

February 2021
MPT-2 Library

State v. Kilross

Excerpts from Franklin Criminal Code and Franklin Rules of Evidence

Franklin Criminal Code § 25 Theft

A person commits the offense of theft when he unlawfully takes or, being in lawful possession thereof, unlawfully appropriates any property of another with the intention of depriving him of the property, regardless of the manner in which the property is taken or appropriated.

...

Franklin Criminal Code § 29 Robbery

(a) A person commits the offense of robbery when, with intent to commit theft, he takes property of another from the person or the immediate presence of another

(1) by use of force;

(2) by intimidation, by the use of threat or coercion, or by placing such person in fear of immediate serious bodily injury to himself or to another; or

(3) by sudden snatching.

(b) A person convicted of the offense of robbery shall be punished by imprisonment for not less than 1 nor more than 20 years. Robbery under this section is a felony.

Franklin Rules of Evidence

Rule 609. Impeachment by Evidence of a Criminal Conviction

(a) In General. The following rules apply to attacking a witness's character for truthfulness by evidence of a criminal conviction:

(1) for a crime that was punishable by death or by imprisonment for more than one year, the evidence

...

(B) must be admitted in a criminal case in which the witness is a defendant, if the probative value of the evidence outweighs its prejudicial effect to that defendant; and

(2) for any crime regardless of the punishment, the evidence must be admitted if the court can readily determine that establishing the elements of the crime required proving—or the witness's admitting—a dishonest act or false statement.

State v. Thorpe
Franklin Supreme Court (2012)

This case requires us to determine whether a prior conviction for robbery can be used to impeach a witness under Franklin Rule of Evidence 609(a)(2). This is a case of first impression in Franklin. Courts in other jurisdictions have reached contradictory conclusions on this question.

Jerome Thorpe robbed three different stores, on three separate days in July 2008. Thorpe pled guilty to two of these robberies, both of which were unarmed. In the third robbery, Thorpe and an accomplice presented a threatening note to a cashier; the accomplice had a pistol, which he pointed at the cashier. Thorpe contested the charge of aiding and abetting a robbery, claiming that he did not know that his accomplice had a gun.

Before trial, Thorpe indicated that he would testify and filed a pretrial motion to exclude the use of his guilty pleas to the two unarmed robberies for impeachment under Rule 609(a)(2). The trial court denied the motion. Thorpe testified and was impeached with the two guilty pleas. Thorpe was convicted, and the court of appeal affirmed. We review for abuse of discretion.

In relevant part, Rule 609(a)(2) provides generally that evidence of a prior conviction of a crime for which at least one element required proof of dishonesty or false statement, whether a felony or misdemeanor, may be used for impeachment, regardless of the severity of the offense. If a prior conviction falls within this category, the proponent of this impeachment evidence has an absolute right to use it for that purpose.

“Dishonesty” has at least two meanings. Broadly, the word connotes a breach of trust, including a “lack of . . . probity or integrity in principle,” “lack of fairness,” or a “disposition to betray.” Robbery may fit within this broad definition. More narrowly, “dishonesty” is defined as “deceitful behavior, or a disposition to lie, cheat, or defraud.” Robbery does not fit this definition because it is a crime of violent and not deceitful taking.

The Franklin Rules of Evidence are identical to the Federal Rules of Evidence. Given this, we have held that our courts may use federal legislative history as persuasive authority in interpreting the Franklin Rules. We find that the federal drafters intended the narrower definition of the term “dishonesty or false statement” [citations omitted]. Congress intended Rule 609(a)(2) to apply only to crimes that require proof of an element of misrepresentation or deceit, such as perjury, false statement, or criminal fraud, any of which bear directly on a witness’s propensity to testify truthfully.

Franklin’s definition of robbery includes no requirement that the prosecution prove an act of dishonesty or false statement to obtain a conviction. *See* Fr. Crim. Code § 29. Moreover, the definition of robbery references “theft” as a predicate offense. The crime of theft may involve dishonesty or false statement. But deception is not an essential element of theft; the definition in Franklin Criminal Code § 25 also does not require such proof. Therefore, we hold that the crime of robbery is not a crime with an element requiring proof of dishonesty or false statement that could automatically be used to impeach a witness under Rule 609(a)(2).

However, our inquiry does not end there. The State contends that recent revisions to the Federal and Franklin Rules of Evidence permit the court to look beyond statutory definitions to the factual circumstances underlying the prior offenses. We agree, but only up to a point. A 2007 amendment to Franklin Rule 609(a)(2) mirrors an identical 2006 amendment to the Federal Rules. This amendment permits use of a prior conviction for impeachment if facts in the record establish an act of dishonesty or false statement.

The Federal Advisory Committee Note to the 2006 amendment offers clear guidance on this new language:

Ordinarily, the statutory elements of the crime will indicate whether it is one of dishonesty or false statement. Where the deceitful nature of the crime is not apparent from the statute, . . . a proponent may offer information such as an indictment, a statement of admitted facts, or jury instructions to show that the fact-finder had to find, or the defendant had to admit, an act of dishonesty or false statement in order for the witness to have been convicted. But the amendment does not contemplate a “mini-trial” in which the court plumbs the record of the previous proceeding. . . .

In the case at hand, the prosecution can point to nothing in the record that establishes that Thorpe engaged in any act of deception or false statement when committing the two unarmed robberies. The prosecution could have done so by relying either on the language of its indictment or on facts admitted by the witness during the hearing on his guilty pleas, but it did not.

By way of example, in *State v. Frederick* (Fr. Ct. App. 2008), the defendant was charged with theft. The prosecution sought to introduce the defendant’s plea to an earlier shoplifting case. At her plea hearing in the shoplifting case, the defendant admitted that she had placed unpurchased items in a backpack and then lied about its contents to a security officer. We held that the prosecution had sufficiently proved acts of deception to use the prior crime to impeach the defendant under Rule 609. By contrast, in this case, the prosecution offered no such proof. In admitting the evidence, the trial court abused its discretion.

Reversed.

State v. Hartwell
Franklin Court of Appeal (2014)

Michael Hartwell was convicted of being a felon in possession of a firearm under the Franklin Criminal Code. In this appeal, Hartwell contends that the trial court erred in admitting evidence of a prior conviction for firearms possession to impeach his testimony at trial.

Hartwell was arrested after a police officer allegedly saw him pull a weapon out of his pocket and hold it behind his back while he and Tim Wagner walked past the officer's cruiser. The officer jumped out of the car and advised Hartwell and Wagner to drop their weapons. The officer testified that he saw a gun drop to the ground between Wagner's legs. Hartwell was arrested. As he was taken into custody, Hartwell exclaimed, "That's not my gun. You didn't see me with a gun." Later, a records search revealed that Hartwell was a convicted felon who was not permitted to possess a firearm.

At trial, Hartwell sought to prove that Wagner had possessed the gun and sought to impeach the testimony of the arresting officer. Hartwell also took the stand to testify that he had pulled his cell phone from his pocket, not a gun. Relying on Franklin Rule of Evidence 609(a)(1)(B), the trial court permitted the State to impeach Hartwell with a certified copy of a six-year-old federal conviction for possession of a firearm by a convicted felon, a federal offense identical to the one for which Hartwell was on trial. Hartwell was convicted.

Rule 609 permits evidence of a prior felony conviction to be offered to impeach a testifying witness. However, when the testifying witness is also the defendant in a criminal trial, the prior conviction is admitted only "if the probative value of the evidence outweighs its prejudicial effect to that defendant." Fr. Rule of Evid. 609(a)(1)(B). This reflects a heightened balancing test and creates a preference for exclusion. We review evidentiary decisions for abuse of discretion.

We consider four factors when weighing the probative value against the prejudicial effect under this heightened test: (1) the nature of the prior crime involved, (2) when the conviction occurred, (3) the importance of the defendant's testimony to the case, and (4) the importance of the credibility of the defendant.

(1) The nature of the prior crime: In evaluating the "nature of the prior crime," courts should consider the impeachment value of the prior conviction and its similarity to the charged crime. "Impeachment value" refers to how probative the prior conviction is of the witness's character for truthfulness. Crimes of violence generally have lower probative value in weighing

credibility. By contrast, crimes that by their nature imply some dishonesty have much higher impeachment value. In this case, Hartwell's prior conviction for possession of a firearm does not imply dishonesty and thus has relatively low probative value as impeachment.

As to "similarity," the more similar the prior crime is to the present charge, the stronger the grounds for exclusion. Admission of evidence of a similar offense can lead the jury to draw the impermissible inference that, because the defendant was convicted before, it is more likely that he committed the present offense. As stated in the Advisory Committee Notes to Rule 609, "the danger that prior convictions will be misused as character evidence is particularly acute when the defendant is impeached." Given this potential prejudice, evidence of similar offenses for impeachment under Rule 609 should be admitted sparingly if at all. Hartwell's prior conviction is for a crime virtually identical to the one for which he was tried in this case, maximizing the risk of prejudice.

(2) The age of the prior conviction: The Franklin Rules presumptively exclude convictions more than 10 years old. But even for convictions less than 10 years old, the passage of time can reduce the conviction's probative value, especially where other circumstances suggest a changed character. A prior conviction may have less probative value when the defendant has maintained a spotless record since the earlier conviction. Here, the prior conviction is six years old, and Hartwell has incurred no further convictions during that time.

(3) The importance of the defendant's testimony: The third factor focuses on the importance of the defendant's testimony to his defense at trial. If the defendant's only rebuttal comes from his own testimony, the court should consider whether impeachment with a prior conviction would prevent the defendant from taking the stand on his own behalf, severely undercutting his ability to present a defense. By contrast, if the defendant can establish his defense with evidence other than his own testimony, impeaching with a prior conviction would have less of an impact on the defendant's case. Wagner, Hartwell's companion, chose not to testify, exercising his Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination. Thus, Hartwell had only his own testimony to support his theory at trial.

(4) The importance of the defendant's credibility: Where the defendant's credibility is the focus of the trial, the significance of admitting a prior conviction is heightened. But if the defendant testifies to unimportant matters or to uncontested facts, his credibility matters less and the need to impeach with prior convictions is lessened.

Hartwell's credibility is a central issue in the case, as is that of the arresting officer. But all other factors weigh *against* use of the prior conviction. The probative value of the prior conviction for attacking the defendant's credibility is low and is lessened still further by its age (six years) and the defendant's spotless record since that time. Further, the fact that the past conviction is virtually identical to the present offense creates a heightened risk of prejudice, one that has a significant impact on the central theory of the defendant's case.

We hold that the State has failed to meet its burden of establishing that the probative value of the prior offense for impeachment purposes outweighs its prejudicial impact. Thus, the trial court abused its discretion in admitting this evidence.

Reversed.