

**TESTIMONY OF
THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
THIRTY-FIRST LEGISLATURE, 2022**

ON THE FOLLOWING MEASURE:

H.B. NO. 2074, RELATING TO CREDIT FOR TIME OF DETENTION PRIOR TO SENTENCE.

BEFORE THE:

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY AND HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS

DATE: Tuesday, February 8, 2022 **TIME:** 2:00 p.m.

LOCATION: State Capitol, Room 325, Via Videoconference

TESTIFIER(S): Holly T. Shikada, Attorney General, or
Lance Goto, Deputy Attorney General

Chair Nakashima and Members of the Committee:

The Department of the Attorney General (Department) strongly supports this bill.

The purpose of this bill is to amend section 706-671(3), Hawaii Revised Statutes (HRS), to clarify that a defendant, being sentenced for an offense that was committed while serving a sentence of imprisonment on a separate unrelated felony conviction, cannot be given credit for a period of presentence detention that took place while the defendant was also serving the sentence of imprisonment for the separate unrelated felony conviction.

When the Legislature passed section 706-671(3), HRS, in 2012, it indicated in its final report from the Senate Committee on Judiciary and Labor that "[t]he purpose and intent of this measure is to clarify that a defendant will not earn credit for time served for a subsequent crime while the defendant is serving an imprisonment sentence for a separate, unrelated offense." Senate Stand. Com. Rep. No. 3188, at 1 (2012). It also stated that "[t]his measure creates uniform application and deters imprisoned offenders from incurring new offenses." Id.

But in State v. Abihai, 146 Hawai'i 398, 408-410, 463 P.3d 1055, 1065-1067 (2020), the Hawaii Supreme Court found that the plain language of section 706-671(3), HRS, which would have denied the defendant's entitlement to presentence credit, does not eliminate the defendant's entitlement to presentence detention credit pursuant to section 706-671(1), HRS. The result was that the defendant was given credit for the

time that he had been detained pretrial, even though he was still serving a sentence of imprisonment for a separate unrelated felony offense. Id. at 410, 463 P.3d at 1067.

The Abihai court concluded that the current language of section 706-671(3), HRS, does not eliminate defendant's entitlement to presentence detention credit pursuant to the plain language of section 706-671(1), HRS. Id. at 408-410, 463 P.3d at 1065-1067

The court's holding was inconsistent with the original intent of the Legislature as expressed when section 706-671(3), HRS, was added in 2012. The amendments in this bill are needed to clarify that the limitations on presentence detention credit under section 706-671(3), HRS, are applicable to imprisoned offenders, notwithstanding any other law to the contrary, including section 706-671(1), HRS, and that an imprisoned offender is not entitled to credit for the period of detention served for the subsequent offense.

Enactment of this clarification of section 706-671(3), HRS, will serve to deter convicted criminals from committing crimes while incarcerated and ensure that the sentences of imprisonment for any such crimes committed will not be subsumed within or diminished by the sentences of imprisonment the defendants were already serving.

The Department respectfully requests the passage of this bill.

STATE OF HAWAI‘I
OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC DEFENDER

**Testimony of the Office of the Public Defender,
State of Hawai‘i to the House Committee on
Judiciary and Hawaiian Affairs**

February 8, 2022

H.B. No. 2074: RELATING TO CREDIT FOR TIME OF DETENTION PRIOR
TO SENTENCE

Chair Mark M. Nakashima, Vice Chair Scot Z. Matayoshi and Members of the Committee

The Office of the Public Defender respectfully opposes H.B. No. 2074, which would amend HRS § 706-671(3) to deny pre-sentence detention credit to a defendant who is accused of committing a subsequent criminal offense while already serving a prison sentence.

The proponents of this bill assert that this change to HRS § 706-671 (3) is necessary to correct a statutory construction problem that was exposed in State v. Abihai, 146 Hawai‘i 398, 463 P.3d 1055 (2020), and to serve as a deterrent to individuals who contemplate committing subsequent crimes while serving an unrelated prison sentence.

What the proponents of this bill do not address are the constitutional rights that it will violate. In a subsequent ruling to Abihai, the Hawai‘i Supreme Court, in the State v. Thompson, SCWC-17-0000427 (July 1, 2020) (SDO), held that denying pre-sentence detention credit to a defendant that had earned it would be paramount to a violation of the double jeopardy clause of article I, § 10 of the Hawai‘i Constitution and the fifth amendment to the United States Constitution. *See also North Carolina v. Pearce*, 395 U.S. 711, 717, 89 S.Ct. 2072, 2076 (1969)(“[t]he constitutional guarantee against multiple punishments for the same offense absolutely requires that punishment already exacted must be fully “credited in imposing sentence.”).

Furthermore, this statutory change would violate a defendant’s constitutional right to a trial in violation of article 1, §§ 5 and 14 of the Hawai‘i Constitution and the sixth amendment to the U.S. Constitution, as it would act as a deterrent to defendants wishing to exercise their constitutional right to trial. If a defendant were to resolve their case as soon as they are charged by way of a guilty plea, they would


immediately begin to earn detention credit upon being sentenced. However, if the same defendant chose to exercise their right to a jury trial, which could take months or longer to commence, the pre-sentence detention credit earned while awaiting trial would be denied to the defendant at sentencing. Thus, exercising one's constitutional right to a trial, wherein one would be presumed innocent, until and unless one was proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, would cause one to be incarcerated longer than if one chose to plead guilty. There should be no penalty for exercising one's constitutional right.

Lastly, the proposed language of this bill goes well beyond its intended purpose or title, as it will deny a defendant all detention credit, and act as a *de facto* consecutive sentence. See line 22 of page 2 of the proposed bill, the language "any periods of detention" would include pre-trial, pre-sentence and post-sentence detention time, and coupled with the language on page 3 line 2: "shall not be deducted from the minimum and maximum terms of the sentence imposed on the later crime" means that the defendant shall not receive any detention credit, not just pre-sentence detention credit, for a subsequent offense while serving their first sentence. This would only compound the constitutional violations described above.

The OPD understands that there is a need to have some method of deterrence to prevent people from committing crimes while incarcerated, but this proposed statutory change is not the answer. Judges who sentence defendants who fall into this category of offenders already have at their disposal the ability to deal with those for whom lengthier incarceration is necessary.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on this measure.

DAVID Y. IGE
GOVERNOR



STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
1177 Alakea Street, 6th Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

MAX N. OTANI
DIRECTOR

Maria C. Cook
Deputy Director
Administration

Tommy Johnson
Deputy Director
Corrections

Jordan Lowe
Deputy Director
Law Enforcement

No. _____

WRITTEN TESTIMONY ONLY

TESTIMONY ON HOUSE BILL 2074
RELATING TO CREDIT FOR TIME OF DETENTION
PRIOR TO SENTENCE.

By
Max N. Otani, Director

House Committee on Judiciary and Hawaiian Affairs
Representative Mark M. Nakashima, Chair
Representative Scot Z. Matayoshi, Vice Chair

Tuesday, February 8, 2022; 2:00 p.m.
Via Video Conference

Chair Nakashima, Vice Chair Matayoshi, and Members of the Committee:

House Bill (HB) 2074 seeks to clarify that defendants may not earn credit on a sentence imposed for a subsequent conviction for time being served on a previous felony conviction.

The Department of Public Safety (PSD) supports this measure and appreciates the clarification in determining detention credit for repeat felony offenders. This measure will provide the Department with the needed guidance in sentence computation and help to prevent future costly litigation.

Thank you for the opportunity to present this testimony.

DEPARTMENT OF THE PROSECUTING ATTORNEY
CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU

ALII PLACE
1060 RICHARDS STREET • HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813
PHONE: (808) 768-7400 • FAX: (808) 768-7515

STEVEN S. ALM
PROSECUTING ATTORNEY

THOMAS J. BRADY
FIRST DEPUTY
PROSECUTING ATTORNEY



THE HONORABLE MARK M. NAKASHIMA, CHAIR
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY AND HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS
Thirty-First State Legislature
Regular Session of 2022
State of Hawai'i

February 8, 2022

RE: H.B. 2074; RELATING TO CREDIT FOR TIME OF DETENTION PRIOR TO SENTENCE.

Chair Nakashima, Vice-Chair Matayoshi and members of the House Committee on Judiciary and Hawaiian Affairs, the Department of the Prosecuting Attorney of the City and County of Honolulu ("Department") submits the following testimony in support of H.B. 2074.

The purpose of H.B. 2074 is to address the Supreme Court of Hawaii's decision in *State. v. Abihai*,¹ clarifying that a defendant, sentenced for an offense committed while already serving a sentence of imprisonment (on a prior unrelated felony conviction), cannot be given credit for any pre-sentencing detention.

The Department believes that the current holding in *Abihai* is inconsistent with the original intent of the Legislature when it enacted section 706-671(3) of the Hawaii Revised Statutes ("HRS") in 2012. In *Abihai*, the Supreme Court held that the plain language in HRS §706-671(3) did not eliminate the defendant's entitlement to pre-sentence detention credit pursuant to the language outlined in HRS §706-671(1). However, when the Legislature codified HRS §706-671(3), during the 2012 Legislative Session, it indicated its intent in the Senate Committee on Judiciary and Labor's committee report:

"...the purpose and intent of this measure is to clarify that a defendant will not earn credit for time served for a subsequent crime while the defendant is serving an imprisonment sentence for a separate, unrelated offense."

¹ *State v. Abihai*, 146 Haw 398, 463 P.3d 1055 (2020), available online at <https://cases.justia.com/hawaii/supreme-court/2020-scwc-17-0000546.pdf?ts=1588098720>; last accessed February 6, 2022.

Senate Stand. Com. Rep. No. 3188 (2012)

The passage of H.B. 2074 would further solidify the legislative intent of HRS §706-671(3), which was originally established in 2012. Additionally, it would ensure that convicted offenders do not benefit from effectively shortened sentences, if they commit additional crimes while incarcerated.

For all of the foregoing reasons, the Department of the Prosecuting Attorney of the City and County of Honolulu **supports** the passage of H.B. 2074. Thank you for the opportunity to testify on this matter.