

INDIGENT DEFENSE OR INDIGENT OFFENSE? THE UNASHAMED JURISPRUDENCE OF BARRING RELIEF FOR DEATH-SENTENCED INMATES BASED UPON "GARDEN-VARIETY" INEFFECTIVENESS OF COUNSEL

110 *

10

110
110
110

110

1

110
110
110
110
110
110
110

110

110

110 -110 110

110
110

110

110

* 110 110 110

110 110 110

110 110 110

110

110 110 110

110 110

110

110

110

1980.

1. 110 110 110, 110 (1963).

Art. 61 (3), a
k
p
b
2
3
4

1.8 (/ 5 5 T () 0.6 ((3 0 T () T E 1.2 6 .5 (0.8 (0.8 (0.5 .3 () T 0.5 .3 (0.5 .3 C /

750

SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY LAW JOURNAL

61 :745

2 Coleman v. Thompson

10

10

10

Finley²

0

10

Pennsylvania v.

10

10

017]

INDIGENT DEFENSE OR INDIGENT OFFENSE?

7 5 1

~~017] (S) (1) 5 .3 (() 5 .3 5 6 -0 -1. 1 (N) (4 5 .4 (Y) 5 . (X) 3 8 .9 6 6 11) 0.5 (5) 19 6 6 (5) 3 .) 5 .3 (X)~~

752

SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY LAW JOURNAL

№ 1 : 745

~~FCU~~
~~Coalition~~
~~by William~~

John Coleman

~~FCU~~

~~EV~~

017]

017]

INDIGENT DEFENSE OR INDIGENT OFFENSE?

755

65 . 55 In Holland v. Florida, 493 U.S. 597 (1990).

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

55. The Inequities of AEDPA Equitable Tolling: A Misapplication of Agency Law, 85 S.C.L. Rev. 42, 43 (2016) (a 6014, "1996, 1997")

56. 39 B. 1334, 1339 (1108), rev'd, 130 S.C. 49 (010).

57. 130 S.C. 49, 63 (010).

58. Id. 62 (05 44 IS40 8, 418 (005)).

59. 130 S.C. 49, 63 (010).

60. 130 S.C. 49, 63 (010).

61. 130 S.C. 49, 63 (010).

62. 130 S.C. 49, 63 (010).

63. 130 S.C. 49, 63 (010).

64. 130 S.C. 49, 63 (010).

65. Id. 64.

66. 130 S.C. 49, 63 (010).

67. 130 S.C. 49, 63 (010).

68. 130 S.C. 49, 63 (010).

69. 130 S.C. 49, 63 (010).

70. 130 S.C. 49, 63 (010).

71. 130 S.C. 49, 63 (010).

every day

hicus I[TD [(h [6-10.7(o C12(3.7([F.7oJ 0 (ea)-13.8(s)

SR LB UR SØ LW

017]

INDIGENT DEFENSE OR INDIGENT OFFENSE?

7 5 7

hhhhhh

72 hhh

hhhhhh Maples

hhhhhh 73 hhhhh

hhhh

74

hh

hhhhhh

hhf oshhhhh Holland

v

Florida, 5 6 0 LS6 3 1, 6 5 4 6 5 2010). hhh

hhhhhhhhhh

hhhhhhhhhh

hh

hhhhhhhhhh

hh (19 9 8). hhhhh

Maplesv Thomas 5 6 5 LS_ _n8 (012 (p al7, n8), a

hh hhhhhhh

hhhhhhhhhh

75

hhhh

hhhh

hhhh 0(h)"

76 hhhhh

hhhh

Maples, 77 hhh

hhhh

78 hhh

hh

79

72 Id. 18 9 2 hhh 0(h) hhh

hhhh

hh" hhhhh

È " FD . R Cm . P. 6 0(h)6 (016). hhh

hhhh(6) h

inter alia, hh

" 18 5 4 5 IS5 2, 5 3 5

(005). hhhhhhhhhhh Martinez

hh

hh

" hhh

hh 0(h)hh

Gonzalez

73 .Christeson 13 5 S08 9 2

74 .Id. 18 9 3 .

75 .Id. 18 9 4 . hh

"hh

hh

hhhhhhhhhh after

hh

hh hh hhhhhhhhh

hhhhhh, 005

-117 hhh ... hhh

hh ... hhhhh

"Fv(S)-10.5 (-0.007 0.007 0.108 08 4.1(0)14.7 (6 8 4 .4 3 7 0 4444

D. The Operation of 18 U.S.C. § 3599 and Abandonment

18 USC § 3599 (a) provides that a defendant who is convicted of a crime and sentenced to a term of imprisonment shall be eligible for parole at the expiration of the term of imprisonment. The statute provides that the parole board shall have the authority to grant parole to any such defendant who has served at least one year of the term of imprisonment and who is found to be suitable for parole. The statute also provides that the parole board shall have the authority to revoke parole if the parolee is found to be unsuitable for parole.

