



■

UNDERSTANDING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT LAW

SECOND EDITION

■

Linda E. Carter
Ellen S. Kreitzberg
Scott W. Howe



LexisNexis

UNDERSTANDING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT LAW

SECOND EDITION

Linda E. Carter

Professor of Law

University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law

Ellen S. Kreitzberg

Professor of Law, Director, Death Penalty College

Santa Clara University School of Law

Scott W. Howe

Frank L. Williams Professor of Criminal Law

Chapman University School of Law

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Carter, Linda E.

Understanding capital punishment / Linda E. Carter, Ellen S. Kreitzberg, Scott W. Howe. -- 2nd ed.
p. cm.

Rev. ed of: Understanding capital punishment law. c2004.

Includes index.

ISBN 978-1-4224-2386-8 (softbound)

I. Capital punishment--United States. I. Kreitzberg, Ellen. II. Howe, Scott. III. Carter, Linda E. Understanding capital punishment law. IV. Title.

KF9227.C2C36 2008

345.73*0773--dc22

2008009626

This publication is designed to provide accurate and authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis, the knowledge burst logo, and Michie are trademarks of Reed Elsevier Properties Inc, used under license. Matthew Bender is a registered trademark of Matthew Bender Properties Inc.

Copyright © 2008 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.
2008

All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material exceeding fair use, 17 U.S.C. § 107, may be licensed for a fee of 25¢ per page per copy from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

NOTE TO USERS

To ensure that you are using the latest materials available in this area, please be sure to periodically check the LexisNexis Law School web site for downloadable updates and supplements at www.lexisnexis.com/lawschool.

Editorial Offices

744 Broad Street, Newark, NJ 07102 (973) 820-2000

201 Mission St., San Francisco, CA 94105-1831 (415) 908-3200

www.lexisnexis.com

MATTHEW  BENDER

UNDERSTANDING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT LAW

LexisNexis Law School Publishing Advisory Board

Charles P. Craver

Freda H. Alverson Professor of Law
The George Washington University Law School

Richard D. Freer

Robert Howell Hall Professor of Law
Emory University School of Law

Craig Joyce

*Andrews Kurth Professor of Law &
Co-Director, Institute for Intellectual Property and Information Law*
University of Houston Law Center

Ellen S. Podgor

Professor of Law
Stetson University College of Law

Paul F. Rothstein

Professor of Law
Georgetown University Law Center

Robin Wellford Slocum

*Professor of Law & Director,
Legal Research and Writing Program*
Chapman University School of Law

Charles J. Tabb

Alice Curtis Campbell Professor of Law
University of Illinois College of Law

Judith Welch Wegner

Professor of Law
University of North Carolina School of Law

PREFACE

This book is written for students in capital punishment courses and for others, whether lawyers, experts, activists, or scholars who are interested in an overview of this complex area of law. The primary emphasis of the book is an explanation of the constitutional law that governs death penalty proceedings in the United States.

In the few years since the first edition, there have been significant changes in death penalty law, procedure and practice. We have tried to keep up with those changes, but new cases seem to appear even as we type. We have tried to present the most up-to-date information and trends in death penalty law.

We would never have been able to research and write this edition without outstanding work by our research assistants over the years. We express great thanks to Delores Thomas Temitayo Adewoyin, Spencer Chne, Sara Dabkowski, Elizabeth Gillen, Thomas Hartnett, Timothy Kennedy, Kimberly Love, David Richter, and Uyen Tran of Santa Clara Law, Angelique Batsel of Chapman, and Ben Eilenberg of McGeorge.

We also appreciate and thank our individual universities for their support of our research through research stipends and other resources.

All of us have families that have supported our efforts through their patience and encouragement. We are truly grateful for their support.

As the law continues to evolve, so does this book. We consider this a work-in-progress, All comments, suggestions, corrections, or additions are greatly appreciated.

Linda Carter lcarter@pacific.edu

Ellen Kreitzberg ekreitzberg@scu.edu

Scott Howe swhowe@chapman.eduetc.

For Michael, Michelle, and Laura– L.E.C.

For Tom, Erika and Kristoffer– E.K.

For Jetty, Mario, and Jordan– S.W.H.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1	INTRODUCTION TO CAPITAL PUNISHMENT LAW . . .	1
§ 1.01	The Capital Punishment Controversy in the Twenty-First Century	1
§ 1.02	Capital Trials in the United States: The Importance of Constitutional Law	2
[A]	Overview	2
[B]	Organization of the Chapters on the Constitutional Constraints on Capital Punishment	5
CHAPTER 2	THE DEATH PENALTY DEBATE	7
§ 2.01	Major Arguments For and Against the Death Penalty	7
§ 2.02	Penological Purposes	8
[A]	Deterrence	8
[B]	Retribution	11
§ 2.03	Systemic Fairness	14
§ 2.04	Financial Costs of the Death Penalty	16
CHAPTER 3	SOURCES OF LAW	17
§ 3.01	Overview	17
§ 3.02	State and Federal Statutory Law and State Constitutional Law .	17
§ 3.03	United States Constitutional Provisions	18
§ 3.04	The Importance of Federal Constitutional Law	18
§ 3.05	Constitutional Premises	19
[A]	Federalism	19
[B]	“Death Is Different”	19
§ 3.06	Case Law	20
§ 3.07	Treaties	20
CHAPTER 4	CHALLENGES TO THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE DEATH PENALTY	21
§ 4.01	Overview of Constitutional Challenges to the Death Penalty . .	21
§ 4.02	Challenges to the Arbitrariness of the Death Penalty	22
[A]	The Due Process Challenge	22
[B]	The Cruel and Unusual Punishment Challenge	23
§ 4.03	Challenge to the Death Penalty as <i>Per se</i> Unconstitutional . . .	25
[A]	Overview	25
[B]	Acceptability of the Punishment to Contemporary Society:	

	Evolving Standards of Decency	25
[C]	Principle of Human Dignity: The Independent Evaluation of Excessive Punishments	25
§ 4.04	Challenges to the Proportionality of the Death Penalty	26
[A]	Overview	26
[B]	Proportionality as an Eighth Amendment Principle	27
[C]	The First Prong: Contemporary Standards of Decency	29
[1]	Whose Views Count?	29
[2]	Statistical Interpretation	31
[D]	The Second Prong: Furthering Goals of Punishment	32
CHAPTER 5	METHODS OF EXECUTION	33
§ 5.01	Overview and History	33
§ 5.02	Legal Challenges to Methods of Execution	35
[A]	Analytical Framework	35
[B]	Challenges to Methods of Execution	36
[1]	Hanging	37
[2]	Lethal Gas	37
[3]	Electrocution	38
[4]	Lethal Injection	39
[C]	Future Issues	41
CHAPTER 6	MODERN DEATH PENALTY STATUTES	43
§ 6.01	Overview	43
§ 6.02	<i>Furman v. Georgia</i>	44
§ 6.03	The Georgia Statute	44
§ 6.04	The Florida Statute	46
§ 6.05	The Texas Statute	47
§ 6.06	The Mandatory Statutes: Louisiana and North Carolina	49
CHAPTER 7	THE DEATH PENALTY TRIAL	51
§ 7.01	The Bifurcated Trial	51
§ 7.02	The Penalty Phase	52
§ 7.03	The Decision Process	53
[A]	The Structure: Weighing v. Non-Weighing	53
§ 7.04	Automatic Appeal	55
§ 7.05	Jury Selection	55
[A]	Overview	55
[B]	Challenges for Cause: Juror Attitudes Towards the Death Penalty	57

[C]	Peremptory Challenges: Discriminatory Use	59
-----	---	----

CHAPTER 8	CATEGORICAL BARS TO THE DEATH PENALTY . . .	63
------------------	--	-----------

§ 8.01	Overview of Categorical Bars to the Death Penalty	64
[A]	Categories of Defendants or Crimes	64
[B]	Challenges to the Proportionality of the Death Penalty for Categories of Defendants and Crimes	64
§ 8.02	Felony Murder and the “Non-Killer” Accomplice	66
[A]	Overview	66
[B]	Categorical Bar for a Non-Killer Accomplice Without <i>Mens Rea</i>	68
[1]	<i>Enmund v. Florida</i>	68
[2]	<i>Tison v. Arizona</i>	70
[C]	How is the Categorical Bar Applied?	72
[1]	How Do the Courts Apply the Major Participant Reckless Indifference Test?	72
[2]	Who Decides the Major Participant Reckless Indifference Issue?	73
§ 8.03	Persons Who are Mentally Retarded	74
[A]	Overview	74
[B]	Between <i>Penry</i> and <i>Atkins</i>	75
[C]	The Court’s Proportionality Review	76
[D]	The Dissent’s Proportionality Review	77
[E]	Post- <i>Atkins</i> Procedures	78
§ 8.04	Juveniles	80
[A]	Overview	80
[B]	The Road to <i>Roper v. Simmons</i> and the Abolition of the Juvenile Death Penalty	81
[1]	The Fifteen-Year-Olds	81
[2]	Sixteen- and Seventeen- Year-Old Juveniles	83
[C]	<i>Roper v. Simmons</i> : The Death Penalty is Unconstitutional for Juveniles.	84
§ 8.05	Non-Murder Crimes	86
[A]	Overview	86
[B]	Rape of an Adult Woman: <i>Coker v. Georgia</i>	87
[1]	The Decision	87
[2]	Rape, Race and the Death Penalty	88
[C]	Rape of a Child: Punishable by Death?	89
[D]	Crimes Against the Government	90
[E]	Drug Kingpins	92

CHAPTER 9: OVERVIEW OF AGGRAVATING EVIDENCE: THE ELIGIBILITY FUNCTION AND THE SELECTION FUNCTION 95

§ 9.01 Overview 95

§ 9.02 Aggravating Evidence and Narrowing 98

 [A] Eligibility/Narrowing in the Penalty Phase 98

 [B] Narrowing During the Guilt Phase 99

 [C] Hybrid: The California Model 100

§ 9.03 Selection Decision in the Penalty Phase 101

CHAPTER 10: AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES: ELIGIBILITY OF THE CASE FOR THE DEATH PENALTY 103

§ 10.01 Constitutional Constraints on Aggravating Circumstances ... 103

§ 10.02 Aggravating Circumstances as “Elements” of a Capital Case . 105

§ 10.03 Challenges to Aggravating Circumstances: Vagueness 106

 [A] Eighth Amendment Vagueness v. Due Process Vagueness . 106

 [B] Eighth Amendment Vagueness Challenges 107

 [1] “Outrageously or Wantonly Vile, Horrible or Inhuman”: Constitutional on Its Face 107

 [2] “Outrageously or Wantonly Vile”: Unconstitutionally Vague as Applied 108

 [3] Other “Heinous” Aggravating Circumstances: State Court Narrowing Interpretations 108

§ 10.04 Challenges to Aggravating Circumstances: Duplicative of the Crime 111

CHAPTER 11 AGGRAVATING EVIDENCE AND THE SELECTION DECISION 113

§ 11.01 Eligibility and Selection Decision 113

 [A] Overview 113

 [B] Use of the Aggravating Evidence in the Selection Decision: Weighing v. Non-Weighing Statutes 114

§ 11.02 Evidence of Future Dangerousness 115

 [A] Overview 115

 [B] Can Experts Predict Future Dangerousness? 118

 [C] Constitutional Issues with Psychiatric Interviews 119

 [1] Overview 119

 [2] Basic Fifth and Sixth Amendment Analysis 120

 [3] Constitutional Violations and Psychiatric Interviews ... 121

 [4] Waiver of Constitutional Rights 121

§ 11.03	Victim Impact Evidence	122
[A]	Overview	122
[B]	From <i>Booth</i> to <i>Payne</i>	123
[C]	Limits on Victim Impact Evidence	124
[D]	Examples of Victim Impact Evidence Admitted at Trial Since <i>Payne</i>	126
§ 11.04	Non-Statutory Aggravating Factors at Sentencing	128
[A]	Overview	128
[B]	Statutory Approaches to Non-Statutory Aggravating Evidence	129

CHAPTER 12	SELECTION PROCESS: MITIGATION	131
-------------------	--	------------

§ 12.01	Overview	131
§ 12.02	The Admissibility of Mitigation: The Legacy of <i>Lockett</i>	132
[A]	The “No Preclusion” Principle of <i>Lockett</i>	132
[1]	<i>Lockett v. Ohio</i> : The Facts	132
[2]	<i>Lockett v. Ohio</i> : The Constitutional Standard	134
[B]	The Expansion of the <i>Lockett</i> Doctrine	135
§ 12.03	The Limits of the <i>Lockett</i> Doctrine	136
[A]	Irrelevant Evidence	136
[B]	Structuring the Use of Mitigating Evidence	138
[1]	The Sentencing Structure Must Allow for the Consideration of Mitigation by Individual Jurors	138
[a]	The Sentencer Must Listen	138
[b]	The Sentencing Structure Must Give Effect to the Mitigation	139
[c]	Mitigation Decisions by Individual Jurors	141
[2]	State Variation Allowed in Structuring How the Sentencer Uses Mitigating Evidence	141
[a]	Mitigation Relevant Only to Future Dangerousness . . .	142
[b]	Burden of Persuasion on Mitigation	144
§ 12.04	Constitutional Right to Assistance of Experts	146
[A]	Overview	146
[B]	<i>Ake v. Oklahoma</i>	147
[C]	Post- <i>Ake</i> Issues	148

CHAPTER 13	SELECTION PROCESS: THE LIFE OR DEATH DECISION	151
-------------------	--	------------

§ 13.01	Overview	151
§ 13.02	No Constitutionally Mandated Formula: Variations in Decision-Making Structure	153

[A]	Highly Structured Format: The Texas System of Specific Questions	153
[B]	Unstructured, Open-Ended Format: The Georgia Process of General Consideration of All Evidence	155
[C]	Mandatory Results	155
[D]	Discretionary Results	156
§ 13.03	Burden of Persuasion: Prosecution or Defense?	156
§ 13.04	Constitutional Limitation on the Sentencing Process: Cannot Affirmatively Mislead Regarding the Role and Responsibility of the Decision-Maker	159
§ 13.05	Information about Defendant's Potential Release: Commutation and Parole	161
[A]	Overview	161
[B]	Commutation Power of Governor	162
[C]	Meaning of "Life With Parole"	164
[D]	Effect of Hung Jury	167
§ 13.06	The Dual Requirements of Guided Discretion and Individualized Consideration	169
CHAPTER 14	DIRECT APPEALS	173
§ 14.01	Overview of Statutory Approaches	173
§ 14.02	Harmless Error in General	174
§ 14.03	Appellate Role When Aggravating Circumstance Invalidated	175
§ 14.04	What Is Harmless in a Penalty Determination?	179
§ 14.05	Double Jeopardy	179
[A]	General Principles of Double Jeopardy and Collateral Estoppel	179
[B]	Double Jeopardy and Collateral Estoppel in Capital Cases	181
[C]	Statutorily Imposed Life Imprisonment After a Hung Jury	183
CHAPTER 15	POSTCONVICTION PROCEEDINGS: THE WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS	187
§ 15.01	Overview	187
§ 15.02	The Nature of a Habeas Proceeding	189
§ 15.03	The Habeas Process	190
[A]	Statute of Limitations and Basis of Claim	190
[B]	Exhaustion of State Remedies	191
[C]	Adequate and Independent State Grounds: Procedural Default of Constitutional Claims	192
[D]	Evidentiary Hearings	194
§ 15.04	Grounds for Granting a Writ of Habeas Corpus	196

[A]	Non-Retroactivity	196
[B]	Contrary to or Unreasonable Applications of the Law or Unreasonable Determinations of Facts	198
[1]	Contrary to or an Unreasonable Application of Clearly Established Federal Law	199
[2]	Unreasonable Application and Unreasonable Determination of Facts	201
[C]	Harmless Error	201
§ 15.05	Successive Petitions	202

CHAPTER 16 INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL 205

§ 16.01	Overview	205
[A]	The Role of Defense Counsel in Capital Cases	205
[B]	Ineffective Assistance of Counsel in a Capital Case	207
[C]	Raising a Claim of Ineffective Assistance of Counsel	207
§ 16.02	Right to Counsel	207
[A]	Introduction	207
[B]	<i>Scottsboro</i> : A Failure to Provide Effective Representation	208
[C]	<i>Gideon</i> : Recognition of a Fundamental Need for Counsel in Criminal Cases	209
[D]	<i>Strickland</i> : Development of a Test for Ineffective Assistance of Counsel	210
[1]	Introduction	210
[2]	The Case	210
[3]	The Two-Prong Test	211
[4]	Applying the Two-Prong Test	212
§ 16.03	The First Prong: Deficient Performance	213
[A]	Overview	213
[B]	Duty to Investigate and Present Penalty Phase Evidence	213
[C]	ABA Guidelines for the Representation of Criminal Defendants in Death Penalty Cases	218
§ 16.04	The Second Prong: Prejudice	219
[A]	Overview	219
[B]	Prejudice in a Penalty Phase	220
§ 16.05	Ineffective Assistance of Counsel: Presumption of Prejudice	221
[A]	Overview	221
[B]	Complete Breakdown of Adversary System	221
[C]	Conflict of Interest	223
[D]	The Mentally Impaired, Drug Addicted, or Alcoholic Lawyer	224
[E]	The Sleeping Lawyer	225

§ 16.06	Future Issues	227
CHAPTER 17	INNOCENCE	229
§ 17.01	Overview	229
[A]	What is Innocence?	229
[B]	Facts and Figures	230
[C]	Direct Appeal and Claims of Innocence	231
[D]	Habeas Corpus and Claims of Innocence	232
[E]	Freestanding Claim of Innocence v. Innocence as a Gateway Claim	233
§ 17.02	Innocent of the Crime	234
[A]	Is it Unconstitutional to Execute an Innocent Person?	234
[B]	Freestanding Claims of Actual Innocence	236
[1]	<i>Herrera v. Collins</i>	236
[2]	<i>House v. Bell</i>	237
[C]	Innocence as a Gateway to Consideration of Constitutional Error	238
[D]	The Effect of the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act (AEDPA)	240
§ 17.03	Evidence of Innocence	241
§ 17.04	Legislative Response	243
§ 17.05	Federal Courts: Innocence and the Constitutionality of Federal Death Penalty	244
§ 17.06	Current Debate and Controversy	245
CHAPTER 18	CLEMENCY	249
§ 18.01	Overview	249
§ 18.02	The Function of Clemency	252
§ 18.03	How Clemency Works	253
[A]	How Often is Clemency Granted?	253
[B]	How is Clemency Decided?	253
[1]	The Process	253
[2]	Reasons to Grant Clemency	254
§ 18.04	Due Process Restrictions on Clemency	255
[A]	“Minimal” Due Process: The <i>Woodard</i> Case	255
[B]	Post- <i>Woodard</i> Cases	256
§ 18.05	Criticisms and Defense of the Clemency Process	258
[A]	Misguided Reliance on Clemency to Justify Limiting Judicial Review	258
[B]	Political Chilling Effect	259
[C]	Lack of Procedures	259

[D]	The Response: In Defense of Clemency as Political and Unregulated	260
-----	---	-----

CHAPTER 19	DEATH ROW ISSUES: INSANITY AND DEATH ROW PHENOMENON	261
-------------------	--	------------

§ 19.01	Insanity or Incompetency at the Time of Execution	261
[A]	Eighth Amendment Prohibition Against Executing the Insane	261
[1]	The Nature of the Issue	261
[2]	The <i>Ford</i> Opinion	262
[3]	What is Meant by “Insane” or “Incompetent” at Time of Execution?	263
[4]	The <i>Panetti</i> Opinion	264
[5]	What Procedure is Required?	265
[B]	“Medicate-to-Execute” Issues	267
[1]	The Nature of the Issue	267
[2]	Overview of the Legal Issues	267
[3]	Constitutionality of Involuntary Medication in Prison or for Competency to Stand Trial	268
[a]	<i>Washington v. Harper</i> : Involuntary Medication of Prison Inmates	268
[b]	Involuntary Medication for Competency to Stand Trial	268
[4]	Questions from the Confluence of <i>Ford</i> / <i>Panetti</i> and <i>Harper</i> / <i>Sell</i>	269
[5]	Medication for the Purpose of Competency for Execution	270
[6]	Medication for the Purposes of the Inmate’s Medical Interest and Prison Safety	271
[a]	Changing the Focus to Medical and Safety Needs	271
[b]	Is it Constitutional to Execute an “Artificially” Competent Death Row Inmate?	272
[c]	Is it Ethical for Physicians to Participate in Medicating a Death Row Inmate into Competency?	274
[d]	Legal, Medical, and Legislative Responses	275
§ 19.02	Death Row Phenomenon	275
[A]	The Nature of the Issue	275
[B]	Cruel and Unusual Punishment?	276

CHAPTER 20 RACE AND THE DEATH PENALTY 279

§ 20.01	Historical Background	279
§ 20.02	The Criminal Justice System	281
[A]	Overview	281
[B]	Rape, Race, and the Death Penalty	281
[C]	The Modern Era of Death Penalty Trials and Race	282
§ 20.03	Measures of Racial Discrimination	284
§ 20.04	<i>McCleskey v. Kemp</i>	285
[A]	The Case	285
[B]	The Baldus Study: Statistical Evidence of Sentencing Disparities in Georgia	286
[C]	The Five-Justice Majority	287
[D]	An Impassioned Dissent	290
§ 20.05	Post- <i>McCleskey</i> : Judicial Response	290
§ 20.06	Post- <i>McCleskey</i> : Legislative Response	292
§ 20.07	Racial Issues	292
[A]	Racial Attitudes of the Decision-Makers	292
[B]	Racial Attitudes of the Defense Attorney	294
[C]	Race and Future Dangerousness	295

CHAPTER 21 GENDER BIAS AND THE DEATH PENALTY 297

§ 21.01	Overview	297
§ 21.02	Statistics	298
§ 21.03	Theories of Gender Discrimination	298
[A]	Chivalry Theory	298
[B]	Evil Woman Theory	299
[C]	Legislative Selection of Death-Eligible Crimes	299
[D]	Retribution	300
§ 21.04	Case studies	300
[A]	Velma Barfield	300
[B]	Karla Faye Tucker	301
[C]	Susan Smith	301
§ 20.05	The Future of Executing Women	302

CHAPTER 22 VOLUNTEERS: DEFENDANTS WHO WANT TO DIE . 305

§ 22.01	Nature of the Issues	305
§ 22.02	Defendant Advocates Death at Trial Level	306
[A]	Overview	306
[B]	Eighth Amendment: Is Mitigation Required?	308
[C]	Sixth Amendment: What is Effective Assistance of Counsel for a	