

1971

Kjeld Victorio Guglielmetti v. John W. Turner, Warden, Utah State Prison : Appellant's Brief

Utah Supreme Court

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/uofu_sc2



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Original Brief submitted to the Utah Supreme Court; funding for digitization provided by the Institute of Museum and Library Services through the Library Services and Technology Act, administered by the Utah State Library, and sponsored by the S.J. Quinney Law Library; machine-generated OCR, may contain errors.

Larry V. Lunt; Attorney for Defendant-Respondent Galen Ross; Attorney for Plaintiff-Appellant

Recommended Citation

Brief of Appellant, *Guglielmetti v. Turner*, No. 12600 (Utah Supreme Court, 1971).

https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/uofu_sc2/3171

This Brief of Appellant is brought to you for free and open access by BYU Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Utah Supreme Court Briefs (1965 –) by an authorized administrator of BYU Law Digital Commons. For more information, please contact hunterlawlibrary@byu.edu.

**IN THE SUPREME COURT
of the
STATE OF UTAH**

KJELD VICTORIO GUGLIELMETTI,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

—vs.—

JOHN W. TURNER, Warden, Utah State
Prison,
Defendant-Respondent

Case No.
12600

APPELLANT'S BRIEF

An Appeal from the Judgment of the Third District
Court for Salt Lake County, State of Utah
Honorable Stewart M. Hansen, Presiding

GALEN ROSS
Attorney-at-Law
731 East South Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah
*Attorney for Plaintiff-
Appellant*

LARRY V. LUNT
Attorney-at-Law
State Capitol Building
Salt Lake City, Utah
*Attorney for Defendant-
Respondent*

FILED
1973-1971

Clerk, Supreme Court, Utah

INDEX

	<i>Page</i>
STATEMENT OF THE NATURE OF THE CASE.....	1
DISPOSITION IN THE LOWER COURT.....	2
RELIEF SOUGHT ON APPEAL.....	2
STATEMENT OF THE FACTS	3
ARGUMENT	4
POINT I—IN ACCEPTING GUILTY PLEAS TO FELONY CRIMES, COURTS ARE REQUIRED TO ASCERTAIN THAT A DEFENDANT IS VOLUNTARILY AND UN- DERSTANDINGLY PLEADING BECAUSE BY A GUILTY PLEA A DEFENDANT WAIVES A NUM- BER OF FUNDAMENTAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS, AND THE RECORD MUST SHOW THAT A FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL STANDARD OF VOLUNTARINESS AND UNDERSTANDING HAS BEEN MET.	4
POINT II—ABSENT A WARNING BY TRIAL COURT, AND NOTWITHSTANDING PRESENCE OF COUN- SEL THE RECORD DISCLOSES ADEQUATE EVI- DENCE TO SUPPORT APPELLANT'S CONTEN- TION THAT HIS ENTERING OF A PLEA OF GUILTY WAS NOT VOLUNTARY BECAUSE UN- CONSTITUTIONAL INDUCED BY A PLEA BAR- GAINING PROCEDURE.	18
POINT III—ABSENT A WARNING BY TRIAL COURT AND NOTWITHSTANDING PRESENCE OF COUN- SEL, APPELLANT'S GUILTY PLEA WAS NOT VOL-	

INDEX—Continued

	<i>Page</i>
UNTARILY ENTERED BECAUSE INDUCED BY LACK OF INFORMATION AS TO THE CONSEQUENCES THEREOF, AMOUNTING TO GROSS INADEQUACY OF REPRESENTATION AS FAR AS THE RECORD DISCLOSES, THEREBY DEPRIVING HIM OF EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL GUARANTEED BY THE SIXTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION.	22
POINT IV—APPELLANT IS ENTITLED TO THE OPERATION OF THE PRESUMPTION THAT HIS GUILTY PLEA WAS INVOUNTARY UNLESS THE RECORD SHOWS AN INTELLIGENT AND VOLUNTARY WAIVER OF BASIC CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS.	26
POINT V—EVEN IF NOT ENTITLED TO THE OPERATION OF A PRESUMPTION OF INVOLUNTARINESS, APPELLANT MET THE UTAH CASE LAW REQUIREMENT OF INVOLUNTARINESS BY SHOWING VIOLATION OF A FUNDAMENTAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT, AND IT WAS ERROR TO HOLD THAT HE DID NOT MEET HIS BURDEN OF PROOF.	28
POINT VI -- APPELLANT'S GUILTY PLEA WAS NOT UNDERSTANDINGLY MADE BECAUSE SO FAR AS THE RECORD DISCLOSES, APPELLANT WAS AT NO TIME ADVISED OR ADMONISHED AS TO THE POSSIBLE MAXIMUM CONSEQUENCES OF SUCH A PLEA, OR AS TO THE STATUTORY MINIMUM SENTENCE OF FIVE YEARS, AND AS A REASON-	

INDEX—Continued

Page

ABLY INTELLIGENT PERSON APPELLANT COULD HAVE BELIEVED THAT HE WOULD RE- CEIVE A RELATIVELY MINOR PENALTY, AND SAID FAILURE TO MAKE CLEAR TO HIM THE CONSEQUENCES OF PLEADING GUILTY AMOUNT- ED TO ERROR SO SUBSTANTIAL AND PREJU- DICIAL AS TO OBTAIN ANY POSSIBILITY OF APPELLANT'S PLEADING WITH ANY REALISTIC CONCEPTION OF THE PROBABLE RESULTS THEREOF.	31
POINT VII — A DECISION OF THIS COURT HANDED DOWN SINCE THE DATE OF APPELLANT'S SEN- TENCING HAS DEFINED THE UTAH STATUTORY LANGUAGE RELATIVE TO SENTENCING FOR THE CRIME OF SELLING A NARCOTIC DRUG TO IN- CLUDE THE POSSIBILITY OF PROBATION BY THE TRIAL COURT, WHICH LANGUAGE HAD PRE- VIOUSLY SEEMED TO MANDATE INCARCERA- TION FOR AN INDETERMINATE TERM OF FROM FIVE YEARS TO LIFE; AND SINCE THE RECORD OF APPELLANT'S SENTENCING INDICATES THAT THE JUDGE WAS UNAWARE THAT HE COULD GRANT PROBATION, THEREFORE THE SENTENCE IMPOSED UPON APPELLANT MAY HAVE BEEN FAR GREATER THAN THE LAW RE- QUIRED, OR THAN THE TRIAL COURT WOULD HAVE IMPOSED HAD HE BEEN AWARE OF THE PROBATIONARY OPTION, AND THE SENTENCE SHOULD BE REDUCED ACCORDINGLY.	36
CONCLUSION	38

INDEX—Continued

Page

UTAH CASES CITED

Brown v. Turner, 21 U.2d 96, 440 P.2d 968 (1968).....	30
Klotz v. Turner, 23 U.2d 303, 462 P.2d 705 (1969).....	13
Kryger and Stewart v. Turner, U.2d, 479 P.2d 477 (1971)	24
Mayne v. Turner, 24 U.2d 195, 468 P.2d 369 (1970).....	29
State v. Banford, 13 U.2d 63, 368 P.2d 473 (1962).....	29, 32
State v. Barlow, U.2d, 283 P.2d 236 (1971).....	37

FEDERAL CASES CITED

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Boykin v. Alabama, 395 U.S. 238, 23 L.Ed. 2 274, 89 S. Ct. 709 (1969).....	5, 26
Carnley v. Cochran, 369 U.S. 506, 8 L.Ed. 2 70, 82 S. Ct. 884 (1962)	5
Douglas v. Alabama, 380 U.S. 415, 13 L.Ed. 2 934, 85 S. Ct. 1074 (1965)	8
McCarthy v. U.S., 394 U.S. 459, 22 L.Ed. 2 418, 89a S. Ct. 1166 (1969)	9
Machiba v. U.S., 368 U.S. 487, 7 L. Ed. 2 473, 82 S. Ct. 510 (1962)	5

INDEX—Continued

	<i>Page</i>
McMann v. Richardson, 397 U.S. 759, 25 L. Ed. 2 763, 90a S. Ct. 1441 (1970)	22
North Carolina v. Alford, 400 U.S. 25, 27 L.Ed. 2 162, 91 S. Ct. 160 (1970)	23
Parker v. North Carolina, 397 U.S. 790, 25 L.Ed. 2 785, 90 S. Ct. 1458, 90 S. Ct. 1474.....	5
Ziang Sung Wan v. U.S., 266 U.S. 1, 69 L.Ed. 131, 455 S. Ct. 1 (1924)	19

INFERIOR FEDERAL COURTS

Jones v. U.S., (2dCir. 1971) Bur. Nat. Affrs., 9Crt. Rep. 2012..	10
Munich v. U.S., 337 F.2d 356 (9 Cir. 1964).....	29, 33
Shelton v. U.S., (5th Cir. 1957) 242 F. 2d 101.....	19
U.S. ex rel. Fink v. Rundle, 414 F.2d 542 (3d Cir. 1969).....	8
U.S. v. Malcolm, 432 F.2d 809 (2d Cir. 1970).....	29
Waddy v. Heer, 383 F.2d 789 (6th Cir. 1967).....	11
William v. Beto, 354 F.2d 698 (5th Cir. 1965).....	24
McCulloch v. U.S., 231 F. Supp. 740 (N.D. Fl. 1964).....	29

CASES AND AUTHORITIES

Quibell v. U.S., 265 F. Supp. 474 (S.D. Cal. 1966).....	29
U.S. ex rel. Smith v. Hendrick, 260 F. Supp. 235 (ED Pa. 1966)	8
U.S. ex rel. Young v. Monroney, 309 F. Supp. 109 (E.D. Pa. 1969)	8

INDEX—Continued

	<i>Page</i>
CASES FROM OTHER STATES	
Commonwealth ex rel. Wes v. Rundle, 428 Pa. 102, 237 A.2d 196	33
Day v. Page, 436 P.2d 59 (Okla. Crim. 19).....	33
People v. Baxton, 10 Ill. 2d 295, 139 NE2d 754, (1957) cert. den. in 353 U.S. 976	11
People v. Nixon Fooks, Land and Robinson, 21 NY2d 338, 234 NE2d 687 (1967)	12, 29
People v. Seaton, 19 NY2d 404, 227 NE2d 294 (1967).....	11
State v. Blaylock, 394 SW 2d 364 (Mo. 1965).....	11, 29, 33
State v. Burke, 22 Wis. 2d 486, 126 NW2d 91 (1964).....	11
State v. Jones, 267 Minn. 421, 127 NW 2d 153 (1964).....	33
Woods v. Rhay, 68 Wash. 601, 414 P.2d 601 (1966) cert. den. in 385 U.S. 905, 17 L.Ed. 2d 135, 87 S. Ct. 215	11, 33

STATUTES CITED

Utah Code Anno. (1953), § 58-13a-44 (3)	37
Utah Code Ann. (1953), § 77-24-6	29, 32
Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, Rule 11, Pleas.....	5
Colorado Revised Statutes, Anno. § 39-7-8	11
Illinois Revised Statutes, c. 38 §§ 113-1, 114-1.....	11

INDEX—Continued

Page

OTHER AUTHORITIES

American Bar Association Project on Minimum Standards for Criminal Justice, Standards Relating to Pleas of Guilty, Tentative Draft (Feb. 1967)	11
Annotation, ALR2d, Later Case Service, 203 supplementing 97 ALR2d 549-604.....	33