1	COURT OF APPEALS		
2	STATE OF NEW YORK		
3			
4	THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK,		
5	Respondent,		
6	-against- NO. 18		
7	JEFFERY BUSH,		
8	Appellant.		
9	20 Eagle Street Albany, New York February 10, 202		
10	Before:		
11	CHIEF JUDGE JANET DIFIORE		
12	ASSOCIATE JUDGE JENNY RIVERA ASSOCIATE JUDGE MICHAEL J. GARCIA		
13	ASSOCIATE JUDGE ROWAN D. WILSON ASSOCIATE JUDGE MADELINE SINGAS		
14	ASSOCIATE JUDGE ANTHONY CANNATARO ASSOCIATE JUDGE SHIRLEY TROUTMAN		
15			
16	Appearances:		
17	YING-YING MA, ESQ. THE LEGAL AID SOCIETY		
18	Attorney for Appellant		
	199 Water Street New York, NY 10038		
19	ARIEH SCHULMAN, ESQ.		
20	KINGS COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE Attorney for Respondent		
21	350 Jay Street 19th Floor		
22	Brooklyn, NY 11201		
23			
24	Karen Schiffmille		
25	Official Court Transcribe:		



CHIEF JUDGE DIFIORE: Number 18, The People of 1 2 the State of New York v. Jeffery Bush. 3 And we'll give our colleagues one moment to 4 collect themselves before we begin. 5 You may remain where you are. Thank you. 6 Okay, good afternoon, Counsel. 7 MS. MA: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Two minutes 8 for rebuttal, please? 9 CHIEF JUDGE DIFIORE: You may. 10 MS. MA: Thank you. 11 May it please the court, Ying-Ying Ma on behalf 12 of the appellant, Jeffery Bush. 13 When a sentencing court upends the promised plea 14 bargain on the day of sentencing, with a completely new 15 type of sentence, which was never mentioned before the 16 plea, no burden of preservation is placed on the accused, 17 because there was not sufficient notice of this new 18 sentence. 19 JUDGE SINGAS: Ms. Ma, wasn't this the judge 20 asking? It was more an inquiry of the sentence. Is this a 21 CD, rather than an imposition of the sentence? So couldn't 22 at that point, somebody said, no, that's not what it is, 23 Judge. I don't understand why, under these circumstances, 24 the judge asking what the sentence was wouldn't allow for

the defense a meaningful opportunity to object?

25

MS. MA: Well, the reason for that is, Mr. Bush, as a layperson, he has no idea what the two letters, CD, meant. Maybe his lawyer understood that to be the promise, but that was not the promise that was put on the record at the plea. That's clear from the plea minutes. Mr. Bush had no idea that he was going to be sentenced to a conditional discharge. And when the court just used - - -

2.2

JUDGE TROUTMAN: But the record is also clear that there was a negotiation. This plea went from a felony to a misdemeanor. His attorney negotiated out the possibility of probation. And it was clear that community service would be a part of it. The question is, how does the court pronounce sentence to accommodate the requirement of the community service?

MS. MA: Well, I understand Your Honor is saying that a community service sentence can only be imposed along with a conditional discharge, but that doesn't mean the court is not still obligated to put that on the record.

Mr. Bush does not know that. I - - I don't think many lawyers even know that, you know, you cannot impose a community service sentence without a conditional discharge.

JUDGE TROUTMAN: So it's not enough that he knew the most he faced, if he didn't com - - - complete the community service, was a year in jail. The court needed to specifically tell him, the mechanism that was going to be

utilized in order to impose a sentence of community service; is that what you're saying?

MS. MA: Yes, I think when the court tells him, at the plea, don't get arrested; otherwise, you'll face a year in jail, it's unclear that that is for a - - I mean, it's completely not stated that that's for a year after he completes the sentence. It's - - it could very well mean only in the period between the plea and the sentence, which is a very traditional condition of a plea, to show up to court, to not get rearrested, and to complete any conditions.

JUDGE TROUTMAN: And - - -

JUDGE WILSON: So could - - - could I - - - I'm sorry.

JUDGE TROUTMAN: Go ahead.

never practiced in New York Criminal Court, so you need to help me a little bit here. What do I make out of the form, the conditional discharge form, that's at page A20? So when I read the record, it's at least possible, but I have no idea if this is right or not, that what normally happens is, you take a plea, there's a day for sentencing, that's the return date for sentencing, and that, at that point, the sen - - this form is filled out with the conditions for the conditional discharge in it, and then you meet

whatever those conditions are thereafter.

But that something anomalous happened here, which was that Mr. Bush completed all his community service before this form was ever filled out. But he did fill - - - he did sign the form, and it does say a year, and it's a year from that date. Is this - - -

MS. MA: Yes, that is - - - well, the normal procedure is - - - normally when somebody gets community service, it's on a misdemeanor plea, and so plea and sentence are imposed at the same time, and then the form is given to the person. It's unusual that on an indicted felony, there would be a plea down to a mis - - - a community service sentence, so that's why this case has some - - somewhat unusual facts.

And it's true that Mr. Bush did not object, but this court has - - - in People v. Turner, which was a very similar case, where the defendant there was not told about post-release supervision at her plea, and then at her sentence, the court announces it for the very first time.

Ms. Turner, as well, she did not object, but not only that, she also told the court specifically that she had spoken to her lawyer about post-release supervision, and that she was still ready to proceed with sentencing. And the court still found that preservation was not required in that case because she didn't have sufficient notice.

She wasn't given the fact - - - the - - - the knowledge that she would face any period of post-release supervision. And the court specifically takes the time in - - in its decision in Turner to distinguish People v. Murray, a case where the defendant was told about post-release supervision at the plea, and then at sentence, the only difference was the - - - the term of post-release supervision was changed from two years to three years.

2.1

So the court says that in that situation, the defendant is already aware of the nature of that sentence, specifically that if he violates the terms of PRS, then his term in prison could be extended. And that's exactly the situation - - -

JUDGE TROUTMAN: So are you req - - - would you require a rule that, at the time of plea, the court puts on the record every variation of sentence that could be imposed?

MS. MA: No, I'm asking for the imposition of the rule that already exists, which is that the court must make a clear record of each and every direct consequence of the plea. And a conditional discharge is clearly a direct consequence of the plea. It's an authorized sentence in the penal law. It's not - - - it's not something that can just be merely kind of suggested by - - - by - - - by announcing only one part of a conditional discharge, which

is, don't get rearrested. For that matter, you know, then a court can just impose probation by saying, don't get rearrested, because the - - - not being - - -

on the screen. Can I just clarify this part of your argument in response to Judge Troutman's question about what's the rule you're seeking? It - - - it - - - is the rule that you've got to say, you're subject to a conditional discharge and how long the conditions are being imposed? Or is it just, I've got to run through all the conditions, even if I don't tell you the length of time? Or is it enough to just say, conditions will be imposed, and they're going to last a year? I mean, what - - in this case, what - - what would have been enough? What did the judge have to say - -

MS. MA: I think the judge just - - - JUDGE RIVERA: - - at the plea?

MS. MA: - - - just had to say, conditional discharge with the condition being twenty days of community service. It's not that difficult to ask a judge to merely pronounce the actual name of the sentence at the plea, to fulfill its - - -

JUDGE RIVERA: Well, so the judge didn't have to say, and it's lasting a year?

MS. MA: Oh, one-year conditional discharge - - -



yes, we - - - we believe that the judge would have to - -1 2 to impose a sentence - - -3 JUDGE RIVERA: Yeah, so that that's my - - - oh, 4 okay. If the judge had said - - - or had not said it - - -5 not said the words, conditional discharge, but said, you'll 6 be subject to conditions for a year, and then didn't set out the other conditions, community service has already 7 8 been explained, so I - - - I'm not going to refer to that. 9 Would that have been enough? 10 MS. MA: I think the better rule is just to use the name of - - of the sentence, as it's laid out in the 11 12 Penal Law, and not to merely suggest what the sentence is, 13 to give the - - - the accused person actual, clear notice 14 of what the plea bargain that they're entering into is and 15 what a direct consequence of that bargain will be. 16 JUDGE RIVERA: Is that - - - but isn't - - - I -17 - - I may have misunderstood your argument. I - - - I 18 thought your whole point to that was, so that a defendant 19 would know what, if any, limitations are placed on their 20 liberty? 21

22

23

24

25

JUDGE RIVERA: Okay, but the - - - doesn't - - - so that - - - yes, I'm sorry. So doesn't that mean you have to tell them the amount of time their liberty is



constrained, as well as the nature of the constraints? 1 2 MS. MA: Yes, we are asking that the - - - that 3 the court make a record at the plea of both the name of the 4 sentence and the duration of the sentence. 5 JUDGE WILSON: So why - - -6 MS. MA: And here neither - - -7 CHIEF JUDGE DIFIORE: So the specific words must 8 be, Mr. Defendant, I - - - this court sentences you to one 9 - - - a conditional discharge, the duration of which is one 10 year, and the condition attached is community service. MS. MA: That's correct. 11 12 CHIEF JUDGE DIFIORE: And if they don't say - -13 if the court only says, a conditional discharge, and the 14 service is community - - - the condition is community 15 service, by eliminating one year. Is that what are you 16 suggesting that - - - that's not sufficient? 17 MS. MA: It - - - it is our position that the one 18 year should be included, but here, there was not any 19 mention of a conditional discharge. The only thing the 20 court said was, if you complete - - - if you don't complete 21 twenty days of community service, you'll go to jail. 2.2 CHIEF JUDGE DIFIORE: No, I - - - I'm 23 piggybacking on Judge Rivera's question. What are the 24 specific words that must be said, both one-year,

conditional discharge, and then the - - - the conditions of

25

1	the conditional discharge?		
2	MS. MA: Yes, I believe it is specified		
3	CHIEF JUDGE DIFIORE: Okay.		
4	MS. MA: in the criminal pro		
5	procedure law, that when a court does impose a sentence of		
6	a conditional discharge, that it must specify the the		
7	conditions of that discharge		
8	CHIEF JUDGE DIFIORE: Yeah.		
9	MS. MA: and the length.		
10	JUDGE WILSON: And so why is this appeal not		
11	- sorry, over here why is it not moot?		
12	MS. MA: It's not moot because there's never been		
13	a prejudice requirement. In People v. Van Dusen, the cour		
14	held that for a Catu error, the defendant does not have to		
15	show that they would have not not taken the plea.		
16	That if the plea had been vacated, that they would have		
17	chosen to not take the plea.		
18	So the he Mr. Bush suffered serious		
19	harm by living under the threat of incarceration for one		
20	year, by serving an entirely additional sentence, when he		
21	thought that he was getting a sentence of twenty days		
22	community service, and in fact		
23	JUDGE WILSON: Well, that		
24	MS. MA: he diligently completed		
25	JUDGE WILSON: that injury I mean, in		

1	he if he did suffer some injury, men mental
2	anguish or whatever, during that year, we can't take that
3	back. We can't remedy that. He's as I understand
4	it, a year went by; he wasn't rearrested; there was no
5	other adverse consequence.
6	MS. MA: Judge, we still think that is
7	that does require reversal, even though he completed the
8	year with no no new arrests. But he did have to
9	serve an entirely additional sentence that was not part of
10	his plea agreement.
11	JUDGE WILSON: Well, just help help
12	help me out here with the
13	MS. MA: And if you take that to its logical
14	conclusion, the court
15	JUDGE WILSON: But the the consequence of
16	conditional discharge, if you meet the conditions, is that
17	there's no conviction. Is that right or wrong?
18	MS. MA: No, it's just a sentence. There
19	the conviction still stands.
20	JUDGE WILSON: Okay.
21	MS. MA: But we do believe that in this case,
22	because Mr. Bush cannot be made whole, as Your Honor is
23	pointing out by a plea vacature, that dismissal
24	JUDGE WILSON: Right.
25	MS. MA: of the case is warranted.

CHIEF JUDGE DIFIORE: Thank you, Counsel.

MS. MA: Thank you.

CHIEF JUDGE DIFIORE: Counsel?

MR. SCHULMAN: Good afternoon, Your Honors. May it please the court. This case, there was nothing wrong with the plea itself. The plea, as it stood, was completely legal on its face. Defendant was told that if he satisfied the conditions, the twenty days community service, the 150-dollar man - - - mandatory surcharge, and the six-month license suspension, he would, in essence, be sentenced to an unconditional discharge.

Notably, this court has upheld cases where interim probation is issued as part of the sentence before the sentence is actually imposed. So although the conditional - - - the unconditional discharge words were not uttered, in substance, the defendant was told at the plea proceeding that if he satisfied these requirements, he would get nothing more. So the - - -

JUDGE RIVERA: So Counsel, can I just be clear - I'm sorry; I'm on the screen. There were no other
conditions, only the ones you've named? And the minute he
satisfied them, he was done; is that correct?

MR. SCHULMAN: Well, Your Honor, between the time of the plea and his sentence, he was not to get rearrested. He had to show up to court. But - - -



JUDGE RIVERA: Right.

MR. SCHULMAN: -- after that point, the court never spoke of any additional conditions that Mr. Bush had to satisfy as part of this plea agreement.

JUDGE RIVERA: So I'm sorry. So then the form and the one-year have no applicability here?

MR. SCHULMAN: The - - - Your Honor, the court - - - there was a mistake here. The court de - - - defense attorney and the prosecutor surely made a mistake at the sentencing proceeding. The conditional discharge should never have been issued. The defendant should have received the unconditional discharge. But that goes to the - - - that validity of the sentence and not the validity of the plea.

So that the defendant's complaint in this case really concerns the validity of the plea, and the remedy he's seeking is not the remedy he deserves or is entitled to. Tellingly - - -

JUDGE RIVERA: All right. But before we get to the remedy, can you explain why this error that you say occurred, that it should have been an unconditional discharge?

MR. SCHULMAN: Well, Your Honor, he was told at the plea proceeding that if he satisfied those requirements, namely completing the twenty days of



community service, not - - - not getting rearrested, and showing up to court, then he would be - - - excuse me - - - he would be sentenced to a - - - he would receive a six-month license suspension, and he would be - - - there would be an imposition of a 250-dollar surcharge.

Now, at the sentence proceeding, the court imposed a conditional discharge. That aspect of the - - - of the sentence should have - - - should not have been uttered, and defendant should have received the benefit of his bargain, which is, namely, the unconditional discharge.

JUDGE RIVERA: So - - - oh, okay. So you - - - you're saying that exactly what he was told at the plea were the only conditions that validly could be imposed, or that because that's what wasn't imposed, that is his sentence?

MR. SCHULMAN: Well - - -

JUDGE RIVERA: Or that's what was mentioned, excuse me - - - that was the sentence that should have been imposed.

MR. SCHULMAN: Well, Your Honor, my position - - our position is that, that's the sentence that should have been imposed. Of course, the court had the authority to increase the sentence at the sentencing proceeding, as is often done in cases where the victim speaks, or the court learned something new in between the plea and the



sentence; the - - - the sentencing court is entitled to increase the sentence. People v. Selikoff, and - - - and - - - and numerous cases thereafter, you know, provide the court the authority to increase the sentence.

JUDGE GARCIA: Counsel, I'm sorry - - - over here
- - if I missed this. But is this argument you're making
here anywhere in your brief, that this was an erroneous
sentence? I thought your argument was they had an
obligation to object to this sentence. I - - I - - and
maybe I missed it, and you can point me to it, but is there
anywhere in your brief where you've said what you just said
here in court today, that there was a different agreement
and the court made a mistake. Is that in your brief?

MR. SCHULMAN: No, Your Honor, but we - - - we do believe this defendant had to preserve this argument. But going back to the issue of the - - of the validity of the plea, there was no issue with the val - - validity of the plea. The plea itself was legal, and if we look at the face of the proceeding, the record of - - the record of the plea proceeding; there is nothing wrong with the actual plea itself.

JUDGE TROUTMAN: So if what you're saying is true, and I take it at your word. You're saying, he should have gotten an unconditional discharge. He can't get that now, so why shouldn't he get the relief that's requested by



the defense?

MR. SCHULMAN: Well, Your Honor, the relief he was entitled to was specific performance. He had relied, to his detriment, on the community service aspect of his plea. So had the defense attorney objected at sentencing, the court could have, and presumably would have, it appears on the record, that the court was not wedded to this conditional discharge, as evidenced by the question he asked at the outset of the proceeding, then the court would have excised that portion of the - - - of the conditional de - - - of the sentence, and the twenty-days community service.

However, dismissal of the plea - - - of the indictment and vacatur of the plea is not the remedy.

JUDGE GARCIA: Was the Appellate Division aware of this position you're taking here? Did you argue before the Appellate Division that this is a mistake?

MR. SCHULMAN: We argued that pre - - - preservation applied, Your Honor.

JUDGE TROUTMAN: But the mistake of imposition of a conditional as opposed to an unconditional, you're acknowledging was not argued in the Appellate Division?

MR. SCHULMAN: It was not. Had it been argued in the - - - had it been the defendant's position, and had that been argued, we would have - - - we would not have



opposed that relief. And we would have - - - we would have consented to the - - - to the aspect of vacating the conditional discharge.

But just going back to the remedy for a second, Your Honor, while the defendant can't be put back to his original position, this is akin to cases where a defendant is tried, convicted, and later on raises a claim on appeal, which ultimately is meritorious. The defendant doesn't just have a dis - - - the - - - the remedy isn't just dismissal of the indictment and vacatur of the plea. He's entitled to a retrial, so while he isn't entirely made whole, that is the best that the - - - the criminal procedural law provides for. I - - - you know, it's not a perfect solution, but there's not much more that can be done in that respect.

So just - - - just to reiterate and - - - and just to respond to my adversary's argument about People v.

Turner and - - - and the - - - the line of other cases,

McAlpin, et cetera - - -

JUDGE RIVERA: Can I - - - I'm - - - Counsel, I'm sorry. I just - - - I just want to clarify something from your view about the actual sentence that is imposed. Is it your view that since - - - although it's not clear to me when the one-year runs; maybe - - - maybe you know when the judge intended the one year to run from - - - I assume from

the day of sentencing, but you tell - - - you can tell me otherwise - - - anyway, that for one year, he was subject - - his understanding was he was subject to all of those conditions, and if he violated any condition, that then he would have, what? What would have happened?

MR. SCHULMAN: Well, Your Honor, there would have been Outley hearing, and it would have been - - -

JUDGE RIVERA: Um-hum.

MR. SCHULMAN: - - determined whether he had violated any of those conditions, and - - -

JUDGE RIVERA: Right.

MR. SCHULMAN: - - - presumably, if he were, in fact, in violation of any of those conditions, he would have a - - he would - - - he would be convicted of, you know, a violation of the conditional discharge.

able to raise the claim he's raising now, in any - - in any of these opportunities? Would he - - - or - - or would he have been able to make the claim that you say - - that you now concede that it's an unlawful sentence? I - - I'm just trying to get straight what this procedure would have been, should he have violated during the one year, because you - - are you conceding that - - given that the one year was imposed, again, if he violated any conditions, he's now subject to some kind of hearing,

potentially some kind of sanction? Just - - - just trying to be clear on what would have happened.

MR. SCHULMAN: In terms of what the defendant - - - if I'm - - - if I'm understanding correctly, Your Honor, in terms of what the defendant should have done at the time the - - - the sentence of conditional discharge was imposed?

JUDGE RIVERA: No. I'm asking if - - - if during the - - - the one year after sentencing, if during the period during which he is subject to what you now say is an unlawful sentence, but let's just stay with this. And I thought you did mention it in your brief to us, but it may very well be you didn't raise it in the AD.

But in any event, if - - - if indeed he violated anything, you're saying yes, he would have - - - would have gone before the court; he would have been brought in for a violation. And so I'm - - - I'm just - - - I was just trying to clarify your perspective, your view as to how this would have played itself out, if indeed the - - - the conditions he's subject to, have been allegedly violated during the period of time he's subject to them?

MR. SCHULMAN: Your Honor, had he raised the - - the fact that this conditional discharge never should
have been issued in the first place, then - - - then there
would be no violation of the conditional discharge and



1 whatever - - - had it been a new crime, then he would face 2 the consequences of that crime alone. 3 If I may just finish with one point, Your Honor? 4 CHIEF JUDGE DIFIORE: Yes, please. 5 MR. SCHULMAN: Just to distinguish this case from 6 People v. Turner, People v. McAlpin, and People v. Louree, 7 those cases all dealt with post-release supervision. 8 in each one of those cases, the plea itself, standing on 9 its own, was invalid. So the defendant could never have 10 received the benefit of his bargain at the time the plea was issued. 11 12 In this case, however, the plea itself on its 13 own, was valid, and the promise could have been imposed at 14 sentencing. 15 Thank you. 16 CHIEF JUDGE DIFIORE: Thank you, Counsel. 17 Counsel, your rebuttal? 18 JUDGE GARCIA: Counsel, would you like to respond to this point, that the sentence was erroneous? 19 The - - - the last point? 20 MS. MA: 2.1 JUDGE GARCIA: Yeah, that this is not the 2.2 sentence that was agreed upon at all? It - - - it is - - -23 do you see that anywhere in the briefs before this court? 24 MS. MA: No, I think it's telling that respondent 25 is bringing up a completely new argument at oral argument

in front of this court that was not raised below, that was 1 2 not raised in these briefs. I think that's a real reach to 3 say - - - to make these arguments, because respondent is 4 aware that this court has already fashioned a rule, that if 5 applied as it should be in this case, dictates the outcome 6 here. And before we - - -7 JUDGE GARCIA: But do we think that it might 8 change the outcome, the fact that we've just - - - I just 9 heard, that this was not the agreed upon sentence. 10 MS. MA: I'm sorry, which was not the agreed upon

sentence?

JUDGE GARCIA: That this conditional discharge was an error; it should never have been imposed.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. MA: That's - - - that's not how these - - that's not how courts operate. It's not how we should, you know, create confidence in our justice system, is to say, oh, actually it was a mistake. You know, we agreed on this as the sentence, and now we're giving you this other thing, that - - - that, in fact, really undermines confidence in our justice system.

JUDGE RIVERA: Counsel, I'm - - - I'm - - - I'm I'm a little unclear. I - - - perhaps it's on the screen. not this exact argument about the lawfulness of the sentence. I thought they did argue in their brief here, that an unconditional discharge could have been imposed.



Then, I thought your response was that, no, they - - - that couldn't be imposed, which goes to the lawfulness of the sentence.

Did I misunderstand this briefing?

2.1

MS. MA: No, I think that I - - - well, I think on second - - - on second consideration, the court could have - - - our position is the court could have fashioned a creative remedy, to make Mr. Bush whole at that point. The court could have, for instance, imposed a conditional discharge and then immediately terminated it - - -

JUDGE GARCIA: But Counsel, I think that the issue that I - - - I - - - I think we're going sideways on here, on the bench, is my understanding of the argument - - that argument Judge Rivera just said, you know, reiterated is, look, this is a sentence that could have been imposed, unlike the PSR sentences. You know, you - - - this sentence with a conditional discharge, this was legal under the statute. It's not unlawful.

What I thought I just heard, though, was that wasn't the agreed upon sentence in this case. That there should not have been a conditional discharge imposed here, and the argument now appears to be no harm, no foul; you know, we didn't agree to, you know - - - the defendant never agreed to a conditional discharge, but one got imposed, but you know, you should have objected.



1 I never heard the part about - - - that I can 2 recall - - - that there was no agreement to impose 3 conditional discharge. I thought the argument was, when 4 the judge says CD, that's what people had agreed to. But 5 it seems - - -6 MS. MA: Yes, that's my understanding of their 7 argument as well that, you know, maybe the lawyers had 8 understood that to be the promise, but that was not what 9 was told to Mr. Bush. What was told to him was just 10 twenty-days community service. And in fact, he diligently 11 completed those twenty days, before he even returned to 12 court. It was twenty days out of a two-and-a-half-month 13 period, which was every single weekend - - -14 So basically at the trial court JUDGE TROUTMAN: 15 level, everyone was confused about what the sentence was 16 supposed to be? 17 MS. MA: I don't think we can know for certain, 18 but what we do know is that Mr. Bush was not told that he 19 would face - -

JUDGE TROUTMAN: Right.

20

2.1

2.2

23

24

25

MS. MA: - - - a one year - - -

JUDGE TROUTMAN: But it's not until today, we're told, well, he should have gotten the CD. The People say, he did not receive the benefit of his bargain. Today they say that.



1 MS. MA: Yeah, it's easy for them to say today, 2 but that's not what happened. He didn't receive the 3 benefit of his bargain. 4 JUDGE TROUTMAN: No, no, they said, he didn't. 5 He was supposed to get an unconditional discharge. 6 a conditional discharge, but he shouldn't get the relief 7 that you're requesting is their argument. 8 JUDGE GARCIA: Today. 9 I understand that, but I - - - I -10 as I have cited earlier, this court has never found that 11 there is a prejudice requirement. And we do believe that 12 living under a conditional discharge for an additional 13 year, serving an additional sentence was a harm that Mr. 14 Bush suffered, and so we do ask this court to reverse. 15 CHIEF JUDGE DIFIORE: Thank you, Counsel. 16 MS. MA: Thank you. 17 (Court is adjourned) 18 19 20 21 22 23 24



25

1		CERTIFICATION	
2			
3	I, K	aren Schiffmiller, certify that the foregoing	
4	transcript of proceedings in the Court of Appeals of The		
5	People of the State of New York v. Jeffery Bush, No. 18 was		
6	prepared using the required transcription equipment and is		
7	a true and accurate record of the proceedings.		
8		11 1 10 · M	
9	Karen Schiffmille		
10	Signature:		
11			
12			
13	Agency Name:	eScribers	
14			
15	Address of Agency:	7227 North 16th Street	
16		Suite 207	
17		Phoenix, AZ 85020	
18			
19	Date:	February 21, 2022	
20			
21			
22			
23			

