

OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
PUBLIC ACT SUMMARY



PA 12-115—sHB 5554

Judiciary Committee

AN ACT CONCERNING HABEAS CORPUS REFORM

SUMMARY: For certain habeas corpus petitions, this act:

1. requires the court, on its own or if asked by a party, to determine if there is good cause to proceed to trial and
2. for a petition related to a criminal conviction, creates a rebuttable presumption that a petition filed after certain dates was delayed without good cause and requires the court to dismiss it if the petitioner does not establish good cause for the delay.

These provisions apply to a habeas petition unless it is (1) claiming actual innocence, (2) challenging prison conditions, or (3) challenging a capital felony conviction that resulted in a death sentence.

Previously, statutes and court rules did not place limits on filing habeas petitions. Under court rules, grounds for a court to dismiss a habeas petition include presenting the same grounds as a prior petition previously denied and failing to state new facts or offer new evidence not reasonably available at the time of the prior petition (Practice Book §§ 23-29 and 25-42).

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 1, 2012 and applicable to petitions filed on or after that date.

GOOD CAUSE TO PROCEED TO TRIAL

For any type of habeas petition except those excluded as specified above, the act requires the court to determine whether there is good cause for some or all of the petition's allegations to proceed to trial if, after the pleading, (1) a party requests it or (2) the court notifies the parties of its intention to make such a determination.

The act allows the parties to submit exhibits such as documentary evidence, affidavits, and unsworn statements. The court can look at an exhibit *in camera* (in private) if a party (1) requests it and (2) would be prejudiced by disclosure at that stage of the proceeding.

The court can determine good cause based on the petition and exhibits if they:

1. allege specific facts that, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief and
2. provide a factual basis to conclude that evidence supporting the facts exists and will be presented at trial, as long as the court does not make a finding that the evidence is contradicted by judicially noticeable facts (generally, facts that the court can accept without requiring proof because they are generally known).

If the petition and exhibits do not establish good cause, the act requires the

OLR PUBLIC ACT SUMMARY

court to hold a preliminary hearing. It must dismiss all or part of a petition after the hearing if it does not find good cause after considering the parties' evidence and arguments.

REBUTTABLE PRESUMPTION OF DELAY

The act creates two rebuttable presumptions of delay in filing habeas petitions challenging a criminal conviction other than claims of actual innocence or capital convictions resulting in a death sentence: one for initial petitions and another for subsequent petitions. If either presumption applies, the petitioner must have an opportunity to show good cause for the delay before the court dismisses the petition.

Initial Petition

The act creates a rebuttable presumption that a petition was delayed without good cause if it is filed after the later of:

1. five years after appellate review of the conviction concludes or the time for review expires;
2. October 1, 2017; or
3. two years after a constitutional or statutory right asserted in the petition was initially recognized and made retroactive by the U.S. Supreme Court, the Connecticut Supreme or Appellate Court, or a public or special act.

The act's time periods are not tolled (suspended) by another pending petition challenging the same conviction.

Subsequent Petition

The act creates a rebuttable presumption that a subsequent petition challenging the same conviction was delayed without good cause if it is filed after the later of:

1. two years after the date appellate review of the prior petition concluded or the period for review expired;
2. October 1, 2014; or
3. two years after the date a constitutional or statutory right asserted in the petition was initially recognized and made retroactive by the U.S. Supreme Court, the Connecticut Supreme or Appellate Court, or a public or special act.

These provisions do not apply if the prior petition was withdrawn.

The act's time periods are not tolled by another pending petition challenging the same conviction.

The act specifies that these provisions do not create or enlarge a petitioner's right to file subsequent petitions.

Hearing

If a rebuttable presumption of delay applies, the court must, at the respondent's request, order the petitioner to show cause why the petition should proceed. The petitioner or his or her counsel must have a meaningful opportunity

OLR PUBLIC ACT SUMMARY

to investigate the basis for the delay and respond to the order. The court must dismiss the petition if it does not find good cause for the delay.

Under this provision, good cause for this purpose includes the discovery of new evidence that materially affects the merits of the case that could not have been discovered by due diligence in the required timeframes.

BACKGROUND

Habeas Corpus

Habeas corpus is a civil action that allows a petitioner to challenge the legality of certain actions. For example, a habeas petition can be filed by a:

1. prisoner to challenge the legality of his or her conviction and confinement or the constitutionality of his or her prison conditions,
2. person confined in a hospital for psychiatric disabilities to challenge the legality of his or her confinement,
3. person subject to involuntary representation by a conservator to challenge the legality of the involuntary representation, or
4. person to challenge child custody or visitation orders.

OLR Tracking: CR:KM:PF:ro