1	COURT OF APPEALS
2	STATE OF NEW YORK
3	
4	PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK,
5	Respondent,
6	-against-
7	No. 2 ANTHONY JONES,
8	Appellant.
9	
10	20 Eagle Street Albany, New York 12207
11	January 04, 2016
12	
13	Before: ASSOCIATE JUDGE EUGENE F. PIGOTT, JR.
14	ASSOCIATE JUDGE JENNY RIVERA ASSOCIATE JUDGE SHEILA ABDUS-SALAAM
15	ASSOCIATE JUDGE LESLIE E. STEIN ASSOCIATE JUDGE EUGENE M. FAHEY
16	
17	Appearances:
18	KRISTINA SCHWARZ, ESQ. THE LEGAL AID SOCIETY
19	Attorneys for Appellant 199 Water Street
20	5th Floor New York, NY 10038
21	SHEILA L. BAUTISTA, ESQ.
22	NEW YORK COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE Attorneys for Respondent
23	One Hogan Place New York, NY 10013
24	
25	Penina Wolicki Official Court Transcriber

1 JUDGE PIGOTT: Ms. Schwarz, welcome. 2 MS. SCHWARZ: Yes, good afternoon. And 3 welcome to the new year. I'm going to reserve two minutes for rebuttal. 4 5 JUDGE PIGOTT: All right. Please proceed. MS. SCHWARZ: Subdivision 1 of Criminal 6 7 Procedure Law 420.40 provides that hardship deferral of surcharges are available to all defendants 8 9 receiving mandatory surcharges at sentencing. 10 Knowing this, it should be clear that the legislature 11 did not intend to create two classes of cases. JUDGE ABDUS-SALAAM: Counsel, don't we have 12 13 to look at 60.30 and 420 - - - don't we have to look at 60 - - - don't we have to look at 60.35 when we 14 15 also look at 420.10 or 420.40? MS. SCHWARZ: Yes. And 60.35(8), the 16 17 latter part of that subdivision, deals directly with non-summonses cases, cases where the defendant is 18 19 sentenced to more than sixty days. 2.0 JUDGE ABDUS-SALAAM: Was your client 21 sentenced to more than sixty days? 22 MS. SCHWARZ: Yes, he was. He was 23 sentenced to six months. 2.4 JUDGE ABDUS-SALAAM: So don't we have to 25 look at both statutes - - -

1	MS. SCHWARZ: Yes.
2	JUDGE ABDUS-SALAAM: not just the
3	one?
4	MS. SCHWARZ: Yes. And I and both
5	statutes support a conclusion that the court has
6	- has the power, at sentencing, to conduct hardship
7	hearings for those cases that do not get a summons
8	for sixty days later. In other words, cases where
9	defendants are sentenced to more than sixty days
10	-
11	JUDGE ABDUS-SALAAM: So your your
12	position is that no summons has to be first served or
13	a defendant before a court can hear a hardship?
14	MS. SCHWARZ: Well, C C.P.L.
15	420.40(2) spells out a procedure for cases where the
16	sentence is sixty days or less.
17	JUDGE ABDUS-SALAAM: Um-hum.
18	MS. SCHWARZ: And in those cases, it's
19	required that the court simultaneously at sentence
20	issue a summons. During that sixty-day period, it's
21	sort of like a grace period. During that
22	JUDGE RIVERA: Why is that? I saw that in
23	your why is that a grace period?
24	MS. SCHWARZ: Well, during
25	JUDGE RIVERA: Don't the statutes require

that they start collecting, if there is anything to 1 2 be collected, while someone is incarcerated? Why - -3 - why doesn't that apply to - - - to the client or a 4 defendant who's less than sixty days? 5 MS. SCHWARZ: Because - - - because Penal 6 Law 60.35(5), which deals with the collection of 7 incarcerated defendants - - -8 JUDGE RIVERA: Yeah. 9 MS. SCHWARZ: - - - states that it is 10 immediate collection for those defendants where 11 payment is due. But in the cases where a summons is 12 issued, those cases - - - the payment is not due - -13 14 JUDGE RIVERA: No, no, no, no. No, no, no, 15 60.35(8) says that - - - the summons is 16 issued if after - - - and applies and they have to 17 show up if after sixty days from the date it was imposed it remains unpaid. Doesn't that mean that 18 19 the defendant could indeed pay or that while they're 20 incarcerated money could be collected from their 21 account? 22 MS. SCHWARZ: It says where they have 23 failed to pay the mandatory surcharge. In these 2.4 cases, they have - - - in cases where a summons is

issued, they haven't failed to pay. They - - - they

1	still have the right
2	JUDGE RIVERA: I'm sorry, what line are you
3	are you look read
4	MS. SCHWARZ: So in subdivision (5) it says
5	when a person who's incar is convicted of a
6	crime or violation and sentenced to a term of
7	imprisonment, has failed to pay the
8	JUDGE RIVERA: No, no, no. I'm looking at
9	60.35(8) that deals with the summonses.
10	MS. SCHWARZ: So in that case, you're
11	where are you looking at, Your Honor?
12	JUDGE RIVERA: It says at the at the
13	time the mandatory surcharge is imposed, courts shall
14	issue and cause to be served upon the person required
15	to pay the mandatory surcharge
16	MS. SCHWARZ: A summons
17	JUDGE RIVERA: a summons directing
18	that they appear before the court regarding the
19	payment of the surcharge, if after sixty days
20	obviously I'm not reading about
21	MS. SCHWARZ: Yes.
22	THE COURT: the other types of fees,
23	only the mandatory surcharge if after sixty
24	days from the date it was imposed, it remains unpaid.
25	MS. SCHWARZ: Okay, so

1 JUDGE RIVERA: So they, of course, 2 voluntarily could pay. But my question is, does this 3 - - - are you reading this to mean that they're also excluded from the other statutory provisions that 4 5 require that if they have any money, it be taken from their inmate account? 6 7 MS. SCHWARZ: Yes. 8 JUDGE RIVERA: What you're calling that 9 grace period? 10 MS. SCHWARZ: Yes. And that's because of 11 60.35(5) - - -12 JUDGE RIVERA: Okay. 13 MS. SCHWARZ: - - - which only authorizes the collection from inmate funds when the person has 14 15 failed to pay the mandatory surcharge. So - - -16 JUDGE PIGOTT: Well, the - - - it seemed, 17 if you look at the legislative history of this whole 18 thing, that the legislature is getting a little 19 peeved at the courts for waiving these fees on a 20 fairly regular basis. In fact, if you - - - if you 21 look at the legislative history, it was talking about how like eighty percent of the - - - of the fees were 22 23 being waived by courts, and they seemed to get pretty 2.4 upset by that, and they therefore said we can't waive

them - - - courts can't waive them anymore. They can

defer them only. Right?

2.4

MS. SCHWARZ: Correct.

JUDGE PIGOTT: All right.

MS. SCHWARZ: And - - and the - - so this isn't a waiver. But it is a deferral.

JUDGE PIGOTT: But what's the point of making an application for a deferral until after you get out? It would - - - it would seem to me it would defeat the whole purpose of the statute to say well, you can defer it during the twenty-five to life that you're doing on this case, and then we'll take it up in the event that you somehow get out?

MS. SCHWARZ: Well, the deferral would only be granted if the - - - the individual can demonstrate by credible and verifiable information that collection of the surcharge would cause an unreasonable hardship to that individual or his or her immediate family.

JUDGE STEIN: Well, why would - - - you talked about creating two separate classes. But under your interpretation, then the - - - the person that's going to be incarcerated for more than sixty days gets an immediate hearing, whether he or she has attempted to pay or not, whereas the person who's going to be incarcerated for less than sixty days

1 gets this grace period. Why would that be? 2 MS. SCHWARZ: Because the individual who is 3 issued a summons doesn't need to make payment until 4 the sixty days. And in the summons part, they have 5 the right - - -JUDGE RIVERA: But I don't see - - -6 7 MS. SCHWARZ: - - - to a hardship deferral 8 9 JUDGE RIVERA: - - - I'm sorry. I'm going 10 --- I just don't --- I'm still unclear how you 11 read the statutes to say that because 60.35(8) allows 12 the court to issue this summons, that they're going 13 to appear if they haven't paid, means that - - - that 14 they don't have to pay, number one; or number two, 15 that they can't have their account credited, right, 16 the money taken out of their prisoner account. 17 MS. SCHWARZ: And that's because Penal Law 18 60.35(5) - - -19 JUDGE RIVERA: I know, you've said that. 20 But I don't see - - - I need you to explain that. 21 35(5) all it says is someone who hasn't paid. So I'm 22 at sentencing. I don't pay. I now go to jail. What 23 - - - what in the statute says that they can't 2.4 collect from my inmate account, if there's anything

to collect? Granted, if there's nothing to collect,

1	it can't collect anything.
2	MS. SCHWARZ: Because the summons is the
3	summons to pay. So they have the sixty days to come
4	up with the payment.
5	JUDGE RIVERA: The summons is to show up -
6	is to show up if you have not paid.
7	MS. SCHWARZ: Or pay it in full, if they
8	do. So if they pay in full, they're done. But they
9	they it isn't due until sixty days later.
10	It's treated as a sixty-day
11	JUDGE ABDUS-SALAAM: Counsel, are you
12	MS. SCHWARZ: grace period.
13	JUDGE ABDUS-SALAAM: this is
14	this is where
15	MS. SCHWARZ: Whereas
16	JUDGE ABDUS-SALAAM: I'm a little
17	confused. You're saying that the summons is issued
18	at sentencing. But the statute seems to say that the
19	summons is issued if one has failed to pay after
20	sixty days.
21	MS. SCHWARZ: No. The the statute
22	which is 60.35(8)
23	JUDGE ABDUS-SALAAM: 8, right.
24	MS. SCHWARZ: says that at
25	sentencing, if the sentence is sixty days or less, at

1 that time, they're required to issue a summons. 2 summons basically says you have sixty days to make 3 payment in full, and then you don't have to come back 4 to court. But if day sixty arrives and you still 5 haven't made payment, you have to come into court and 6 ask for the surcharge deferral hearing or make some 7 pay - - - partial payment and get an adjourn date. 8 And that's how it - - - it's interpreted. 9 But what happens with those individuals who 10 are sentenced to more than sixty days, C.P.L. 11 60.35(5) says - - - says that they are immediately 12 due. And so that means when they go to the confining

facility, the facility - - -

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

JUDGE PIGOTT: Well, but that - - -

MS. SCHWARZ: - - - can immediately begin to take the funds out of their inmate accounts.

JUDGE PIGOTT: That's what I understood

Judge Stein to be asking. You're - - - you're saying

that the - - - the lesser sentenced people don't have

to pay. They - - - they have this grace period of

some sort, when in fact, I think they do have to pay.

And if they don't pay it, then they're going to get
- - then the summons is going to be issued after

sixty.

Is it your experience that when - - - when

someone is sentenced to a period of incarceration of sixty days or less, that at that time, somebody - - -I don't know who it would be - - - but somebody then says, by the way, as you're on your way to jail, here's a summons for the amount of the surcharge? happens at the sentence? MS. SCHWARZ: At sentencing. That's what the statute requires. JUDGE PIGOTT: I'm asking you in your experience? In other words, if you're in court, I

experience? In other words, if you're in court, I would be surprised if - - - if I'm standing there with my client and he just gets, let's say forty-five days on a DWI, and someone said, and by the way, here's a summons for the - - - the surcharge.

MS. SCHWARZ: Yeah.

2.4

JUDGE PIGOTT: I'd be wondering who the - - who the - - - who's the lawyer that's now suing my
client for that, and what do I have to do to properly
represent my client at that time?

MS. SCHWARZ: I - - - I can't say how it's

- - - the paperwork is distributed. But I do know

that that's what the statute indicates. And so what

happens is those people sentenced to sixty days or

less are given additional paperwork and said you must

make payment of your mandatory surcharges in the

1 summons part, sixty days later. So anyone who's 2 sentenced to - - -3 JUDGE FAHEY: But aren't we stuck if 4 there's a legislative logic for the sixty-day 5 distinction for minor crimes as opposed to anything more than sixty days? I - - - I would say anything 6 above a B misdemeanor, but that may not be the case. 7 8 But anyway, anything beyond sixty days, if there's a 9 legislative logic to what they're doing, then aren't 10 we stuck? We don't really have any discretion here 11 to go beyond that? MS. SCHWARZ: Well, the statutes give 12 13 authority for entertaining deferral hearings at 14 sentencing for those individuals who are sentenced to 15 more than - - - than sixty days. And that's through 16 the - - - Penal Law 60.30 gives full civil authority 17 to the sentencing court. 18 So what's really - - -JUDGE PIGOTT: But that seems to be - - -19 20 MS. SCHWARZ: - - - happen - - -21 JUDGE PIGOTT: Pardon me. But that seemed 22 to read that they can impose more of a civil penalty, 23 not that they could re - - - forgive one. 2.4 MS. SCHWARZ: Well, the - - -25

JUDGE FAHEY: I don't know if I - - -

1 that's a - - - I don't know if I agree with that 2 reading of it. 3 MS. SCHWARZ: Well, the - - - the provision 4 does say that they have the power to impose 5 appropriate orders as a part of the judgment of conviction. And - - -6 7 JUDGE FAHEY: All right. That isn't the 8 same as deferring a mandatory fee. That - - - those 9 are a little bit - - - that's something a little bit 10 different. So assume that that's the case - - - I 11 disagree with you about that - - - then what's the 12 only other way that this court could address this 13 issue? It seems to me that we'd have to look to the 14 - - - to the intent of the legislature and say 15 there's no logical basis for this sixty-day 16 distinction. 17 MS. SCHWARZ: Well, I think that the intent of the legislature was to make sure that the 18 19 mandatory nature of the surcharges was honored. 20 JUDGE FAHEY: Right. They were trying to 21 cut out - - -22 MS. SCHWARZ: So those individuals - - -23 JUDGE FAHEY: Slow down. They were trying 2.4 to cut out all the wiggle room for the courts. I 25 understand that. But my question, I guess, to you

1 is, can you point to something in the legislative 2 history that you think would allow us to draw that 3 distinction? MS. SCHWARZ: Well, I think that the 4 5 absence of any express language creating the 6 distinction or explaining why sixty days was the 7 magic number where you have the right to hardship 8 deferral or where you don't, that's the - - - it's 9 utterly silent. 10 I believe the reason they created this 11 summons part was to make those individuals who were 12 sentenced to sixty days or less to really have to 13 struggle and come up with the money. And if they 14 can't at sixty days, then they have to go back to 15 court and make that application. 16 JUDGE FAHEY: Well - - -17 MS. SCHWARZ: So that might encourage 18 people - - -19 JUDGE FAHEY: It's true. 20 MS. SCHWARZ: - - - to comply. Whereas - -21 22 JUDGE STEIN: But why wouldn't they make 23 that same requirement of somebody that's going to 2.4 prison for a longer time?

MS. SCHWARZ: Well, the problem - - - the

best - - - an illustration here explains it. Someone 1 2 who's sentenced to sixty days versus someone who's 3 sentenced to sixty-one days. The - - - the person who's sentenced to sixty-one - - - sixty days doesn't 4 5 have to pay the surcharge - - -JUDGE STEIN: Well - - -6 MS. SCHWARZ: - - - until - - - and then 7 8 goes to court at the summons part and asks for his 9 hardship deferral. The person who's sixty - - -10 JUDGE RIVERA: Isn't it a civil judgment 11 against them? MS. SCHWARZ: The - - -12 13 JUDGE RIVERA: Doesn't it stand as a civil judgment when they don't pay that day at sentencing? 14 15 I guess I'm not understanding the sixty-day grace 16 period. 17 MS. SCHWARZ: Well, I - - -JUDGE RIVERA: But I'll ask - - - I'll ask 18 19 the People about that. 20 MS. SCHWARZ: The statutes do authorize 21 imprisonment for failure to pay the surcharges. So 22 that's why there's a distinction between entering 23 judgment which is what would happen if the court 2.4 found that there was substantial hardship and granted 25 deferral.

1 JUDGE RIVERA: Um-hum. 2 JUDGE PIGOTT: Ms. Bautista - - -3 MS. SCHWARZ: So there's a - - -4 JUDGE PIGOTT: - - - Ms. Bautista's 5 chomping at the bit to say something. So why don't 6 we excuse you and ask her to - - -7 MS. SCHWARZ: Thank you. 8 JUDGE PIGOTT: Thank you. 9 Good afternoon, Ms. Bautista. 10 MS. BAUTISTA: Good afternoon, Judge 11 Pigott. Good afternoon, Your Honors. May it please 12 the court, my name is Sheila Bautista, and I 13 represent the People in this case. 14 Your Honors, the legislature's priority 15 with respect to the mandatory surcharge is its imposition and collection. The statutes clearly 16 17 state that it's - - - it is to be imposed at sentencing then collected from the defendant's inmate 18 19 account regardless of the length of his sentence. 2.0 JUDGE RIVERA: So there's no grace period? 21 MS. BAUTISTA: There's no grace period. 22 The plain language of 60.35(5) directs that the 23 superintendent of the facility or the municipal 2.4 official collect the money from the inmate's account,

which contemplates by designating a superintendent or

1 a municipal official, that contemplates jail terms or 2 state prison terms. 3 So it's the People's position that there is 4 no grace period. 60.35(5) says - - -5 JUDGE ABDUS-SALAAM: But is it your 6 experience, though, counsel, that the summons is 7 issued at sentencing for those who are sentenced to 8 sixty days or less? 9 MS. BAUTISTA: Your Honor, I - - - I don't 10 have experience in the trial courts. However, our 11 reading of the statute is that 60.35(8) which talks about the summonses, our reading is that it should be 12 13 issued at sentencing if the defendant hasn't paid. 14 JUDGE PIGOTT: That's the troubling part. 15 It - - - it was described, I guess, in the notes, as poorly drafted and difficult to follow, I think - - -16 17 yes, and difficult to follow. That's the way - - -MS. BAUTISTA: Well - - - well, it's clear 18 19 from the - - -20 JUDGE PIGOTT: Well, what I wanted to say 21 then is that we have a - - - we have a poorly 22 drafted, difficult to follow statute, and no one 23 seems to have any experience with exactly what 2.4 happens here, particularly with respect to the sixty

days or less. Because sixty days and beyond, I - - -

I don't think - - - Ms. Schwarz refers to sixty-one days. But I picture the person who gets paid - - - gets three-and-a-half to seven or twenty-five to life. I mean, I doubt that they care too much about what the surcharge is, except that it's coming out of their monthly thing. But on the sixty and less, I just have no feel for that, and you - - you don't either, on how - - how the summons part is supposed to work?

2.4

MS. BAUTISTA: Your Honor, the statute states that the summons is to be issued - - - $\!\!\!$

JUDGE PIGOTT: I'm aware of that. But I - - but I'm curious as to how that happens. I - - I'm trying to picture the defendant standing there.
Sort of, by the way, on your way to jail, here's a
summons. You've got twenty days to answer. Or
you've got sixty days to answer. Or the plaintiff is
so and so, and by the way, criminal defense lawyer,
you're now his civil defense lawyer. You have to
defend him on this civil action that's being brought
against him for the surcharge. I - - - I'm just
curious as to how it operates.

MS. BAUTISTA: Unfortunately, Your Honor, I don't have that in this record, because this defendant was sentenced to greater than sixty days.

```
And our - - - our position is that here - - -
 1
                    JUDGE FAHEY: Yeah, but - - - but isn't
 2
 3
          what would normally happen - - -
 4
                    JUDGE RIVERA: Well, perhaps you can bring
 5
          some clarity to what the summons - - - as the statute
 6
          - - - is supposed to say.
 7
                    MS. BAUTISTA: A sum - - -
                    JUDGE RIVERA: What is - - - how is it
 8
 9
          supposed to work?
10
                    MS. BAUTISTA: - - - a sum - - - a summons
11
          should be issued, and it tells the defendant that if
12
          you have not paid within sixty days, you must appear
13
          on this date sixty days after the imposition of the -
14
15
                    JUDGE RIVERA: And if you have paid - - -
16
                    MS. BAUTISTA: - - - mandatory surcharge.
17
                    JUDGE RIVERA: - - - you provide some kind
18
          of proof so that you don't have to show up, or you
19
          could show up with the proof?
20
                    MS. BAUTISTA: That's my understanding.
21
          That - - - it's - - - that's if it's unpaid. If it's
22
          paid - - -
23
                    JUDGE STEIN: It's an enforcement
2.4
          mechanism.
```

MS. BAUTISTA: - - - then - - -

2.4

JUDGE STEIN: It's not a you-get-sixty-days. It's you better pay, but if you haven't in sixty days, you better show up in court and make an argument why - - - why it should be deferred.

MS. BAUTISTA: Correct.

JUDGE STEIN: Correct?

MS. BAUTISTA: Correct.

TUDGE FAHEY: I thought - - - in Buffalo the court clerk sends them out. I was actually on city court before the old days. And Judge Pigott is right, we did try to defer or waive every fee that we could. Usually, when you're giving someone some serious time, it seemed like the height of cruelty to - - - to add a - - - a financial penalty to people that couldn't pay it at the end of giving them the time. So it's true. We - - - we would try to waive them all the time. I think that eighty percent is probably low. It's probably near ninety percent if they could get away with it.

But - - - so these laws were passed,
actually, while I was in city court, and they were
passed to do exactly what you argue, which is to make
sure that there was no more wiggle room for the
courts to be able to do this.

But the way the process works, at least it

1 did then when I was still there, is that the court 2 clerk would send out a summons subsequent to the 3 sentencing for the sixty-day people, and they would 4 get a notice, either pay it or appear at such at such 5 date. And then they just rolled them forward. They just rolled forward all the time. So - - -6 7 MS. BAUTISTA: But this - - - this - - -8 JUDGE FAHEY: Pretty straightforward. 9 MS. BAUTISTA: - - - and it just all goes 10 to show, though, that the deferral is not available 11 at sentencing, which is the issue in this case. 12 With all due respect, the practice of the 13 judges, the legislature made clear, they didn't want 14 the judges to exercise that judicial discretion at -15 16 JUDGE STEIN: You concede that this could 17 result in, you know, somebody applying post-18 sentencing, and then having to bring them back into 19 court, and - - - you know, all that additional 20 bureaucracy or whatever you want to call it? 21 MS. BAUTISTA: Well, Your Honor, there are 22 three main reasons why a deferral at sentencing 23 shouldn't be made available. As a practical matter, 2.4 a defendant would have - - - wouldn't be able to show

at sentencing that he suffers an undue hardship from

the mandatory surcharge, because he has not yet begun his incarceratory sentence.

JUDGE PIGOTT: Well, to pick up one of the things that Judge Fahey is saying, if you're - - - if you've got assigned counsel or the public defender representing you in city court or somewhere else, because you do not have sufficient funds to hire a lawyer, it's a pretty good indication that you're probably going to have trouble making - - paying this mandatory surcharge. I would think that would be the application that would be made.

MS. BAUTISTA: But Your Honor, also making it available at sentencing - - - making the deferral available at sentencing would preclude the DOCS from collecting it from the defendant, which would conflict with the mandate that it be collected from him while he's incarcerated.

JUDGE PIGOTT: Well, DOCS - - - DOCS is only a year or more. If you - - if you've got sixty days, you're going to be doing local time. And that won't be DOCS, that would be - - - I guess as Judge Fahey's indicating, somehow the city court does it.

MS. BAUTISTA: And if --- if --- but if deferral would be available at sentencing for this

defendant, then the city - - - the city authorities would not be collecting from his inmate account, as 60.35(5) mandates. It would conflict with that mandate and it would - - - as a practical matter, it would - - - the deferral would amount to the waiver that the legislature tried so hard to curb by making the mandatory surcharge mandatory and waivers totally unavailable.

2.0

2.4

Because if deferral were available at sentencing, either City or DOCS would not collect anymore. That would amount to - -

JUDGE FAHEY: But the process has been created.

MS. BAUTISTA: - - - a waiver.

JUDGE FAHEY: Let me ask a question in honor of Judge Lippman. Does this seem fair?

Because what you - - what the process has created, just from a fairness point of view. And this is - - - and the People, of course are concerned about this too. Does it seem fair that you've created a process which has eliminated waivers, but by law has to have a deferral?

We all agree that there's no way you can escape some form of a deferral in this by constitutional law. So if a deferral is required,

1 you've created a deferral process which in essence is 2 impossible to apply for once you've started to become 3 incarcerated and you don't have counsel assigned to 4 you anymore, and you're always post-sentence. Do you 5 see what I'm saying? 6 MS. BAUTISTA: Yes. Yes, Your Honor. 7 JUDGE FAHEY: Yeah. MS. BAUTISTA: It does seem fair. 8 Because 9 while the person is incra - - - incarcerated he has 10 opportunities to earn money to - - - to pay the 11 mandatory surcharge. He can participate in incentive 12 programs, rehabilitation. These are incentives for 13 him to take classes or work or - - -14 JUDGE FAHEY: But - - -15 MS. BAUTISTA: - - - things - - -16 JUDGE FAHEY: - - - but my point is not 17 that. My point - - - I agree with you. collection process is - - - it is what it is. 18 19 certainly - - - there's nothing unfair about that. 2.0 The question is whether or not the virtual 21 elimination of deferral is fair. And that's what 22 this seems to do. This process seems to virtually 23 eliminate deferral for anyone who's sentenced to any 2.4 crime more than a B misdemeanor.

MS. BAUTISTA: Yes, because it - - - it's -

1 - - the legislature saw fit to make this surcharge 2 mandatory. 3 JUDGE FAHEY: Um-hum. 4 MS. BAUTISTA: And that - - - that's what 5 the legislature said. And it's clear from their statute that this is a mandatory surcharge that can 6 7 never be waived, and the defendant - - -JUDGE RIVERA: Well, could the legislature 8 9 have actually written into the statute: "and it cannot be deferred"? 10 11 MS. BAUTISTA: It - - - it - - - there is a 12 deferral process. 13 JUDGE RIVERA: I understand. 14 MS. BAUTISTA: There is a deferral process. 15 JUDGE RIVERA: That wasn't my question. 16 MS. BAUTISTA: Right. 17 JUDGE RIVERA: Could the legislature have 18 chosen to even remove the opportunity for deferral -19 - - for deferment? 2.0 MS. BAUTISTA: They could have - - - they 21 could have. But they didn't, because it - - - it is still available. But it's clearly not available at 22 23 sentencing, because the only deferral process that 2.4 they describe is not available to people - - - for 25 the people who are sentenced to less than sixty days,

it's not available until they're out - - - until 1 they've served their time. 2 3 So there is a deferral process, it's just not available at sentencing, because it - - - it 4 5 conflicts with - - -6 JUDGE ABDUS-SALAAM: The summons. 7 - I'm still curious about the summons, counsel. For 8 someone who's sentenced to more than sixty days, is a 9 summons issued at sentencing, or is it only issued 10 after the person has - - - well, or it won't be 11 issued for someone whose sixty days - - - whose 12 sentence is more than sixty days because they'll be 13 incarcerated and the statute won't allow them to be 14 summonsed while they're incarcerated, correct? 15 MS. BAUTISTA: Correct. My understanding 16 is that the summons is not issued to a - - - to the 17 defendants who are sentenced to greater than sixty 18 days. But our position is that for persons sentenced 19 later, they still have a deferral mechanism under 2.0 420.10(5). 21 JUDGE ABDUS-SALAAM: But that mechanism 22 requires them to bring a motion to be resentenced? 23 MS. BAUTISTA: Correct. 2.4 JUDGE ABDUS-SALAAM: And when they're - - -25 they move to be resentenced, what are - - - what are

1	the mechanisms available for deferral for them?
2	MS. BAUTISTA: The resentencing motion?
3	JUDGE ABDUS-SALAAM: Yes.
4	MS. BAUTISTA: It would they would
5	have to make a showing of undue hardship such
6	similar to what the defendants sentenced to less than
7	sixty days show. They would have to make that
8	showing. Upon that showing, the court could decide
9	whether or not to defer the judgment. It would
10	become a civil judgment.
11	JUDGE ABDUS-SALAAM: So it's just a matter
12	of when they can make this request to be considered
13	for a deferral?
14	MS. BAUTISTA: Correct. And
15	JUDGE ABDUS-SALAAM: Not whether they can
16	ask for a deferral?
17	MS. BAUTISTA: Correct. Our position is a
18	deferral is available to all defendants, just not at
19	sentencing.
20	JUDGE RIVERA: Where where is that
21	standard you just set out for those who are
22	incarcerated over sixty days?
23	MS. BAUTISTA: Section 420.35 says that the
24	provisions of 420.10 are are applicable to the
25	mandatory surcharge And there's 420 10(5) has

1 a resentencing provision. 2 JUDGE RIVERA: Um-hum. 3 MS. BAUTISTA: So since 60.35(8) doesn't make it available to the defendants sentenced to 4 5 greater than six - - - than sixty days, we look to 420.10 for those defendants. 6 7 JUDGE RIVERA: And - - - and you're saying 420.10 uses the language of unreasonable hardship 8 9 that you find in 420.42? 10 MS. BAUTISTA: It - - -THE COURT: That applies to those under 11 12 sixty days' incarceration? 13 MS. BAUTISTA: - - - it uses a similar - -14 - it uses a similar language. It also says that 15 incarceration alone is not a showing of - - -16 JUDGE RIVERA: Yes, I know that. 17 MS. BAUTISTA: - - - unreasonable hardship. So if you look at 420.10(5) and (6) functionally, 18 19 those are the equivalent of a 420.40(5) deferral 20 hearing that's available to the defendants who are 21 sentenced to less than sixty days. 22 JUDGE RIVERA: All right. 23 MS. BAUTISTA: So in a nutshell, that's our 2.4 - - - that's our position. Our position is that 25 deferral's available, just not at sentencing.

Because if so, it would conflict with the mandate to 2 collect and it would contravene the legislature's 3 intent to curb judicial discretion to grant relief 4 from the mandatory surcharge. 5 JUDGE RIVERA: So what hap - - - let me 6 just ask you. I'm - - - I've been given the three-7 and-a-half to seven - - - I think that's what Judge Pigott mentioned before - - - and I don't have a 8 9 penny to my name. So I'm going in. And obviously 10 DOCs is now going to collect from my fund whenever any money goes into the fund. Is there a civil 11 12 judgment that's been imposed? 13 MS. BAUTISTA: If - - - has it been deferred? Has it - - -14 15 JUDGE RIVERA: At sentencing or whenever -16 - - shortly thereafter? Is it now a civil judgment 17 that I'm paying off? What am I paying off? 18 MS. BAUTISTA: You're - - - you're paying 19 the mandatory surcharge. 20 JUDGE RIVERA: So it's not a civil judgment 21 as in a - - -22 MS. BAUTISTA: No. JUDGE RIVERA: - - - lien under the 23 2.4 C.P.L.R. 25 MS. BAUTISTA: No.

1 JUDGE RIVERA: Because there are provisions 2 for making these things - - -3 MS. BAUTISTA: It is - - -4 JUDGE RIVERA: - - - civil judgments. 5 MS. BAUTISTA: Correct. It's a mandatory 6 surcharge, and it does not become a civil judgment 7 until the sentencing court notifies the clerk of 8 court. 9 JUDGE RIVERA: Um-hum. So since - - -10 since DOCS is collecting whatever amount it may be 11 collecting, even twenty-five cents a month - - -12 MS. BAUTISTA: It's twenty percent. JUDGE RIVERA: - - - it will not be - - -13 14 whatever amount it - - - well, depending on the 15 amount that I've got. It will not be converted to 16 that civil judgment? 17 MS. BAUTISTA: Not while they're incarcerated. But at the end of a person's 18 19 incarceration, DOCS tells the sentencing court 2.0 whether or not the defendant has paid the mandatory 21 surcharge - - - let me see if I can find that. I believe it's a directive. It's a DOCS directive. 22 23 - - - DOCS Directive 2788 at pages 8 to 9. DOCS 2.4 tells the sentencing court whether or not the

surcharge has been paid. And in turn, the sentencing

court tells the State whether the mandatory surcharge 1 2 has been paid or not. 3 My understanding is the sentencing court 4 can enter a civil judgment if a mandatory surcharge 5 hasn't been paid under C.P.L. 420.10(6). But it doesn't become a civil judgment until he gets out, is 6 7 my understanding. JUDGE RIVERA: Until release. 8 9 MS. BAUTISTA: Right. 10 JUDGE RIVERA: Thank you. 11 Thank you, Ms. Bautista. JUDGE PIGOTT: 12 MS. BAUTISTA: Thank you. 13 JUDGE PIGOTT: Ms. Schwarz, you want to 14 straighten us out? 15 MS. SCHWARZ: I'll try. There's been a lot of questions about how the summons would work when 16 17 someone is serving a shorter-than-sixty-day sentence. 18 And I've seen that happen in criminal court. I can 19 tell you they are told about what to do. There's 2.0 paperwork processed by the clerk. But it's not 21 delivered to the defendant until they're released. 22 At least that's how it happens in Manhattan criminal 23 court. 2.4 JUDGE FAHEY: Well, that would be only for

over sixty days. Yeah. Other than that, they - - -

they just - - - just mail it to them and they appear. 1 2 MS. SCHWARZ: But - - - and - - - and a 3 very similar procedure is used in the compliance 4 parts where defendants have to go to a drug treatment 5 program or whatever they're told they must return to 6 court with compliance paperwork and to pay their 7 surcharges. JUDGE PIGOTT: But the bottom line, I 8 9 think, as Ms. Bautista was pointing out, is that the 10 legislature seems to have done everything in their 11 power to make sure that we do not do anything but 12 make sure these things get collected. 13 MS. SCHWARZ: I have to respectfully 14 disagree, because yes they said no waiver. But we're 15 saying it's imposed. It's just that it's deferred. And certainly the legislature has said the opposite, 16 17 because they created C.P.L. 420.40 and the whole 18 point - - -19 JUDGE ABDUS-SALAAM: Someone - - - counsel, 2.0 if someone is doing - - -21 MS. SCHWARZ: - - - of that is deferral. So they've said its' - - -22 23 JUDGE ABDUS-SALAAM: - - - so if someone is 2.4 doing three to seven, and it's deferred while they're 25 in prison, does that mean that the State or the City

has to wait for seven years if they're going to do the full time before the mandatory surcharge can be collected, even though the inmate could be earning whatever amount - - - I know it's not a lot - - - but earning something in prison? MS. SCHWARZ: Well, before deferral would be granted, the court would have to be convinced that this individual was under such terrible, serious financial hardship that they could - - - that imposition of the surcharge would cause an

financial hardship that they could - - - that imposition of the surcharge would cause an unreasonable hardship to him or his family. And that would be - - is a very difficult burden for him to make.

JUDGE ABDUS-SALAAM: Isn't the legisla - -

MS. SCHWARZ: Or her.

2.4

JUDGE ABDUS-SALAAM: - - - isn't the legislation somewhat of a presumption that if you're going to prison for more than sixty days, as I believe the ADA just mentioned, you will have the ability to earn something while you're in prison, so the hardship won't be as hard or as difficult as someone who will get out in sixty days or less?

MS. SCHWARZ: Not all - - - not every individual is eligible for - - - for work. There are

people with medical conditions. There are people with serious financial obligations, court-ordered or otherwise, who aren't able to make those payments.

So I think what the legislature - - -

2.4

JUDGE RIVERA: So then nothing is collected against them. And there's no civil judgment against them. Isn't what the legislature - - - it appears from these statutes - - - is saying is if you're in jail and you're collecting money or money is put into your account - - - as I read the statutes also if you receive money from someone and it goes into your account - - - that's fair game? They can collect off that too to pay the surcharge.

Okay. So if you've got funds, we've got victims who - - - and victim services we're trying to fund as the State, we're going to - - - we're going to collect while you're in jail. Isn't that what these statutes are saying? Regardless of whether or not anyone in this courtroom might have made that choice, that appears to be the legislative choice, is it not?

MS. SCHWARZ: Yes. However, they provide - this legislature provided for deferral in the
unusual circumstance where someone's small pittance
of money they earn while in prison isn't even going

1 to be enough for them to buy a toothbrush. And those 2 people should be able to have equal access for 3 fairness purposes, to request deferral. 4 Now, the three-and-a-half to seven person's 5 going to have a hard - - -JUDGE STEIN: Well, as I understand it, 6 7 they can. They just can't do it at sentencing. 8 MS. SCHWARZ: But at - - if they don't do 9 it at sent - - - the only way to have a level playing 10 field is for them to have it at sentencing, because 11 at sentencing, as soon as they're sentenced, the 12 courts can start withdrawing funds. So they're going 13 to have funds withdrawn while - - -14 JUDGE RIVERA: Your concern is you - - -15 MS. SCHWARZ: - - - pending - - -JUDGE RIVERA: - - - don't want someone 16 17 who's incarcerated to have their inmate account drained. 18 I - - - I get your argument, but - - -19 MS. SCHWARZ: Especially these extremely -2.0 21 JUDGE RIVERA: Yes, I get your argument. 22 MS. SCHWARZ: - - - indigent - - -23 JUDGE RIVERA: The question is whether or 2.4 not you can read the statutes that way. And it seems 25 pretty clear, the statute is saying you collect from

the minute they walk into the - - - to be 1 2 incarcerated. 3 MS. SCHWARZ: I would just urge the court 4 t.o - - -5 JUDGE RIVERA: That we can start the 6 collection process. 7 MS. SCHWARZ: It's when they fail to pay. And the - - - a defendant who's issued a summons 8 9 hasn't failed to pay until it's time to return for 10 the summons. They are given a grace period of sixty days in order to make payment one way or the other. 11 12 And it's not until sixty days later that they fail to 13 pay. Whereas those people sentenced to more than 14 sixty days, the - - - it's due immediately. 15 that's the distinction. 16 And in order for the statute to be applied 17 fairly to all individuals, the - - - the only way that - - -18 19 JUDGE RIVERA: Would it be fairly applied 20 if we said that everybody is subject to have 21 immediate collection upon incarceration. If we 22 disagreed with you on this grace period, is that then 23 a fair application? Again, it may be harsh; you may 2.4 disagree with it, but it may be the legislative poi -

25

- - choice.

1	MS. SCHWARZ: Well, I don't think you could
2	read 60.35(5) as saying that. So
3	JUDGE PIGOTT: We'll we'll take a
4	look at it. I think your time has expired. But I
5	appreciate your time. Thank you.
6	(Court is adjourned)
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

CERTIFICATION

I, Penina Wolicki, certify that the foregoing transcript of proceedings in the Court of Appeals of People of the State of New York v. Anthony Jones, No. 2 was prepared using the required transcription equipment and is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Penina waieh.

Agency Name: eScribers

Signature:

Address of Agency: 700 West 192nd Street

Suite # 607

New York, NY 10040

Date: January 6, 2016