- 7. Convictions appealed from: two counts of Battery with a Deadly Weapon Causing Substantial Bodily Harm.
- 8. Sentence for each count: Two (2) consecutive terms of a minimum thirty-five (35) months to one hundred fifty-six (156) months for the two counts of Battery with a Deadly Weapon Causing Substantial Bodily Harm.
 - 9. Date of decision: June 1, 2012.
 - 10. Date of written judgment: June 5, 2012.
- 11. This is not an appeal from an order granting or denying a petition for a writ of habeas corpus.
 - 12. The time has not been tolled by the filing of any motion.
 - 13. Date Notice of Appeal filed: June 26, 2012.
- 14. Statute governing time limit for filing notice of appeal: Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure (NRAP) Rule 4(b)(1)(A).
- 15. Statute, rule or other authority granting Supreme Court to review judgment appealed from: NRS 177.015(3).
 - 16. Nature of Disposition below: Judgment after entry of plea.
 - 17. Pending and prior proceedings in this court: none.
 - 18. Pending and prior proceedings in other courts: none.
 - 19. Proceedings raising same issues: none.
- 20. Procedural history: On January 23, 2012, the State filed an information charging KUPA'A KEA with two counts of Battery with a Deadly Weapon Causing Substantial Bodily Harm. See, Appellant's Index, pp. 1-2. On February 7, 2012, the Appellant signed a guilty plea memorandum wherein the State agreed to dismiss a drug charge in another case, forego filing additional charges and the Appellant agreed to plead guilty to the two counts of Battery with a Deadly Weapon Causing Substantial Bodily Harm. Both sides were free to argue. See, Appellant's Index, 4-9. On February 8, 2012, the Appellant pled guilty to the charges. See, Appellant's Index,

pp. 12-21. At sentencing, the Appellant acknowledged that prison was appropriate, but asked for less that the maximum sentence based upon his drug addiction and issues with his early life. See, Appellant's Index, p. 81. The district court sentenced the Appellant to 35-156 months on each count to run consecutively. See, Appellant's Index, pp. 83-84.

21. Statements of Facts: This is an appeal from a judgment of conviction pursuant to a guilty plea. The Appellant was sentenced to 35-156 months on each count to run consecutively. See, Appellant's Index, pp. 83-84.

The Appellant lived in an abusive environment as he was growing up. See, Appellant's Index, pp. 57-58. His mother moved to the East Coast thereby abandoning him and also giving his sister, Momi, guardianship while he was being detained in Rite of Passage here in Nevada. See, Appellant's Index, p. 58. His grade school teacher, Ms. Hardaway and his principal, Ms. Ford, tried to befriend him, seeing him as a child who slipped through the cracks. See, Appellant's Index, p. 59. The Appellant turned to alcohol and methamphetamine to mask the abandonment and pain he felt. See, Appellant's Index, pp. 59-60. Mr. KEA is eighteen years old, and according to Ms. Mahaffey, the psychologist who evaluated him, his character and personality are not yet totally formulated. See, Appellant's Index, pp. 60-62. The Appellant stated that he wants to cut the gang ties. See, Appellant's Index, pp. 62 & 64. The report of the psychologist noted that young people are less culpable because of their psychosocial immaturity. See, Appellant's Index, p. 64. The Appellant requested two concurrent sentences of 24 to 72 months. See, Appellant's Index, p. 64.

- 22. Issues on Appeal: The Appellant's sentence violates the Eighth Amendment proscription against punishments that are disproportionate to the crime committed.
- 23. Legal Argument: The Eighth Amendment declares: "Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted." The final clause prohibits not only barbaric punishments, but also sentences that are disproportionate to the crime committed. Solem v. Helm, 463 U.S. 277, 286, 103 S.Ct. 3001, 3006(1983). In Pickard v. State, 94 Nev. 681, 585 P.2d 1342 (1978) the court observed: "Punishment may be constitutionally

impermissible under the Eighth Amendment not only because of its nature or mode, but also because of its severity or harshness." The United States Supreme Court, in <u>Coker v. Georgia</u>, 433 U.S. 584, 592, 97 S.Ct. 2861, 2865, 53 L.Ed.2d 982 (1977), reaffirmed its prior holding in <u>Gregg v. Georgia</u>, 428 U.S. 153, 96 S.Ct. 2909, 49 L.Ed.2d 859 (1976), that "a punishment is 'excessive' and unconstitutional if it (1) makes no measurable contribution to acceptable goals of punishment and hence is nothing more than the purposeless and needless imposition of pain and suffering; or (2) is grossly out of proportion to the severity of the crime.

While the Second Judicial District Court did not impose the maximum sentence in the instant case, the sentence is too harsh when one considers the age of the Appellant, his psychosocial immaturity, the fact that he is less responsible for his actions because of his age, his abandonment by his family at an early age, his taking responsibility for his actions, his divorcing himself from the gang influence even though it was his surrogate family, and his substance abuse. This was the Appellant's first felony conviction. To send an eighteen year old to prison for a minimum of 70 months, almost six (6) years is harsh. The Appellant understands what he did and has taken responsibility for it. To order the Appellant to spend more than 24 - 72 months in prison is purposeless and needless imposition of pain and suffering.

- 24. Preservation of issues: The issue of the severity of the Appellant's sentence was discussed at the Appellant's sentencing. See, Appellant's Index, pp. 52-66, 77-81.
 - 25. This is not a case of first impression.

Pursuant to NRS 239B.030 the undersigned hereby affirms that this document does not contain a Social Security Number.

Dated this 5 day of September, 2012.

KATHRINE I. BERNING, ESQ

Nevada State Bar #3678 Fry & Berning, LLC.

195 Casazza Drive

Reno, Nevada 89502

Telephone (775) 329-8646

AFFIDAVIT OF KATHRINE I. BERNING

County of Washoe)
)ss.
State of Nevada)

- I, KATHRINE I. BERNING, under penalty of perjury I state that the following assertions are true:
- 1. That I am an attorney duly authorized to practice law in the State of Nevada, and am the attorney of record for Appellant, KUPA'A KEA in Case Number 61160;
- 2. That I had been appointed to represent Mr. KEA through the Alternate Public Defender's office in conjunction with the BELL CONFLICT GROUP;
- 3. That, even though I drafted many Supreme Court appeals documents several years ago, prior to my representation of Mr. KEA, I had never prepared nor filed a Fast Track Appeal Statement with Supreme Court for the State of Nevada;
- 4. That my client filed a Notice of Appeal with the Second Judicial District Court on June 26, 2012;
- 5. That, due to a procedural oversight on my part, I was not aware at the time that I filed a Fast Track Appeal Statement to the Court when there were several key deficiencies present in the document;
- 6. It was not my intention to knowingly submit a document that was missing the required information as outlined in the Nevada Rules of Appellate Procedure;
- 7. I respectfully request that I be allowed to submit a Supplemental Fast Track Appeal Statement that will correct the deficiencies that are present in the initial Fast Track Appeal Statement;
- 8. Deputy District Attorney JENNIFER NOBLE, ESQ., does not oppose my filing a Supplement and she has graciously agreed to file a Supplement to her Fast Track Response.

Dated this 4th day of September, 2012.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this day of September, 2012.

Notary Appoint

BARRY L. BLOUGH
Notary Public - State of Nevada
Appointment Recorded in Washoe County
No: 09-10029-2 - Expires May 27, 2013