	P 31		h
	1	ORDR DAVID ROGER Inv 20 A DU 107	$\left \right $
	2	Nevada Bar #002781	
	3	MARC DiGIACOMO Chief Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #006955	
	5	200 Lewis Avenue	
	6	Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2212 (702) 671-2500 Attorney for Plaintiff	
	7	DISTRICT COURT	
	-8	THE STATE OF NEVADA, Plaintiff No. 48742	
	9		
	10	-vs-	
	11	RICKIE SLAUGHTER, #1896569	
	12		
	13	Defendant.	
	14	FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF	
	15	LAW AND ORDER	
	16	DATE OF HEARING: 12/18/06	
	17	TIME OF HEARING: 9:00 a.m.	
	18	THIS CAUSE having come on for hearing before the Honorable Douglas Herndon	5
	19	District Judge, on the 18 th day of December, 2006, the Petitioner being present, proceeding	3
	20	In Forma Pauperis, the Respondent being represented by DAVID ROGER, District Attorney	,
	21	by and through MARC DIGIACOMO, Deputy District Attorney, and the Court having	3
	22	considered the matter, including briefs, transcripts, arguments of counsel, and documents or	1.
	23	file herein, now therefore, the Court makes the following findings of fact and conclusions of	f
0	24	aw:	
N	25 2 5 2 3	FINDINGS OF FACT	
RECEIVED	6 26 Z	1) Defendant was charged by way of Information with the following crimes: one coun	
E E	NE 27	of CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT KIDNAPPING (Felony – NRS 199.480, 200.030)	
	28	RECEIVED CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT ROBBERY (Felony - NRS 199.480)	;
		FEB152007	c
	Y.	CLERK OF SUPREME COURT	ł
			-

07-03777

one count of CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT MURDER (Felony – 199.480); two (2)
counts of ATTEMPT MURDER WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (Felony –
NRS 200.010, 200.030, 193.330,193.165); one count of BATTERY WITH USE OF
A DEADLY WEAPON (Felony – NRS 200.481; one count of ATTEMPT
ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (Felony – NRS 200.380, 193.330, 193.165); one count of ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON
(Felony – NRS 200.380, 193.165); one count of BURGLARY WHILE IN
POSSESSION OF A FIREARM (Felony – NRS 205.060); BURGLARY (Felony – NRS 205.060); six (6) counts of FIRST DEGREE KIDNAPPING WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (Felony – NRS 200.310,200.320,193.165) and one count of MAYHEM (Felony – NRS 200.280). Pursuant to plea negotiations, the State filed a fourth Amended Information dismissing thirteen out of the seventeen counts for which Defendant was initially charged.

14
2) On April 4, 2005, proceeding pro se with appointed stand-by counsel, Defendant pled
guilty to: COUNT 1 - ATTEMPT MURDER WITH USE OF A DEADLY
WEAPON (Felony - NRS 200.010, 200.030, 193.330, 193.165); COUNT 2 ROBBERY WITH USE OF A DEADLY WEAPON (Felony - NRS 200.380,
193.165); COUNT 3 - FIRST DEGREE KIDNAPPING (Felony - NRS 200.310,
200.320); and COUNT 4 - FIRST DEGREE KIDNAPPING WITH USE OF A
DEADLY WEAPON (Felony - NRS 200.310, 200.320, 193.165).

3) On August 08, 2005, Defendant was granted appointment of his stand-by counsel for representation at sentencing. The court, having heard argument from the State, Defendant and Defendant's counsel sentenced Defendant as follows: as to COUNT 1, a MAXIMUM of TWO HUNDRED FORTY (240) MONTHS and a MINIMUM of NINETY (90) MONTHS in the Nevada Department of Corrections (NDC), plus an equal and CONSECUTIVE MAXIMUM of TWO HUNDRED FORTY (240) MONTHS and a MINIMUM of NINETY (90) MONTHS for Use of a Deadly Weapon; on COUNT 2, a MAXIMUM of ONE HUNDRED EIGHTY (180)

P:\WPDOCS\FOF\outlying\4n0\4N098001.doc

MONTHS and a MINIMUM of SEVENTY-TWO (72) MONTHS in the Nevada
Department of Corrections (NDC), plus an equal and CONSECUTIVE MAXIMUM
of ONE HUNDRED EIGHTY (180) MONTHS and a MINIMUM of SEVENTY-
TWO (72) MONTHS for Use of a Deadly Weapon, CONCURRENT with Count 1;
on COUNT 3, a MAXIMUM of LIFE in the Nevada Department of Corrections
(NDC), with a MINIMUM of 15 YEARS before Parole Eligibility, CONCURRENT
with Counts 1 and 2; on COUNT 4, LIFE in the Nevada Department of Corrections
(NDC), with a MINIMUM of 5 YEARS before Parole Eligibility, plus an equal and
CONSECUTIVE LIFE in the Nevada Department of Prisons, with a MINIMUM of 5
YEARS before Parole Eligibility for Use of a Deadly Weapon, CONCURRENT with
Counts 1, 2, and 3, with NO Credit for Time Served. Judgment of Conviction was
filed on August 31, 2005.

- On August, 7, 2006, Defendant filed the instant Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Post-Conviction).
- 5) The district court properly canvassed Defendant and properly accepted the guilty plea which was made knowingly, intelligently, voluntarily, and it suffers from no constitutional defects.
- 6) Defendant's claim that he was induced into pleading guilty by the prosecutor's misrepresentations of law upon entry of his plea is completely belied by the record.
- 7) The trial court took sufficient steps to ensure that Defendant's guilty plea was made in a knowing, intelligent, and voluntary manner.
- 8) Defendant signed a guilty plea agreement with the guidance and advice of stand-by counsel on April 4, 2005. The agreement states the range of punishment in explicit detail for the relevant charges. The agreement also contains an explicit "WAIVER OF RIGHTS" section which details all the meaningful constitutional trial rights Defendant is giving up by pleading guilty including the right to testify, the right to confront and cross-examine witnesses, the right to subpoen a witnesses, and that each element of the charges must be proved by the State beyond a reasonable doubt.

P:\WPDOCS\FOF\outlying\4n0\4N098001.doc

P A	
1	Defendant's signature is affixed to the end of this document. There is also a separate
2	"certificate of counsel" signed by Defendant's attorney that avers as an officer of the
3	court that thorough discussions occurred with Defendant about all matters pertinent to
4	the case.
5	9) There is absolutely no indication from the record that the Court based its sentencing
6	decision on impalpable or highly suspect evidence.
7	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
8	1) The law in Nevada directs that "[t]he trial court should view the guilty plea as
9	presumptively valid and the burden should be on the defendant to establish that the
10	plea was not entered knowingly and intelligently." Bryant v. State, 102 Nev. 268,
11	272, 721 P.2d 364, 368 (1986). Further, a guilty plea should not be invalidated "as
12	long as the totality of the circumstances, as shown by the record, demonstrates that
13	the plea was knowingly and voluntarily made and that the defendant understood the
14	nature of the offense and the consequences of the plea." State v. Freese, 116 Nev.
15	1097, 1105, 13 P.3d 442, 448 (2000).
16	2) "To properly accept a guilty plea, a court must sufficiently canvass a defendant to
17	determine if the defendant knowingly and intelligently entered into the plea."
18	Williams v. State, 103 Nev. 227, 230, 737 P.2d 508, 510 (1987).
19	3) In <u>Hanley v. State</u> , the Court stated:
20	[I]n cases where a guilty plea is accepted, the record should affirmatively
21	show that certain minimal requirements are met. These are generally:
22	 an understanding waiver of constitutional rights and privileges;
23	2. absence of coercion by threat or promise of leniency;
24	 understanding of the consequences of the plea, the range of punishments; and
25	4. an understanding of the charge, the elements of the offense.
26	97 Nev. 130, 133, 624 P.2d 1387, 1389 (1981)(internal citations
27	omitted).
28	4) There is no requirement in Nevada that a "ritualistic oral canvass of a defendant"
	4 P:\WPDOCS\FOF\outlying\4n0\4N098001.doc

takes place prior to accepting a guilty plea, and the failure to conduct one does not invalidate a plea. <u>Freese</u>, 116 Nev. 1097, 1105, 13 P.3d 442, 448 (2000). The Supreme Court of Nevada "will not invalidate a plea as long as the totality of the circumstances, as shown by the record, demonstrates that the plea" was entered in a knowing and voluntary manner and defendant understood nature and consequences of the offense(s) and plea. <u>Id</u>. A court may not rely simply on a written plea agreement without some verbal interaction with a defendant. <u>Id</u>. Thus, a "colloquy" is constitutionally mandated, and a "colloquy" is but a conversation in a formal setting, such as that occurring between an official sitting in judgment of an accused at plea. *See <u>id</u>*.

5) The totality of the "record" to be evaluated for plea validity contains all of the following: (1) all interaction between the court and Defendant up to the moment of the plea; (2) an extensive and express written plea agreement signed by Defendant; and (3) a certification from Defendant's attorney that full discussions about the case and all relevant matters occurred with Defendant and that Defendant was sufficiently advised and prepared to enter the plea with no cause for legal concern; and (4) a plea "canvass" to verify that Defendant appreciated the consequences of the moment, and to give him one last chance to question any matter relevant to the proceedings. *See* State v. Freese, 116 Nev. 1097, 13 P.3d 442 (2000).

6) In <u>Hargrove v. State</u>, 100 Nev. 498, 502, 686 P.2d 222, 225 (1984), the Court held that claims asserted in a petition for post-conviction relief must be supported with specific factual allegations, which if true, would entitle the petitioner to relief.

 A defendant cannot repudiate any of the statements he makes on the record. <u>Lundy v.</u> <u>Warden</u>, 89 Nev. 419, 514 P.2d 212 (1973).

26 27 //

//

//

//

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

28

<u>ORDER</u> THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Post-Conviction) shall be, and it is, hereby denied. DATED this $25^{"}$ day of January, 2007. DISTRICT JUDGE **DAVID ROGER** DISTRICT ATTORNEY Nevada Bar #002781 BY MARC DIGIACOMO Chief Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar #006955 04FN0980X/GCU:lg ECOURT CLER P:\WPDOCS\FOF\outlying\4n0\4N098001.doc

æ