

1972

## **Michael Nielson v. John v. Turner, Warden, Utah State Prison : Brief of Respondent**

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/uofu\\_sc2](https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/uofu_sc2)

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. Vernon B. Romney, David S. Young, William T. Evans; Attorney for Respondent

---

### **Recommended Citation**

Brief of Respondent, *Nielson v. Turner*, No. 12781 (1972).  
[https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/uofu\\_sc2/5582](https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/uofu_sc2/5582)

This Brief of Respondent 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](mailto:hunterlawlibrary@byu.edu).

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

MICHAEL NIELSON,  
*Plaintiff-Appellant,*

vs.

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

Case No.  
12761

**BRIEF OF RESPONDENT**

APPEAL FROM THE JUDGMENT OF  
THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT, IN AND  
SALT LAKE COUNTY, STATE OF UTAH, THE  
HONORABLE ALLEN B. SORENSEN, PRESIDENT

VERNON B. ROMNEY  
Attorney General

DAVID S. YOUNG  
Chief Assistant Attorney General

WILLIAM T. EVANS  
Assistant Attorney General

236 State Capitol  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114

Attorneys for  
**FILED**

SEP 7 - 1972

F. JOHN HILL  
343 South Sixth East  
Salt Lake City, Utah  
*Attorney for Appellant*

Clerk, Supreme Court, Utah

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
STATEMENT OF THE NATURE OF THE CASE	1
DISPOSITION IN THE LOWER COURT .....	1
RELIEF SOUGHT ON APPEAL .....	2
STATEMENT OF FACTS .....	2
ARGUMENT .....	2
POINT I. THE COURT BELOW PROPERLY DENIED PETITIONER'S WRIT WITHOUT AFFORDING HIM AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING .....	2
CONCLUSION .....	4

### CASES CITED

#### *Federal*

Sunal v. Large, 332 U. S. 174, 91 L. Ed. 1982, 67 S. Ct. 620 (1946) .....	3
--	---

#### *State*

Scandrett v. Turner, 26 Utah 2d 371, 389 P. 2d 1186 (1971) .....	2
---	---

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

---

MICHAEL NIELSON,  
*Plaintiff-Appellant,*

vs.

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

Case No.  
12781

---

**BRIEF OF RESPONDENT**

---

**STATEMENT OF THE NATURE OF THE CASE**

This is an appeal from the judgment of the trial court dismissing appellant's Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus.

**DISPOSITION IN THE LOWER COURT**

Appellant's Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus was dismissed on motion of the respondent without an evidentiary hearing.

## RELIEF SOUGHT ON APPEAL

Respondent asks this court to affirm the judgment of the court below dismissing the Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus.

## STATEMENT OF FACTS

The respondent agrees with the Statement of Facts as set out by the appellant.

## ARGUMENT

## POINT I.

THE COURT BELOW PROPERLY DENIED  
PETITIONER'S WRIT WITHOUT AFFORD-  
ING HIM AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING.

Having raised the same issues that were decided in his appeal, petitioner is now seeking to, "under the guise of this petition, relitigate those issues." *Scandrett v. Turner*, 26 Utah 2d 371, 389 P. 2d 1186 (1971) at 1187. The District Court had available the Utah Supreme Court's opinion of this case on appeal which fully detailed the facts in its exploration of the same issues.

Questions decided by the highest court of appeal are considered law. When the issues presented before a State District Court in a petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus are the same as have been decided against petitioner on appeal to the State Supreme Court, the District Court

is under no obligation to hear the evidence again and has no authority to overrule the State Supreme Court on those issues.

This tactic is not new and neither have the courts allowed it to be successful. Writs of Habeas Corpus are not subject to the doctrine of Res Judicata and the courts are therefore, often confronted with successive writs elaborating the same issues with a slightly different twist. There is an inevitable attraction in the position that a person convicted of a serious crime should receive a new trial whenever a later decision of the highest court indicates that, with the benefit of hindsight, a different course should have been followed at his trial. Of this the Supreme Court commented: "Litigation in these criminal cases will be interminable." *Sunal v. Large*, 332 U. S. at 182, 91 L. Ed. 1982, 67 S. Ct. 620 (1946).

Furthermore, the facts found in an evidentiary hearing for the express purpose of a writ of habeas corpus are no more binding on the Federal Courts than are facts found in a hearing which has litigated the same issues at the original trial. The call for repetition is an unmerited harassment of the judicial process.

## CONCLUSION

There is no need for an evidentiary hearing at any level so long as the issues remain the same as those already confirmed through the appeal process.

To summarily deny such a writ is a prudent exercise of judicial authority and a wise preservation of the court's time.

Respectfully submitted,

VERNON B. ROMNEY  
Attorney General

DAVID S. YOUNG  
Chief Assistant Attorney General

WILLIAM T. EVANS  
Assistant Attorney General

*Attorneys for Respondent*