

Expert Analysis

CRIMINAL LAW AND PROCEDURE

The New York Double Jeopardy Loophole

The law of double jeopardy in New York is complex. It emanates from three separate sources: the federal and state constitutions and the Criminal Procedure Law. The decisional law on this subject is difficult to navigate and, as Justice William Rehnquist once noted, "while the Clause itself simply states that no person shall be 'subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb', the decisional law in the area is a veritable Sargasso Sea which could not fail to challenge the most intrepid judicial navigator." *Albernaz v. United States*, 450 U.S. 333, 343.

This column will focus on one discrete issue that has arisen in light of current events: Does a presidential pardon pose a bar to a state prosecution for the same acts or criminal transactions committed under federal law? To answer that question, one must first review certain aspects of the double jeopardy doctrine, and how it is applied in this state.

The New York Court of Appeals has made clear the purpose served by the doctrine itself: "It protects against a second prosecution for the same offense after acquittal. It protects against a second prosecution for the same offense after conviction. And it protects against multiple punishments for the same crime." *People v. Brown*, 40 N.Y.2d 381 (1976). Thus, the motivating force underlying the doctrine is that the sovereign, "with all its resources and power should not be allowed to make repeated attempts to convict an individual for an alleged offense, thereby subjecting him to embarrassment, expense and ordeal and compelling him to live in a continuing state of anxiety and insecurity..." *Green v. United States*, 355 U.S. 184, 187. Having said that, while the sovereign, i.e., the federal govern-



ment, cannot pursue an individual a second time, the U.S. Supreme Court has held, however, that prosecutions for essentially the same violations may be conducted by separate sovereigns with accompanying punishments imposed upon defendants convicted of violating the laws of each. *Bartholomew v. Illinois*, 354 U.S. 121.

Thus, despite the federal constitution's prohibition against double jeopardy, the Supreme Court, pursuant to the "dual sovereignty" doctrine has noted that

Does a presidential pardon pose a bar to a state prosecution for the same acts or criminal transactions committed under federal law?

there is nothing improper about separate prosecutions by both the federal government and by a state when the criminal law of each has been violated by the same conduct. The Supreme Court's rationale is that a defendant who, in a single act, violates the laws of two sovereigns, has committed two distinct offenses. *United States v. Lanza*, 260 U.S. 377.

Justice Hugo Black, dissenting in *Bartholomew*, noted that it does not matter to the person being charged that a different sovereign is conducting the second prosecution; he only cares that he is being made to stand trial for the same offense. The federal double jeopardy doctrine was ultimately applied to the states through the Fourteenth Amendment in 1969. *Barton v. Maryland*, 393 U.S. 784.

On Dec. 6, 2018, the Supreme Court heard argument in *Gamble v. United States*, No. 17-646 in which

the court is being asked to overturn the dual sovereignty doctrine. The defendant was stopped for driving with a broken tail light, and a gun was found in his automobile. After pleading guilty in an Alabama state court, he was charged by the Alabama U.S. Attorney for the same crime.

After his federal conviction by guilty plea, he appealed on the grounds of double jeopardy, arguing that the dual sovereignty doctrine undermines the protection that the Double Jeopardy clause was designed to provide and that it is inconsistent with its purposes. Counsel also argued that, in the latter part of the 20th century, federal criminal statutes increasingly addressed conduct already criminalized under state law. Thus, this federalization of criminal law has gone far beyond what the judicial authors of the dual sovereignty doctrine could possibly have imagined.

During oral argument, the defendant faced a number of concerns voiced by the justices. Some justices raised the issue of stare decisis, noting that the dual sovereignty doctrine is a "170-year-old rule" for which 30 justices have voted. Justice Gorsuch asked why "of all the errors this Court has made over the years" it should overturn the dual sovereignty doctrine?

Nearly half the states have limited the application of the dual sovereignty clause either by statute or constitution. 38 N. Kentucky L. Rev. 1. While states are bound to provide no less protection than that afforded by the federal constitution, they are free to provide greater protection. New York has done so through Article 40 of the Criminal Procedure Law and the New York Court of Appeals has acknowledged that CPL 40.20(2) "does reject, in large part the dual sovereignty statute" (*Matter of Polito v. Walsh*, 8 N.Y.3d 683, 690). As a result, a prosecution which may not be barred by a constitutional provision, may be barred by a statutory one.

Under CPL 40.30(1), a person is placed "in jeopardy" or "prosecuted" for an offense, when

LAWYER TO LAWYER

FLORIDA ATTORNEY

LAW OFFICES OF RANDY C. BOTWINICK
Formerly of Pappas, Epstein, Jeffs & Pappas

CONCENTRATING IN PERSONAL INJURY

- Car Accidents
- Slip & Falls
- Maritime
- Wrongful Death

- Defective Products
- Tire & Rollover Cases
- Traumatic Brain Injury
- Construction Accidents

RANDY C. BOTWINICK
34 Years Experience

JAY HALPERN
30 Years Experience

Co-Counsel and Participation Fees Paid

Now associated with Halpern, Santos and Pinkert, we have obtained well over \$100,000,000 in awards for our clients during the last three decades. This combination of attorneys will surely provide the quality representation you seek for your Florida personal injury referrals.

Toll Free: **1-877-FLA-ATTY (352-2889)**

From Orlando to Miami... From Tampa to the Keys | www.personalinjurylawyer.ws

Computer & Mobile Forensics Expert

"A rare skill for those in the legal profession."
- TechCrunch

Horowitz Tech Law P.C.
Joshua J. Horowitz, Esq.
Tel: (212) 203-9011
www.techlawny.com
info@techlawny.com

LEGAL MALPRACTICE LITIGATION

Accepting referrals from the bar in the area of Legal Malpractice

Over 35 years of litigation experience, specializing in Professional and Attorney Negligence

Board Certified in Legal Malpractice, Diplomate ABPLA

"Best Lawyers 2012-2018"

ANDREW LAVOOTT BLUESTONE
233 Broadway, Suite 2702
New York, NY 10279
p. (212) 791-5600
f. (212) 513-7206
blog.bluestonelawfirm.com

JUDGMENT ENFORCEMENT AND COMMERCIAL COLLECTIONS

ROSENTHAL & GOLDBERGER, P.C.

- Winner of the 2014 & 2015 NJLJ Enforcement Provider of the Year
- Prosecution of all types of collection matters
- Post-judgment litigation
- Enforcement proceedings throughout New York State

R.G.
1393 Veterans Memorial Hwy
Suite 212N
Hempstead, NY 11788
P: 631-979-8500
F: 631-979-8555
www.NYCollections.com

Your FLORIDA Trial Lawyers

with New York Trial Lawyer Roots

Fighting for Justice Throughout Florida for Injured New Yorkers

- Personal Injury
- Medical Malpractice
- Wrongful Death
- Negligent Security
- Defective Products
- Premises Liability
- Maritime Negligence
- Resort Torts

Ben Rubinowitz, Esq.
Gold Coast Criminal Barometer Bloom Hershenson Shigman & Mackauf

"Rob Boyers is a superb trial lawyer who achieves consistently exceptional results for my New York clients in Florida."

Rob Boyers, Esq.
Gold Coast Criminal Barometer Bloom Hershenson Shigman & Mackauf

"Injured New Yorkers who need great representation cannot have a better advocate in a Florida courtroom than Rob Boyers."

Boyers Law Group
2333 Ponce de Leon Blvd., Penthouse 1120, Coral Gables, Florida 33134
www.BoyersLaw.com • Toll Free (800) 545-9100 • Tel. (305) 512-7600
* Also Admitted in NY & CT • NYSLA Member Since 1991

"MAMMOGRAMS ON TRIAL"



JUDGES and Lawyers Breast Cancer Alert (JALBCA) presented "Mammograms on Trial," where lawyers, judges, doctors and others interested in breast cancer acted as the "jury" during this 23rd annual Ellen P. Hermonson symposium, held in the Ceremonial Courtroom at the Daniel Patrick Moynihan U.S. Courthouse on March 26. Pictured from left were **Claire Gutekunst**, executive director, JALBCA; **Lauren Wachtler**, partner, Phillips Nizer; **Sandra Lespinasse**, principal appellate law clerk, New York State Supreme Court Appellate Division, First Department; **Katherine Ginzburg Treisman**, shareholder, Greenberg Traurig; Dr. **Laurie Margo-**

lies, system chief of breast imaging, Mount Sinai Health System; Judge **Colleen McMahon**, Chief Judge, U.S. District Court, Southern District of New York, who presided over the "trial"; Judge **Saliann Scarpulla**, New York State Supreme Court, Commercial Division; Dr. **Barry Kramer**, former director, Division of Cancer Prevention, National Cancer Institute; **Rita Glavin**, partner, Seward & Kissel; **Judith Livingston**, partner, Kramer, Dillhoff, Livingston & Moore; **Edward Friedland**, district executive, Southern District of New York, and **Virginia Trunkes**, partner, DelBello Donnellan Weingarten Wise & Wiederkehr.

Judicial Ethics

Opinions From the Advisory Committee on Judicial Ethics

The Committee on Judicial Ethics responds to written inquiries from New York state's approximately 3,600 judges and justices, as well as hundreds of judicial hearing officers, support magistrates, court attorney-referees, and judicial candidates (both judges and non-judges seeking election to judicial office). The committee interprets the Rules Governing Judicial Conduct (22 NYCRR Part 100) and, to the extent applicable, the Code of Judicial Conduct. The committee consists of 27 current and

retired judges, and is co-chaired by former associate justice George D. Marlow of the Appellate Division and Margaret Walsh, a Family Court judge and acting justice of the state Supreme Court.

Opinion: 18-138

Digest: (1) A judge with personal knowledge of relevant facts may testify as a fact witness in an attorney disciplinary proceeding, either

voluntarily or pursuant to a subpoena. (2) The judge may provide a written factual statement at the request of the attorney's lawyer, but its admissibility is a legal question. Rules: 22 NYCRR 100.2; 100.2(A); 100.2(C); Opinions 15-74; 12-10; 10-118; 07-153; 01-25; 95-148; 88-155.

Opinion: The inquiring surrogate recently presided over a probate proceeding. The attorney who drafted the will submitted an affidavit concerning a draft.

New York Law Journal

Turn your good press into great marketing!

Reprints are designed in collaboration with you. Reprints are available for rankings, individual verdicts, compilations, and more. Our full suite of products are powerful and versatile to meet your business needs, in print and digitally. Let us help you leverage this great press.

Product Examples:



ALM REPRINTS
www.almreprints.com