No. 10-

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

LUIS MARIANO MARTINEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

DORA SCHRIRO,

Respondent.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

ROBERT BARTELS
Counsel of Record
SANDRA DAY O'CONNOR COLLEGE OF LAW
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY
Tempe, AZ 85287-7906
(480) 965-7053
Robert.Bartels@asu.edu

Attorney for Petitioner

234520

COUNSEL PRESS
(800) 274-3321 • (800) 359-6859

QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether a defendant in a state criminal case who is prohibited by state law from raising on direct appeal any claim of ineffective assistance of trial counsel, but who has a state-law right to raise such a claim in a first post-conviction proceeding, has a federal constitutional right to effective assistance of first post-conviction counsel specifically with respect to his ineffective-assistance-of-trial-counsel claim.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents

TABLE OF APPENDICES

TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

Page

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

STATUTES

Cited Authorities

Page

RULES

OPINIONS BELOW

The relevant decisions and opinions of the Maricopa County Superior Court, the Arizona Court of Appeals, the Supreme Court of Arizona, United States Magistrate Judge Mark E. Aspey, the United States District Court for the District of Arizona, and the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals and are reproduced in the Appendix to this Petition. The panel opinion of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals is reported as *Martinez v. Schriro*, 623 F.3d 731 (9th Cir. 2010).

JURISDICTION

The Court of Appeals denied rehearing on November 5, 2010. (App. at 84a). This petition is being filed within 90 days after entry of that judgment, pursuant to Supreme Court Rules 13.1 and 13.3. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED

The Sixth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides that "[i]n all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right . . . to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defence."

The Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides that "[n]o State shall . . . deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

I. State Court Proceedings

A. Evidence Presented at Trial

1. Petitioner was charged in the state trial court with two counts of sexual conduct with a person under the age of fifteen. 623 F.3d at 733 (App. at 3a). The State's theory was that Petitioner had sexual intercourse with his stepdaughter, Lacey, on two occasions during the morning of July 10, 1999. (Federal Habeas Corpus Petition [hereinafter "Habeas Pet."], District Court DN 1, at 8.)

2. Lacey testified at some length at trial, but she stated that she did not remember much of what had (or had not) happened on July 10, 1999 and for the weeks that followed. (*Id*.). On cross-examination, however, Lacey testified that Petitioner did **not** try to have sex with her or "put his penis up against" her. (*Id*.).

3. Although Lacey's trial testimony did not inculpate Petitioner, the State was permitted to offer testimony that Lacey had made statements prior to trial indicating that Petitioner had rubbed her "private area" and twice had put his "private area" inside her "private area." (*Id*.). On the other hand, there was evidence that Lacey had recanted her accusations against Petitioner during later pretrial conversations with several people. (*Id*.). Lacey's recantations were consistent with Petitioner's exculpatory statements to the police. (*Id*. at 67).

4. The prosecution sought to explain Lacey's recantations primarily by arguing that they were the result of her mother's failure to believe or support Lacey's

initial accusations against Petitioner. (*Id.* at 11]). In this regard, the prosecution relied heavily on expert testimony by a social worker, Wendy Dutton, that "a range of research" indicated that recantations by children of true accusations of sexual abuse most commonly were caused by a "lack of support from the mother of the victim." (*Id.*). Defense counsel did not seek to obtain or present expert testimony to refute Ms. Dutton's opinions, even though such testimony was available. (*Id.* at 12-13).

5. The State presented evidence that a nightgown that Lacey was wearing when the police arrived at the Martinez residence on the morning of July 10, 1999 contained semen stains that matched Petitioner's DNA. (*Id.*). However, the evidence also indicated that it was not possible to determine when the semen had been deposited on the nightgown, that semen still could be found on a garment even after it had been washed, that the extremely low sperm count in the semen samples on the nightgown could have resulted from washing, and that Lacey might have taken her nightgown from a pile of dirty laundry. (*Id.*). Moreover, vaginal swabs collected during a sexual assault examination on the day of the alleged assaults did not contain semen; and the same examination also did not disclose any evidence of injury or trauma on Lacey's body, including her vaginal area. (*Id.*).[1]

6. Petitioner was convicted on both of the counts against him, and he was sentenced to consecutive terms of 35 years to life. 623 F.3d at 733 (App. at 3a).

---

1. Trial counsel ineffectively failed to present additional evidence providing an exculpatory explanation for the State's DNA evidence. (*Id.* at 17-19).

B. State Appellate and Post-Conviction Proceedings

1. On direct appeal, Petitioner raised issues that are not relevant to this Petition. The Arizona Court of Appeals affirmed Petitioner's convictions, and the Arizona Supreme Court denied review. *Id.*

2. In May 2002, during the pendency of Petitioner's direct appeal but without his authorization, his court-appointed appellate counsel, Harriette Levitt, filed a Notice of Post-Conviction Relief. *Id.* at 733-34 (App. at 3a-4a). Under Arizona law, a convicted defendant commences a post-conviction relief proceeding by filing a "notice" of post-conviction relief" that does not include the defendant's claims for relief, which are to be stated in a subsequent "petition." *Id.* at 734 (App. at 3a).

3. There was no reason for Ms. Levitt to file a Notice of Post-Conviction Relief before the conclusion of Petitioner's direct appeal.[2] That Ms. Levitt in fact had no such reason became apparent in February 2003, when -- without having communicated with Petitioner's trial counsel, and without Petitioner's consent -- she filed with the state trial court a statement (a) asserting that she had "reviewed the transcripts and trial file and [could] find no colorable claims pursuant to Rule 32" and (b) requesting that the court issue an order granting Petitioner 45 days to file a pro se petition for post-conviction relief. *Id.* (App. at 4a); Habeas Pet. at 35. Ms. Levitt then failed effectively

2. Under Ariz.R.Crim.P. 32.4(a), a notice of post-conviction relief must be filed "within 30 days after the issuance of the order and mandate in the direct appeal."

to inform Petitioner that he needed to file his own petition,[3] and he did not do so. 623 F.3d at 734 (App. at 4a). On April 28, 2003, the state trial court dismissed the pending post-conviction Notice. *Id.*

4. Represented by new counsel, Petitioner filed a Notice of Post-Conviction Relief in the state trial court on October 18, 2004, and a timely Petition for Post-Conviction Relief on February 7, 2005. *Id.* The Petition alleged that Petitioner's trial counsel was ineffective, in violation of the Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, in several respects including failing to object to Ms. Dutton's expert testimony regarding the alleged victim's recantations, even though that testimony was inadmissible under state law; failing to research the purported basis for Ms. Dutton's testimony or to present readily available expert testimony that Ms. Dutton's testimony was inaccurate and misleading in light of the empirical literature in the field; failing to impeach an important prosecution witness with his own police report; failing to discover or present additional compelling evidence that the alleged victim's initial accusations were false and her subsequent recantations true; and failing to present exculpatory evidence relating the State's DNA evidence. *Id.* (App. at 4a); Habeas Pet. at 10-20, 22-25.[4]

---

3. Ms. Levitt's letters to Petitioner were written in English -- even after Petitioner had informed her, in Spanish, that he did not read English and did not "understand anything of what is happening." (Habeas Pet. at 36).

4. Petitioner also argued in the second post-conviction relief proceeding -- in the state trial court, the Arizona Court of Appeals, and the Arizona Supreme Court -- that he had a federal constitutional right to effective assistance of **first** post-conviction

5. The state trial court dismissed the post-conviction relief Petition without a hearing, finding that Petitioner's claims were "precluded," under Ariz.R.Crim.P. 32.2(a), because Ms. Levitt had not raised those claims in the aborted first post-conviction relief proceeding described above. 623 F.3d at 734 (App. at 5a). The Arizona Court of Appeals granted review but denied relief, solely on the ground that Petitioner's claim was precluded because it could have been raised in the previous post-conviction proceeding. *Id.*; App. at 81a-83a. The Arizona Supreme Court denied review without opinion. 623 F.3d at 734 (App. at 5a).

II. Federal Habeas Corpus Proceedings

1. Petitioner filed a Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus on April 24, 2008, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2241(a) and 2254(a). *Id.* The Petition asserted the above-referenced federal ineffective-assistance-of-counsel claim, and it argued that the claim was not subject to procedural default because Petitioner had not received the effective assistance of first post-conviction counsel, with respect to his ineffective-assistance-of-counsel claim, to which he was entitled under the United States Constitution. *Id.*; Habeas Pet. at 67-83, 87-94.

2. On December 12, 2008, the District Court issued an Order denying the Petition solely on the ground that Petitioner's claim was procedurally defaulted. 623 F.3d at 734 (App. at 5a).

---

counsel with respect to his ineffective-assistance-of-trial-counsel claim, but that Ms. Levitt had performed ineffectively. (Habeas Ex. 4 at 18-19; Habeas Ex. 9 at 5; App. at 8-9; Habeas Ex. 10 at 5-8). Thus, Petitioner exhausted the issue presented in this Petition under *Edwards v. Carpenter*, 529 U.S. 446, 450-51 (2000).

3. After Petitioner filed a timely Notice of Appeal, the District Court issued a Certificate of Appealability with respect to two related issues: "1) whether Arizona's procedural bar, as applied in this case, is an adequate and independent state law ground for denying relief; [and] 2) whether Petitioner has shown cause to excuse his procedural default." *Id.*

4. On September 27, 2010, the Court of Appeals issued a panel Opinion affirming the judgment of the District Court. *Martinez v. Schriro*, *supra*. The Court of Appeals' ruling was based on its holding that Petitioner did not have a federal right to effective assistance of his first post-conviction relief counsel with regard to his federal ineffective-assistance-of-trial-counsel claim, and that the claim therefore was procedurally defaulted. 623 F.3d at 735-43 (App. at 6a-25a).

5. On October 11, 2010, Petitioner filed a timely Petition for Panel Rehearing and Rehearing En Banc. That Petition was denied on November 5, 2010. (App. at 84a).

III. Basis for Federal Jurisdiction in the Court of First Instance

The District Court had jurisdiction of this habeas corpus action under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2241(a), 2241(c)(3), and 2254(a).

ARGUMENT

The Court of Appeals' dispositive holding that Petitioner did not have a federal right to effective assistance of first post-conviction counsel with respect to any ineffective-assistance-of-trial-counsel claim, even though the first post-conviction proceeding provided the first opportunity for Petitioner to raise such a claim, was contrary to this Court's decisions in *Douglas v. California*, 372 U.S. 353 (1963), and *Halbert v. Michigan*, 545 U.S. 605 (2005).

I. Petitioner's Federal Ineffective-Assistance-of-Trial-Counsel Claim is Not Subject to Procedural Default for Two Related Reasons

As noted above, the state courts denied Petitioner's ineffective-assistance-of-trial-counsel claim on the procedural ground that the claim was not raised in the aborted first post-conviction "proceeding" and therefore was precluded in the second post-conviction proceeding. Petitioner of course agrees with the Court of Appeals, 623 F.3d at 735 (App. at 6a-7a), that a federal habeas corpus court may not reach the merits of a claim which the state courts have denied on a procedural ground if that ground is "adequate and independent," unless the petitioner can demonstrate "cause and prejudice to excuse his default" (or show that failure to reach the merits would "result in a fundamental miscarriage of justice"). *Coleman v. Thompson*, 501 U.S. 722, 750 (1991); *Wainwright v. Sykes*, 433 U.S. 72, 90 (1977). In this case, however, there are two related, but independently sufficient, reasons why Petitioner's ineffective-assistance-of-trial-counsel claim was not procedurally defaulted: (A) the procedural ground

on which the Arizona Court of Appeals denied Petitioner's claim was not "adequate"; and (B) there is cause and prejudice to excuse any "adequate" default.

A. The procedural ground on which the state court denied Petitioner's federal claims was not "adequate"

As the Court of Appeals recognized, a "state procedural rule is not adequate to bar federal review if that 'state procedural rule frustrates the exercise of a federal right.'" 623 F.3d at 742 (App. at 6a) (quoting *Hoffman v. Arave*, 236 F.3d 523, 531 (9th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 534 U.S. 944 (2001)); *see also Staub v. City of Baxley*, 355 U.S. 313, 319-20 (1958); *Reece v. Georgia*, 350 U.S. 85, 88-90 (1955). As the following paragraphs will show, the state courts' procedural ruling in this case -- that Petitioner's federal claims were precluded because of the failure of his first post-conviction counsel to raise them, regardless of whether or not she performed effectively -- was not adequate to prohibit federal-court review because it frustrated the protection of two related federal rights: (a) Petitioner's right to effective assistance of first post-conviction counsel specifically with respect to any ineffective-assistance-of-trial-counsel claim, and (b) Petitioner's underlying right to effective assistance of trial counsel.

1. The "adequacy" argument stated above depends in part on the proposition that Petitioner, as an **Arizona** defendant, had a federal constitutional right to effective assistance of his **first** post-conviction counsel, specifically and only with respect to any claim of ineffective assistance of **trial** counsel. In *Coleman v. Thompson*, this Court

stated the general rule that "there is no right to counsel in state collateral proceedings." 501 U.S. at 755. But this Court then recognized that there might be an exception to that general rule when "state collateral review is the first place a prisoner can present a challenge to his conviction." *Id*. The following paragraphs will demonstrate that there is such an exception, in the specific circumstances of this case, under *Douglas v. California*, 372 U.S. 353 (1963), and *Halbert v. Michigan*, 545 U.S. 605 (2005):

a. The defendant in *Halbert*, after being convicted on a plea of nolo contendere, requested that counsel be appointed to represent him in applying for leave to appeal, but the Michigan courts denied that request. 545 U.S. at 609. This Court, however, held that the due process and equal protection guarantees of the Fourteenth Amendment required "the appointment of counsel for [Michigan] defendants, convicted on their pleas, who [sought] access to first-tier review" -- even though such review was discretionary, rather than of right. *Id.* at 610. This holding was based on this Court's conclusion that *Douglas* -- rather than *Ross v. Moffitt*, 417 U.S. 600 (1974)[5] -- provided "the controlling instruction." 545 U.S. at 616-17. That conclusion in turn was based on two factors: (i) "in determining how to dispose of an application for leave to appeal, Michigan's intermediate appellate court looks to the merits of the claims made in the application"; and (ii) "indigent defendants pursuing first-tier review [i.e., their first available opportunity for review] in the Court of Appeals are generally ill equipped to represent themselves," in part because they (unlike the defendant in *Ross*) have no prior briefing by counsel of relevant issues to present to the reviewing court. *Id*. at 617, 618-22.

5. *Ross* is discussed in Argument section II, *infra*.

b. The holdings and rationale in *Halbert* and *Douglas* clearly apply to the ineffective-assistance-of-trial-counsel claim in this case. With respect to that claim, the "first tier" of review that was available to Petitioner was a state post-conviction relief petition -- because he was not permitted to raise the claim on direct appeal under Arizona law. *State v. Spreitz*, 202 Ariz. 1, 3, 39 P.3d 525, 527 (2002). Moreover, the two additional *Halbert* factors discussed in the preceding paragraph are fully satisfied here: (i) In deciding how to dispose of ineffective-assistance-of-trial counsel claims raised in a first post-conviction relief proceeding, an Arizona trial court "looks to the merits of the claims"; and (ii) defendants pursuing **first**-tier review of ineffective-assistance-of-trial-counsel claims have received no prior assistance of counsel, and otherwise are especially "ill equipped to represent themselves," with regard to such claims. Indeed, *Douglas* is even more "controlling" in this case than in *Halbert*: While the "appeal" at issue in *Halbert* was discretionary, an Arizona defendant has a **right** to obtain review of an ineffective-assistance-of-counsel claim on the merits in a timely first post-conviction relief petition. Ariz.R.Crim.P. 32.1(a), 32.4(c)(2).

c. The preceding paragraphs demonstrate that an Arizona defendant pursuing his first opportunity for review of ineffective-assistance-of-trial-counsel claims (necessarily in a Rule 32 post-conviction relief proceeding) has a constitutional right to appointed counsel under *Douglas* and *Halbert*. That means that such a defendant also is entitled to constitutionally **effective** assistance of counsel on such first-tier review. *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668, 684-86 (1984) ("the right to counsel is the right to the effective assistance of counsel").

3. As noted above, when an Arizona defendant is deprived of his federal right to effective assistance of trial counsel, his first and only recourse is to file a petition for post-conviction relief, which he has a right to do under Ariz.R.Crim.P. 32.1(a). Like the defendants in *Douglas* and *Halbert*, however, a defendant is ill-equipped to litigate an ineffective-assistance-of-trial-counsel claim without the assistance of post-conviction counsel -- and such assistance is of little use if it is not effective. Thus, the state courts' ruling that Petitioner's ineffective-assistance-of-trial-counsel claim was "precluded" because his first post-conviction counsel failed to raise it -- regardless of whether or not first post-conviction counsel performed effectively -- frustrated the protection of Petitioner's federal right to effective assistance of trial counsel; and it did so by denying Petitioner's federal right to effective assistance of first-tier-review counsel with respect to ineffective assistance of trial counsel under *Douglas* and *Halbert*.

B. There is cause and prejudice to excuse any procedural default of Petitioner's ineffective-assistance-of-trial-counsel claims

Even if the purely procedural ground for the Arizona Court of Appeals' decision in this case had been adequate and independent, there would be cause and prejudice to excuse the procedural default if Petitioner could show that first post-conviction counsel was **unconstitutionally** ineffective. *Coleman*, 501 U.S. at 753-54 ("Attorney error that constitutes ineffective assistance of counsel is cause"). Argument sections I(A)(1) and (2) have demonstrated that Petitioner did have a federal right to effective assistance of first post-conviction counsel, specifically with respect to his

ineffective-assistance-of-trial-counsel claims; and under *Coleman* a violation of that right constituted cause and prejudice for any procedural default of Petitioner's federal claims in the first post-conviction relief proceedings.

II. The Court of Appeals Misapplied This Court's Decisions In Holding That There Was No Right To Effective Assistance of Counsel On "First-Tier" Review Of Ineffective-Assistance-Of-Trial-Counsel Claims in Arizona

The Court of Appeals' discussion of the holdings in *Douglas*, *Ross*, and *Halbert*, 623 F.3d at 737-39 (App. at 10a-16a), is thorough and accurate, as such. However, the Court of Appeals' application of those holdings to this case, *id.* at 739-42 (App. at 16a-23a), is fundamentally flawed in several respects:

A. The Court of Appeals' analysis of whether this case is controlled by *Douglas* and *Halbert*, or by *Ross*, begins (appropriately) with a critical question: whether Petitioner's first state post-conviction proceeding amounted to "first-tier" review. *Id.* at 740 (App. at 17a). In that regard, the Court of Appeals concludes that "[t]his case is more like *Ross* than *Halbert*":

> Martinez has already received direct review of his conviction and received the assistance of counsel in connection with that appeal. . . . Even if collateral review presents the first tier of review for Martinez' ineffective assistance of [trial] counsel claim, we conclude that Martinez' action is not analogous to a direct appeal -- or

> the **first** opportunity for him to obtain review of his conviction -- so as to entitle him to effective counsel.

Id. (App. at 18a). With respect, this rationale is neither consistent with the holdings and reasoning in *Douglas* and *Halbert* nor supported by *Ross*:

1. As the above-quoted passage from the Court of Appeals' opinion recognizes, the fact that Petitioner was **prohibited** from raising his ineffective-assistance claim in his "direct appeal" from his conviction meant that the first post-conviction proceeding was "the first tier of review" for that claim; and with respect to that claim, Petitioner certainly had not "already received the assistance of counsel in connection with that first appeal." Thus, for Petitioner's ineffective-assistance claim the first post-conviction proceeding fully implicated the "first tier" due process and equal protection concerns that underlay *Douglas* and *Halbert*.

2. The foregoing effectively suggests how clearly *Ross* is distinguishable from this case. In *Ross*, the discretionary review proceedings in which the defendant sought appointed counsel necessarily were restricted to claims that the defendant already had litigated in the state court of appeals -- with appointed counsel. 417 U.S. at 603-604. Thus, those discretionary review proceedings provided second (or third) tier review for all of Moffitt's claims; and Moffitt -- unlike Petitioner -- really **had** "already received the assistance of counsel" for those claims.[6]

---

6. In *Douglas*, this Court noted that it was not concerned with the right to counsel "for the preparation of a petition for discretionary or mandatory review beyond the stage in the

3. The Court of Appeals' flawed reasoning regarding "first tier" review implies that if an Arizona defendant filed a notice and petition for post-conviction relief alleging ineffective assistance of trial counsel **before** he filed a notice of direct appeal [as he could under Ariz.R.Crim.P. 31.3 and 32.4(a)], he would be entitled to effective assistance of counsel in the post-conviction proceedings -- but not with respect to any issues that had to be raised on direct appeal. Such a result would make no sense in terms of the holdings in *Douglas* and *Halbert* (and *Ross*).

4. The Court of Appeals' position regarding "first tier" review also would mean that the State could deprive a defendant of his right to effective assistance of counsel with respect to first-tier review of any federal constitutional claim simply by (i) restricting direct appeal to state-law errors and (ii) requiring all federal errors to be raised by means of a "post-conviction" petition. Such a result would not be consistent with the holdings in *Douglas* and *Halbert*, or with *Halbert*'s explicit statement that the right to counsel on first-tier review is not dependent on whether such review is labelled an "appeal." 545 U.S. at 619.

B. With respect to Petitioner's argument that a pro se defendant is "ill equipped" to represent himself in the proceeding that provides the first opportunity to raise and litigate an ineffective-assistance-of-trial counsel claim, the Court of Appeals' reasoning is that

---

appellate process at which the **claims** have once been presented by a lawyer and passed upon by an appellate court." 372 U.S. at 356 (emphasis added). And in *Ross*, this Court stated that the State had a duty "only to assure [that an] indigent defendant [had] an adequate opportunity to present his **claims** fairly in the context of the State's appellate process." 417 U.S. at 616 (emphasis added).

> Martinez faces a lesser handicap in pursuing collateral review than a defendant pursuing a first appeal, as in *Douglas* and *Halbert*. Martinez has already received the assistance of appellate counsel in a prior proceeding, like the petitioner in *Ross*.
>
> . . . . A defendant seeking second-tier review will have received the assistance of counsel in connection with direct review, and would have "at the very least, a transcript or other record of trial proceedings, a brief on his behalf in the Court of Appeals setting forth his claims of error, and in many cases an opinion by the Court of Appeals disposing of his case."

623 F.3d at 741 (App. at 19a) (quoting *Ross*, 417 U.S. at 615). The above-quoted statements of course are true when "collateral" review involves the same claims as a prior direct appeal -- but they do not apply at all to this case, in which the first post-conviction proceeding was, as a matter of state law, Petitioner's first opportunity to raise an ineffective-assistance-of-trial-counsel claim:

1. The "assistance of appellate counsel in a prior proceeding" that Petitioner received (on direct appeal) could not have had anything to do with any ineffective-assistance-of-trial-counsel claim, since such claims were prohibited on direct appeal. Similarly, neither the "brief on his behalf in the [Arizona] Court of Appeals" nor any "opinion by the Court of Appeals disposing of his case" on direct appeal could have involved any claim of ineffective assistance of trial counsel.

2. A "transcript or other record of trial proceedings" would be inadequate to evaluate the effectiveness of trial counsel, which often depends on what trial counsel did (or did not do) outside the record.

3. Given the purpose of the right to effective assistance of counsel, a defendant obviously is especially ill equipped to represent himself with respect to an ineffective-assistance claim.

C. With regard to Petitioner's argument that his case satisfies *Halbert*'s second factor regarding first-tier review because an Arizona trial court considering an ineffective-assistance claim in a first post-conviction proceeding must "look to the merits" of the claim, the Court of Appeals points out that *Douglas* and *Halbert* both involved discretionary review proceedings in which the reviewing courts looked to the merits of the defendants' claims in performing a "gatekeeping" function. 623 F.3d at 741 (App. at 20a). But that point does nothing to counter Petitioner's argument or distinguish *Douglas* and *Halbert*: In both of those decisions, this Court's point was that **even though** the reviewing courts were performing a gatekeeping function, they looked to the merits in doing so. 372 U.S. at 354-57; 545 U.S. at 612, 617-19. The fact that an Arizona trial court presented with an ineffective assistance claim in a first post-conviction proceeding has no gatekeeping function, but instead must address the merits directly, makes *Douglas* even more clearly controlling in this case than in *Halbert*.[7]

7. Moreover, it does not matter that "there is no impediment to the first tier of **appeal**," 623 F.3d at 741 (App. at 20a) (emphasis added) -- because Petitioner was prohibited from raising any ineffective-assistance claim on direct appeal.

D. The preceding paragraph effectively demonstrates why it is not relevant that

> discretionary appeal to a state Supreme Court or to the United States Supreme Court is not intended to correct error in individual cases, but rather to address questions of public importance, critical issues of law, conflicts in the decisions of relevant courts, and so forth.

623 F.3d at 741 (App. at 21a). In a first post-conviction proceeding, an Arizona trial court has no discretion whether to rule on an ineffective-assistance claims based on considerations of public importance (or anything else); and contrary to the Court of Appeals' suggestion, *id*. at 742 (App. at 21a), with respect to such claims the Arizona trial courts do perform an "error correction function" -- under *State v. Spreitz*, *supra*, and Ariz. R. Crim. P. 32.1(a) and 32.4(c)(2) -- that is precisely "analogous to an appellate court hearing a criminal defendant's direct appeal as of right."[8]

E. With regard to the Court of Appeals' "return" to *Douglas* and its due process and equal protection rationales, 623 F.3d at 742 (App. at 21a-22a), it suffices to point out that every reason that the Court of Appeals offers for not applying due process and equal protection

---

8. In the Arizona context, the Court of Appeals also is incorrect in asserting that post-conviction relief "is not part of the criminal proceeding itself, and it is in fact considered to be civil in nature," 623 F.3d at 742 (App. at 21a): Rule 32.3 of the Arizona Rules of **Criminal** Procedure specifically provides that a post-conviction relief proceeding "is part of the original criminal action and not a separate action."

principles to this case would apply equally to *Douglas* and *Halbert* -- in both of which this Court found those principles to be applicable. 372 U.S. at 355-57; 545 U.S. at 610.[9]

F. The Court of Appeals' discussion of Petitioner's argument for a very specific "exception to the general rule that there is no right to counsel in collateral review" concludes with the proposition that "this exception would swallow the general rule." 623 F.3d at 742 (App. at 23a). While this statement is cryptic, it is supported by a citation to *Bonin v. Calderon*, 77 F.3d 1155, 1160 (9th Cir. 1996) [*Bonin III*] -- which in turn cites to *Bonin v. Vasquez*, 999 F.2d 425 (9th Cir. 1993) [*Bonin I*], in which the Court of Appeals offered the following rationale:

> The actual impact of such an exception would be the likelihood of an infinite continuum of litigation in many criminal cases. If a petitioner has a Sixth Amendment right to competent counsel in his or her first state postconviction proceeding because that is the first forum in which the ineffectiveness of trial counsel can be alleged, it follows that the petitioner has a Sixth Amendment right to counsel in the second state postconviction proceeding, for that is the first forum in which he or she can raise a challenge based on counsel's performance in the first state postconviction proceeding. Furthermore,

9. Petitioner respectfully disagrees with the Court of Appeals' statement that "Martinez advances no argument grounded in the rationale of equal protection," 623 F.3d at 742 (App. at 22a): In relying on *Douglas* and *Halbert*, Petitioner necessarily has been relying on their due process and equal protection rationales.

> because the petitioner's first federal habeas petition will present the first opportunity to raise the ineffective assistance of counsel in the second state post-conviction proceeding, it follows logically that the petitioner has a Sixth Amendment right to counsel in the first federal habeas proceeding as well. And so it would go. Because any Sixth Amendment violation constitutes cause, . . . federal courts would never be able to avoid reaching the merits of any ineffective-assistance claim, regardless of the nature of the proceeding in which counsel's competence is alleged to have been defective. As a result, the "exception" would swallow the rule.

Id. at 430. While the Court of Appeals' apparent concern about the likelihood of an "infinite continuum of litigation" is understandable in the abstract, it is misplaced in this case, for the following independently sufficient reasons:

1. On a theoretical level: While it would appear that a challenge (in a second post-conviction proceeding) to the effectiveness of first post-conviction counsel with respect to an ineffective-assistance-of-trial-counsel claim would constitute first-tier review, in fact that is not the case -- because any review of the effectiveness of first post-conviction counsel necessarily would require **second**-tier review of the effectiveness of trial counsel[10] (which would be covered by *Ross*, rather than *Douglas*

10. First post-conviction counsel could not be ineffective with regard to an ineffective-assistance-of-trial-counsel claim unless that claim was valid.

and *Halbert*). Thus, the "continuum" would end after one tier (in Arizona, the first post-conviction proceeding).[11]

2. On a practical level: It is highly unlikely that a potential habeas petitioner could work his way through several tiers of state post-conviction review without running afoul of the one-year statute of limitation for federal habeas cases, 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1).

3. Even if there was a likelihood that there would be some habeas cases involving multi-level ineffective-assistance claims, that would not justify denying the constitutional right to first-tier-review counsel recognized in *Douglas* and *Halbert*. In effect, the Court of Appeals' decision says that a state criminal defendant has an abstract right to effective assistance of trial counsel -- but that if he is deprived of that right, he has no federal right to an effective remedy.

11. This does not mean that a defendant (like Petitioner) could not challenge the effectiveness of first post-conviction counsel in a second post-conviction proceeding; but it does mean that the defendant would have no federal right to counsel in the second post-conviction proceeding, or in any subsequent federal habeas proceeding.

CONCLUSION

This Petition has not addressed the merits of Petitioner's ineffective-assistance-of-trial-counsel and ineffective-assistance-of-first-post-conviction-counsel claims, because neither the Court of Appeals nor the District Court did so. Thus, this Court should grant this Petition, reverse the judgment of the Court of Appeals, and remand with direction to consider the merits of Petitioner's interdependent ineffective-assistance claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Bartels
Counsel of Record
Sandra Day O'Connor
College of Law
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85287-7906
(480) 965-7053
Robert.Bartels@asu.edu

Attorney for Petitioner