

	FIRST REGULAR SESSION	
ONE HUNE	DRED AND ELEVENTH LEGISLATURE	
Legislative Documen	nt	No. 72
H.P. 576	House of Representatives, February	y 10, 1 9 8
Referred to the Co ordered printed.	ommittee on Judiciary, sent up for concurrence	and
	EDWIN H. PEI	RT, Cler
Presented by Represent Cosponsor: Repres	tative Bell of Paris. sentative Livesay of Brunswick.	
	STATE OF MAINE	
I	IN THE YEAR OF OUR LORD	
NINETE	EEN HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-THREE	
	o Permit the Appeal of Denials	
	he Suppression of Evidence by Criminal Defendants.	
Be it enacted by follows:	y the People of the State of Mai	ne as
15 MRSA §211	15-B is enacted to read:	
§2115-B. Appeal guilty		lea o:
1. Appeals	after plea of guilty. An appea	<u>l ma</u>
<u>be taken by a</u> tions of law fro	a defendant in criminal cases on om the District Court and fro	m the
Superior Court	to the Law Court, after the def	endan
	lea of guilty to a complaint, in	
has heretofore	ent, on all issues that the def been permitted to appeal afte	r tha
	ionally, from an order of the	

prior to that plea denying the defendant's motion for
 the suppression of any evidence, including, but not
 limited to, physical or identification evidence or
 evidence of a confession or admission.

5 2. Cross appeal by the State. When the defen-6 dant appeals pursuant to subsection 1, the State 7 shall be permitted to appeal on questions of law from an order of the court prior to the defendant's plea 8 of guilty granting that defendant's motion for the 9 suppression of any other evidence, including, but not 10 11 limited to, physical or identification evidence or 12 evidence of a confession or admission.

- <u>3. Rules. The Maine Rules of Criminal Procedure</u>
 and District Court Criminal Rules shall apply as in
 any other appeal of a criminal action by a defendant.
- 16 <u>4. Effect of an appellate reversal. Should the</u> 17 appellate review result in a reversal of the lower 18 court's denial of the defendant's motion for the sup-19 pression of any evidence, the defendant shall be per-20 mitted to withdraw his plea of guilty and proceed to 21 trial as if he had not entered that plea.
- 5. Liberal construction. This section shall be
 liberally construed to effectuate its purpose of
 allowing defendants to appeal issues of the suppres sion of evidence without the necessity of proceeding
 through otherwise unnecessary trials.
- 27

STATEMENT OF FACT

28 The purpose of this bill is to allow defendants appeal denials of their motions to suppress evi-29 to 30 dence without the necessity of proceeding to trail in 31 order to preserve the issue. Decisional law presently allows appeals after guilty pleas only on 32 33 jurisdictional and sentence issues, see Dow v. State, Me., 275 A.2d 815, 821 (1971). The theory behind allowing defendants to appeal jurisdictional issues, 34 35 and conversely why other issues cannot be appealed, 36 37 is that jurisdictional issues "cannot be validated by waiver or consent," Id., all other issues, therefore, 38 39 being presumed waived by the plea of guilty.

1 Frequently, the state's prospect of obtaining a 2 conviction of a particular defendant rests solely or 3 primarily on a piece of evidence that was obtained 4 under circumstances which would allow the defendant 5 move to suppress that evidence. Examples would to 6 include a drug search and seizure, a one-person identification of a defendant or a defendant's confes-7 8 sion, each where there exists no or little other evidence to connect the defendant to the crime. 9 If the 10 evidence is suppressed, the State would have to dismiss its case; if it is not suppressed, the defendant 11 faces sure conviction at trial. Under the present 12 13 law regarding appeals, the defendant foregoes his 14 right to appeal what he maintains were constitution-15 ally infirm actions by law enforcement officers if he pleads guilty. To preserve that appeal, he must pro-16 ceed with an unnecessary trial at considerable 17 expense and wasted time to himself, the prosecution 18 19 and the judicial system as a whole.

This bill allows the defendant to appeal those constitutional issues, and allows the State the right to cross appeal a grant of suppression of other evidence thus clarifying all suppression issues at the same time, despite a post-suppression hearing, pretrial plea of guilty.

26

0917012583