HB1059 HD2

RELATING TO COURT ADVISEMENT CONCERNING ALIEN STATUS.

Requires the court to advise a criminal defendant of the effects of a guilty or no contest plea on alien status at the defendant's arraignment and plea hearing, and again prior to the entry of a guilty or no contest plea or the commencement of trial. Effective July 1, 2013. (HB1059 HD2)

FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER
DISTRICT OF HAWAII

Peter C. Wolff, Jr.
Federal Public Defender
peter_wolff@fd.org

300 Ala Moana Boulevard, Suite 7-104
Honolulu, Hawaii 96850-5269

(808) 541-2521 ◆ Facsimile (808) 541-3545 ◆ Toll free (877) 541-2521

March 13, 2013

Senator J. Kalani English
Hawaii State Capitol, Room 205
415 South Beretania Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Re: HB 1059 H.D. 2

Dear Senator English,

I have reviewed HB 1059 H.D. 2. My opinion is that it is a necessary and beneficial piece of legislation in response to Padilla v. Kentucky, 559 U.S. 356, 130 S.Ct. 1473 (2010). While Padilla did not impose a duty on courts, as does HB 1059, to advise defendants of possible adverse immigration consequences of a plea, HB 1059 is nonetheless necessary to ensure that defendants, many of whom are often not familiar with our criminal justice system, are aware that their counsel has such a duty and to impress upon defense counsel the necessity of carrying out that duty in good faith, which may often include consulting with an attorney who specializes in immigration law if they lack the necessary knowledge of immigration law themselves.

A virtue of HB 1059 is that it achieves these positive goals without (as near as I can tell) infringing upon the confidentiality of attorney-client communications. A major concern for the defense bar with "solutions" to the fall-out of Padilla (and the concern that such solutions should prevent convictions from being overturned due to Padilla error) is that many of those solutions attempt to erode the attorney-client privilege, by requiring that the record be peppered at one point or another with statements from the defendant or her attorney about the specific advice the attorney may or may not have given to the defendant concerning potential immigration consequences. My opinion is that such solutions are unconstitutional infringements of the attorney-client privilege, could compel self-incriminating remarks from the defendant, and may well violate due process. HB 1059 appears to avoid such pitfalls, however, by simply having the court advise the defendant that there may be immigration consequences and that the defense attorney has a duty to provide adequate advice to the defendant about those consequences, without unnecessarily having the court pierce the attorney-client privilege or compel statements from either the attorney or the defendant.

I do have one concern, however, with some of the specific language used in HB 1059 H.D. 2. My concern is with the italicized portion of the following portion of the advisement in section 1: "... you have the right to receive advice from your attorney about *the specific impact* that this case will have, if any, on your immigration status. The entry of a guilty ...". HB 1059 H.D. 2, at p. 1 lines 11–12. In Padilla, the Supreme Court did not go quite so far as to hold that counsel has a duty to provide, in every case, advice about the precise immigration consequences that would occur as a result of an admission, a plea, or a conviction. Rather, the Supreme Court recognized that in many cases, the complexity of immigration law makes it unclear exactly what consequences might flow from a conviction, a plea, or an admission. While that "[l]ack of clarity in the law ... does not obviate the need for counsel to say something about the possibility of deportation," it does "affect the scope and nature of" of the advice that counsel is constitutionally required to provide to the defendant. Padilla, 130 S.Ct. at 1483 n. 10. "When the law is not succinct and straightforward ..., a criminal defense attorney need do no more than advise a noncitizen client that pending criminal charges may carry a risk of adverse immigration consequences.[] But when the deportation consequence is truly clear, ... the duty to give correct advice is equally clear." Padilla, 130 S.Ct. at 1483 (footnote omitted). If HB 1059 is meant to impose a higher bar than Padilla requires, then there is no need alter its language. But if the intent is to codify the standard Padilla adopted, then you may wish to reconsider the language I have pointed out above. My suggestion would be to alter the language to read " ... you have the right to receive advice from your attorney about possible adverse immigration consequences that this case may have on you. The entry of a guilty ...".

Very truly yours,

Peter C. Wolff, Jr.

PETER C. WOLFF, JR.
Federal Public Defender
District of Hawaii

TESTIMONY OF
THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
TWENTY-SEVENTH LEGISLATURE, 2013

ON THE FOLLOWING MEASURE:
H.B. NO. 1059, H.D. 2, RELATING TO COURT ADVISEMENT CONCERNING ALIEN STATUS.

BEFORE THE:

SENATE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DATE: Monday, March 18, 2013 **TIME:** 1:17 p.m.

LOCATION: State Capitol, Room 224

TESTIFIER(S): David M. Louie, Attorney General, or
Lance M. Goto, Deputy Attorney General

Chair English and Members of the Committee:

The Department of the Attorney General ("Department") supports this bill with amendments. The Department also supports the H.D. 1 of this bill.

The purpose of both drafts of this bill is to clarify the requirement that courts advise pleading defendants of the possible consequences of the plea upon alien status.

Section 802E-2, Hawaii Revised Statutes, requires courts, prior to the acceptance of a plea of guilty or nolo contendere to a criminal offense, to administer an advisement to defendants of how the criminal matter may affect their immigration status. The specified advisement, however, only warns a defendant that a conviction for the offense may have immigration consequences. This advisement is not consistent with federal law and Rule 11(c)(5) of the Hawaii Rules of Penal Procedure (HRPP). This bill addresses that inconsistency.

Under federal immigration law, a "conviction" is broader by definition than just a judgment of conviction or guilt. Section 1101(a)(48)(A), of Title 8, United States Code, provides:

> The term "conviction" means, with respect to an alien, a formal judgment of guilt of the alien entered by a court or, 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.

> (B) Any reference to a term of imprisonment or a sentence with respect to an offense is deemed to include the period of incarceration or confinement ordered by a court of law regardless of any suspension of the imposition or execution of that imprisonment or sentence in whole or in part.

Under this federal provision, a "conviction" could include a disposition without an adjudication of guilt. It could include just the entry of a plea of guilty or nolo contendere, provided the judge has ordered "some form of punishment, penalty, or restraint on the alien's liberty." It clearly could include a deferred plea under state law.

Rule 11(c)(5) of the Hawaii Rules of Penal Procedure addresses this federal provision by requiring a court to advise a defendant in open court about the possible immigration consequences of a plea of guilty or nolo contendere upon a defendant's entry of a plea.

This bill addresses the concerns by requiring the court to advise a criminal defendant at two times in the criminal justice process, first at arraignment and plea, and then prior to trial or entry of a plea, that certain dispositions in the criminal case may affect the immigration status of the defendant. It should be noted that the bill provides for two separate and slightly different advisements to the defendant. Both advisements have some confusing wording. The Department suggests that the same advisement be given at both stages of the criminal justice process. The requirement for two slightly different advisements could result in unnecessary confusion and error. The Department recommends the following advisement:

> If you are not a citizen of the United States, whether or not you have lawful immigration status, you have the right to receive advice from your attorney about the specific impact that this case will have, if any, on your immigration status. The entry of a guilty or nolo contendere plea, admission of sufficient facts to prove guilt, deferred plea or sentence, or a conviction of the offense for which you have been charged, may have the consequences of your immediate detention, deportation, exclusion from admission to the United States, or denial of naturalization pursuant to the laws of the United States. In some cases, detention and deportation from the United States will be required. Your lawyer must investigate and advise you about these issues prior to the commencement of trial, entry of a plea of guilty or nolo contendere, or admission of sufficient facts to prove guilt to any offense. You are not required to disclose your immigration or citizenship status to the court.

The Department respectfully requests passage of this bill with the proposed amendments. The Department also supports the H.D. 1 for this bill.

The Judiciary, State of Hawai'i

Testimony to the Senate Committee on Transportation and International Affairs

Senator J. Kalani English, Chair
Senator Donovan M. Dela Cruz, Vice Chair

Monday, March 18, 2013, 1:17 p.m.
State Capitol, Conference Room 224

By
Elizabeth M. Zack
Supreme Court Staff Attorney

Bill No. and Title: House Bill No. 1059, H.D. 2, Relating to Court Advisement Concerning Alien Status.

Purpose: Requires the court to advise a criminal defendant of the effects of a guilty or no contest plea on alien status at the defendant's arraignment and plea hearing, and again prior to the entry of a guilty or no contest plea or the commencement of trial. Effective July 1, 2013. (HB1059, HD2)

Judiciary's Position:

1. The Judiciary takes no position on the accuracy or correctness, in legal terms, of the advisements embodied in H.D. 2.

2. For the reasons expressed below, the Judiciary respectfully opposes the language in H.D. 2 that arguably requires the court to administer the advisements verbatim. The Judiciary much prefers the wording of the original bill and H.D.1 – i.e., "the court shall administer an advisement on the record to the defendant, which shall substantially contain the following information."

3. The Judiciary respectfully opposes subsection (a), which requires the reading of the advisement at the arraignment and plea hearing of every defendant, whether the offense charged is a felony, a misdemeanor, or a petty misdemeanor. While we agree with the Office of the Public Defender that advisement at the arraignment and plea stage will "give the defendant sufficient time to consult with an attorney about how a conviction or deferral will affect his

immigration status," we are not sure that the benefit to be derived justifies the cost of the dramatic increases in court time that will be required to process the hundreds of defendants arraigned daily in the circuit and district courts if the entire advisement must be administered to each defendant individually.

We do not oppose the requirement that the advisement be given prior to trial or the entry of a guilty or nolo contendere plea. We note that when the advisement is given at either of those points in the proceeding, the bill provides: "Upon request, the court will allow you and your lawyer additional time to consider your decision to enter a plea or commence with trial in light of this advisal," which would seem to obviate the need to give the advisement at the arraignment and plea hearing.

Further, we would point out that under Padilla v. Kentucky, 130 S.Ct. 1473 (2010), discussed below, the duty to advise the defendant of immigration consequences rests on defense counsel rather than the court. Yet, under House Bill No. 1059, H.D. 2, when read with § 802E-3 (which is left untouched by the bill), it would appear that the court's failure to administer the advisement, either at the arraignment and plea hearing or prior to trial or the entry of a plea, will entitle the defendant to vacation of the judgment and withdrawal of the plea even if defense counsel has adequately advised the defendant of the applicable immigration consequences.

Background on Alien Advisement Proposals

According to House Standing Committee Report No. 913, the purpose of House Bill No. 1059, is "to protect the rights of non-citizens and allow a non-citizen defendant the opportunity to make a knowing, voluntary, and intelligent plea of guilty or no contest," by amending HRS § 802E-2 to require "the court to advise criminal defendants of the effects of a guilty or no contest plea on their alien status in the United States prior to the entry of a guilty or no contest plea."

§ 802E-2 is part of chapter 802E, a three-section chapter that was enacted in 1988. § 802E-1 indicates that the legislative intent behind the chapter is to address the unfairness inherent in a non-citizen defendant pleading guilty or nolo contendere to a criminal offense "without the defendant knowing that a conviction of such offense is grounds for deportation, exclusion from admission to the United States, or denial of naturalization pursuant to the laws of the United States." § 802E-2 deals with the problem by requiring the court, prior to accepting a plea of guilty or nolo contendere, to "administer the following advisement on the record to the defendant:"

> If you are not a citizen of the United States, you are hereby advised that conviction of the offense for which you have been charged 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.

That section also requires the court, upon request, to allow the defendant additional time to consider the appropriateness of the plea in light of the advisement. § 802-3 provides that, if the court fails to administer the advisement and the defendant is able to show that conviction of the offense to which he or she pleaded guilty or nolo contendere "may have the consequences for the defendant of deportation, exclusion from admission to the United States, or denial of naturalization pursuant to the laws of the United States," the court, on the defendant's motion, must vacate the judgment and allow the defendant to withdraw the plea. In the absence of a record that the court provided the advisement, it is presumed that the advisement was not given.

At some point,[1] federal immigration policy was understood to hold that adverse immigration consequences could result not only upon conviction, but also upon entry of a plea of guilty or nolo contendere that, as in the case of a deferral, might never result in a conviction. Accordingly, to the extent that chapter 802E – and § 802E-2 in particular – suggests that the entry of a plea will not trigger adverse immigration consequences and/or that only a conviction will, it is incorrect. Yet, because the language of § 802E-2 arguably leaves no room at all for modification of the advisement to account for changes in the law, it has been the case for several

---

[1]It was likely before December of 2006 as, by an order filed on December 7, 2006 and effective on January 1, 2007, the Hawaii Supreme Court approved the following amendment to Rule 11(c)(5) of the Hawaii Rules of Penal Procedure (deleted material is bracketed and stricken; new material is underscored), which conformed the rule to this understanding of federal law:

> (c) **Advice to Defendant.** The court shall not accept a plea of guilty or nolo contendere without first addressing the defendant in open court and determining that [~~he~~] the defendant understands the following:
>
> * * *
>
> (5) that if [~~he~~] the defendant is not a citizen of the United States, [~~a conviction of the~~] entry of a plea to an offense for which [~~he~~] the defendant has been charged 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.

years that the court is required to administer an advisement that may seriously mislead a non-citizen defendant as to the immigration consequences of his or her plea.[2]

House Bill No. 1059, as introduced, was a simple bill that sought to bring § 802E-2's advisement into conformity with federal law by clarifying that, in addition to a conviction, a plea of guilty or no contest, whether or not deferred by the court, could result in adverse immigration consequences. While the unamended version of § 802E-2 arguably requires the court to administer the advisement verbatim – i.e., the language of the section immediately preceding the advisement currently reads, "the court shall administer the following advisement on the record to the defendant" – House Bill No. 1059 replaced that language with, "the court shall administer an advisement on the record to the defendant, which shall substantially contain the following information."

Judiciary's Position on House Bill 1059 and H.D. 1

Although we submitted no testimony on the bill as introduced, the Judiciary fully supported the intent of House Bill No. 1059. The modification of § 802E-2's language arguably requiring a verbatim reading of the advisement was especially welcome as that language was thought to invite, and did in fact give rise to, challenges to judgments based on technical, non-substantive deviations from the advisement that did not prejudice the defendant. The Judiciary believes that a verbatim requirement is not necessary to protect the rights of non-citizen defendants and that it is sufficient that the statute require the substance of the advisement to be communicated to those defendants. Adopting this approach will provide the court with the flexibility to, for example, paraphrase the advisement into plain language so as to make it more comprehensible to a non-citizen who may have difficulty understanding English and should also discourage challenges to judgments based on technical, non-substantive grounds. In the event of a challenge, however, judicial review will be available to ensure that the purposes of the law have been met.

On second reading, the only substantive amendment to House Bill No. 1059 made by the House Committee on Veterans, Military, & International Affairs, & Culture and the Arts, was to specify that the advisement be given prior to the defendant's entry of a plea rather than prior to acceptance of the plea by the court. The Judiciary, although submitting no testimony one way or the other, had no objection to House Bill No. 1059 in its H.D. 1 form.

---

[2]This undesirable set of circumstances might be avoided in the future by repealing chapter 802E and leaving the matter to the Judiciary's committee on the Hawaii Rules of Penal Procedure or, barring that, including language in the statute conditioning the giving of the advisement on its being compatible with federal immigration law.

Change in the Judiciary's Position on House Bill 1059 H.D. 2

Subsequently, the House Committee on Judiciary amended House Bill No. 1059, H.D. 1 to require the court to give an advisement twice, which differs substantially from the H.D. 1 version – at arraignment and plea and again at the commencement of trial or entry of a plea. In H.D. 2 of this bill, these changes appear to have been based on testimony submitted by the Office of the State Public Defender. That testimony began by pointing out that the United States Supreme Court in Padilla v. Kentucky, 130 S.Ct. 1473 (2010), had held that a defendant's right to the effective assistance of counsel included the right to advice on the immigration consequences of a criminal conviction. Presumably based on Padilla, the original § 802E-2 advisement was more than doubled in length to include, in addition to the changes approved in the H.D. 1 version, information about the defendant's right to advice from his or her attorney on the specific impact of the case on the defendant's immigration status. The public defender's testimony also included the following:

> While we support this measure, we ask that this bill be amended to include two court advisements, one to be given at the defendant's arraignment and plea hearing, and one given prior to the entry of a guilty or no contest plea or the commencement of trial. The reason we ask for two advisements is that a defendant is under the most pressure during the change of plea hearing. A court advisement given at this late stage of a defendant's criminal case is one of many questions asked of a defendant in open court prior to the entry of a guilty or no contest plea, and may be disregarded, merely to "get through" the hearing. Furthermore, a defendant that elects to proceed to trial should receive the court advisement prior [to] its commencement. Moving the first warning to the start of the criminal proceedings at the arraignment and plea hearing will give the defendant sufficient time to consult with an attorney about how a conviction or deferral will affect his immigration status. We ask that the two advisements be included in an H.D. 2 version of this bill.

The H.D. 2 version also reverts, from the more flexible wording of both House Bill No. 1059 as introduced and the H.D. 1 version, back to the language of § 802E-2 that arguably requires the court to administer the advisements verbatim – i.e., "the court shall administer the following advisement on the record to the defendant." This version, House Bill 1059, H.D. 2, passed third reading in the House and has raised the Judiciary's concerns discussed above.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on this measure.

Office of the Public Defender
State of Hawaii
Timothy Ho, Chief Deputy Public Defender

Testimony of the Office of the Public Defender, State of Hawaii
to the Senate Committee on Transportation and International Affairs

March 18, 2013, 1:17 p.m.

H.B. No. 1059, H.D.2: RELATING TO COURT ADVISEMENT CONCERNING ALIEN STATUS

Chair English and members of the committee:

The Office of the Public Defender supports H.B. 1059, H.D. 2.

The United States Supreme Court ruled in *Padilla v. Kentucky*, 130 S.Ct. 1473 (2010), that the Sixth Amendment right to effective assistance of counsel extended to the immigration consequences of a criminal conviction. It held that defense attorneys have a duty to advise their clients on strategies to avoid deportation, and bars to relief from removal. Where the consequences of a criminal conviction are "truly clear", defense attorneys have a duty to advise their clients of the specific immigration consequences of a conviction. Where the consequences of a criminal conviction are "unclear", defense attorneys have a duty to warn of possible immigration consequences.

Furthermore, in *Nunes-Reyes v. Holder*, 646 F.3d 684 (2011), the United States Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals held that deferred judgments and/or convictions in state courts that are subsequently expunged are convictions for immigration purposes, and will not prevent a defendant from deportation proceedings and immigration consequences. The Court ruled that the Federal First Offender Act (FOFA), which defers prosecution in federal courts in a similar fashion California (and Hawaii's) deferred prosecution statutes, was not applicable to defendant's prosecuted in state courts.

The current court advisement in §802E-2, H.R.S. is deficient, and does not adequately advise a defendant of his Sixth Amendment right to competent and specific advise on immigration consequences of a criminal conviction, and that a deferred acceptance of a guilty or no contest plea (Chapter 853, H.R.S) has no effect on deportation or immigration proceedings.

We urge this committee to require that the advisement be read twice, at the defendant's arraignment and plea hearing, prior to the entry of a guilty or no contest plea or the commencement of trial. The reason we ask for two advisements is that a defendant is under the most pressure during the change of plea hearing. A court advisement given at this late stage of a defendant's criminal case is one of many questions asked of a defendant in open court prior to the entry of a guilty or no contest plea, and may be disregarded, merely to "get through" the hearing. Furthermore, a defendant that elects to

proceed to trial should receive the court advisement prior its commencement. Moving the first warning to the start of the criminal proceedings at the arraignment and plea hearing will give the defendant sufficient time to consult with an attorney about how a conviction or deferral will affect his immigration status. After consulting with a circuit court judge, we ask that the court be allowed to read the advisement once at the arraignment and plea hearing to all of the defendants scheduled to appear on the calendar.

We recommend the insertion of the following language on page 1, line 4: "Prior to the commencement of a defendant's arraignment and plea hearing for an offense punishable as a crime under state law, except offenses designated as infractions under state law, the court shall administer the following advisement on the record to all defendants present:"

We have no objection to the Department of the Attorney General's proposal to use a single warning to be read at arraignment and plea and prior to the entry of a plea or trial.

We urge you to pass this bill out of your committee, as we believe that the current law is constitutionally deficient. Thank you for the opportunity to be heard on this matter.

ALAN M. ARAKAWA
Mayor

JOHN D. KIM
Prosecuting Attorney

ROBERT D. RIVERA
First Deputy Prosecuting Attorney

DEPARTMENT OF THE PROSECUTING ATTORNEY
COUNTY OF MAUI
150 S. HIGH STREET
WAILUKU, MAUI, HAWAII 96793
PHONE (808) 270-7777 • FAX (808) 270-7625

CONTACT: RICHARD. K. MINATOYA
Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
Supervisor, Appellate, Asset Forfeiture and Administrative Services Division

TESTIMONY

ON

HB 1059, HD 2 - RELATING TO COURT ADVISEMENT CONCERNING ALIEN STATUS

March 18, 2013

The Honorable J. Kalani English
Chair
The Honorable Donovan M Dela Cruz
Vice Chair
and Members
Senate Committee on Transportation and International Affairs

Chair English, Vice Chair Dela Cruz and Members of the Committee:

The Department of the Prosecuting Attorney, County of Maui, is in STRONG SUPPORT of the passage of HB 1059, HD 2, Relating to Court Advisement Concerning Alien Status. The introduction of this bill was also unanimously supported by the State Law Enforcement Coalition.

HB 1059, HD 2 proposes to require courts to advise criminal defendants of the effects of a guilty or no contest plea on alien status at arraignment and plea and also before the entry of a guilty or no contest plea or before trial. Currently, the advisement required by Hawaii Revised Statutes § 802E-2 only states that the defendant may face immigration consequences upon a conviction. This information is incorrect, because the Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) officials now look to the plea or deferral as triggering the potential for immigration consequences.

We also have problems with the failure of the courts to give the advisement verbatim as required, or to give the advisement correctly. This resulted in the reopening of several cases.

These cases usually occur when a defendant is not deported, but later travels abroad and is detained by ICE upon return for exclusion from the United States. This usually happens several years (i.e., more than ten) after the cases are finished, when the evidence is gone and the witnesses are difficult to locate. This results in time and expense incurred, not only by the defendants, but also by the prosecution. The Standing Committee on the Rules of Penal Procedure and Circuit Court Criminal Rules approved an amendment to the advisement given on the Guilty Plea/No Contest Plea form, and will do so again to mirror the language of this bill if it becomes an act. However, HRS § 802E-2 needs to be amended because it is a verbatim requirement giving incorrect information.

The wording of the required advisements was drafted by the Office of the Public Defender, which supports the intent of this bill. We appreciate their cooperation with this bill, and defer to them on the wording of the advisements.

We ask that HB 1059, HD 2 be PASSED.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to provide testimony on this bill.

DEPARTMENT OF THE PROSECUTING ATTORNEY
CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU

ALII PLACE
1060 RICHARDS STREET • HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813
PHONE: (808) 547-7400 • FAX: (808) 547-7515

KEITH M. KANESHIRO
PROSECUTING ATTORNEY

ARMINA A. CHING
FIRST DEPUTY PROSECUTING ATTORNEY

THE HONORABLE J. KALANI ENGLISH, CHAIR
SEN ATE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
Twenty-Seventh State Legislature
Regular Session of 2013
State of Hawai`i

March 18, 2013

RE: H.B. 1059, H.D. 2; RELATING TO COURT ADVISEMENT CONCERNING ALIEN STATUS.

Chair English, Vice-Chair Dela Cruz and members of the Senate Committee on Transportation and International Affairs, the Department of the Prosecuting Attorney of the City and County of Honolulu submits the following testimony in support of House Bill 1059, House Draft 2.

The purpose of H.B. 1059, H.D. 2, is to correct certain inaccuracies in the language that courts currently use to advise criminal defendants of potential immigration consequences that may result from a plea of guilty, no contest, deferred acceptance of a guilty plea, or deferred acceptance of a no contest plea. While current language informs defendants that they may face immigration consequences for a criminal conviction, it is our understanding that Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE") not only considers convictions, but also considers pleas or deferrals.

Not only is this correction important for purposes of providing accurate information to defendants, but also to guard against potential costs and/or liability that can result from providing inaccurate information. Moreover, this amendment would bring section 802E-2, Hawaii Revised Statutes, in-line with similar amendments already adopted by the Judiciary's Standing Committee on the Rules of Penal Procedure and Circuit Court Criminal Rules.

For the foregoing reasons, the Department of the Prosecuting Attorney of the City and County of Honolulu supports H.B. 1059, H.D. 2. Thank you for the opportunity to testify on this matter.

HB1059

Friday, March 15, 2013
7:53 AM

Subject	***Submitted testimony for HB1059 on Mar 18, 2013 13:17PM***
From	mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
To	TIATestimony
Cc	mendezj@hawaii.edu
Sent	Thursday, March 14, 2013 5:00 PM

HB1059
Submitted on: 3/14/2013
Testimony for TIA on Mar 18, 2013 13:17PM in Conference Room 224

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Javier Mendez-Alvarez	Individual	Support	No

Comments:

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov