt is not made knowingly, voluntarily, and intelligently when a noncitizen is not advised of potential immigration consequences.

R.C. 2943.031(A) states that:

“[e]xcept as provided in division (B) of this section, *prior to accepting a plea of guilty or a plea of no contest* to an indictment, information, or complaint charging a felony or a misdemeanor other than a minor misdemeanor if the defendant previously has not been convicted of or pleaded guilty to a minor misdemeanor, the court shall address the defendant personally, provide the following advisement to the defendant that shall be entered in the record of the court, and determine that the defendant understands the advisement: “If you are not a citizen of the United States, you are hereby advised that conviction of the offense to which you are pleading guilty (or no contest, when applicable) may have the consequences of deportation, exclusion from admission to the United States, or denial of naturalization pursuant to the laws of the United States.”

As stated, because Kona did not enter a plea of guilty or a plea of no contest to an indictment, information, or complaint charging a felony or a misdemeanor, R.C. 2943.031 does not apply.

It is important to mention that Kona cites 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(48)(A) in support of his claim that his admission exposed him to deportation or other immigration difficulties. That provision states:

The term "conviction" means, with respect to an alien, a formal judgment of guilt of the alien entered by a court, of, if adjudication of guilt has been withheld, where:

(i) A judge or jury has found the alien guilty or the alien has entered a plea of guilty or nolo contendere or has admitted sufficient facts to warrant a finding of guilt, *and*

(ii) The judge has ordered some form of punishment, penalty or restraint on the alien's liberty to be imposed.

The record in this case is devoid of any formal judgment of guilt. No judge or jury found Kona guilty, and Kona did not enter a plea of guilty or nolo contendere. Nor did he admit

sufficient facts to warrant a finding of guilty. More importantly, the second element of the provision states that the judge must have ordered some form of punishment, penalty, or restraint on the defendant's liberty. The second prong of the provision is not clearly applicable to the case at bar. Indeed, far from being a penalty, pretrial diversion has been described as "a privilege extended by the court *to help a defendant avoid a conviction of record and future arrest.*" *Lane v. Phillabaum*, 182 Ohio App. 3d 145, 2008-Ohio-2502, 912 N.E.2d 113, 247 Ed. Law Rep. 893 (12th Dist. Butler County 2008), appeal not allowed, 119 Ohio St. 3d 1503, 2008-Ohio-5467, 895 N.E.2d 566 (2008). (Emphasis added).

Because the trial judge conferred a benefit on Kona by granting his motion to enter pretrial diversion, 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(48)(A) does not apply.

Appellant's third proposition of law is without merit.

PROPOSITION OF LAW IV (As stated by Appellant):

A trial court should, pursuant to Crim.R.32.1, withdraw a written admission of guilt thereby vacating the conviction for immigration purposes, where a manifest injustice will otherwise occur.

As stated in the Eighth District's opinion, "because Kona did not enter a plea of guilty or no contest as part of his pretrial diversion program, the trial court was not required to follow the mandates of Crim.R. 11 and R.C. 2943.031..." As to Crim. R. 32.1, the appellate court correctly determined that, "[a] trial court cannot [grant a motion to] withdraw a plea that was never entered into, nor can it vacate a conviction that does not exist." *Kona* at ¶22. It must also be mentioned that it is not at all clear that the admission prerequisite for pretrial diversion exposes him to deportation or any other immigration consequences under 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(48)(A).

PROPOSITION OF LAW V (As stated by Appellant):

A trial court has jurisdiction to withdraw a written admission of guilt and vacate the conviction after a dismissal.

Appellant's fourth and fifth propositions of law fail for the same reasons—"a trial court cannot withdraw a plea that was never entered into, nor can it vacate a conviction that does not exist." *Id.*

CONCLUSION

Kona did not enter a plea of guilty or no contest as part of his pretrial diversion program. Therefore, the trial court was not required to follow the mandates of Crim.R. 11 and R.C. 2943.031. Furthermore, a trial court cannot grant a motion to withdraw a plea that was never entered into, nor can it vacate a conviction that does not exist. For these reasons, the State of Ohio respectfully requests that this Honorable Court decline to accept jurisdiction in this case, and dismiss Appellant's Appeal.

Respectfully submitted,


TIMOTHY J. MCGINTY
Cuyahoga County Prosecutor



JAMES M. PRICE (#0073356)
DIANE SMILANICK (#0019987)
Assistant Prosecuting Attorneys
The Justice Center, 8th Floor
1200 Ontario Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44113

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

A copy of the foregoing Memorandum in Response was sent by regular U.S. mail this 6TH day of June, 2014, to: Joseph T. Burke and Michael G. Polito, 21300 Lorain Road, Fairview Park, Ohio 44126.



JAMES M. PRICE (0073356)
Assistant Prosecuting Attorney