



**WRITTEN TESTIMONY OF
THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
TWENTY-EIGHTH LEGISLATURE, 2015**

ON THE FOLLOWING MEASURE:

H.B. NO. 148, H.D. 2, S.D. 1, RELATING TO WRONGFUL IMPRISONMENT.

BEFORE THE:

SENATE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

DATE: Monday, April 6, 2015

TIME: 9:05 a.m.

LOCATION: State Capitol, Room 211

TESTIFIER(S): WRITTEN TESTIMONY ONLY. For more information, contact Mark M. Nomura, Deputy Attorney General at 586-1300.

Chair Tokuda and Members of the Committee:

The Department of the Attorney General (the Department) appreciates the intent of this bill to provide prompt and certain compensation to innocent persons who have been wrongfully convicted of crimes and imprisoned. The Department, however, opposes the bill because it places the financial burden for rectifying errors in the criminal justice system entirely upon the State. Although the State may not have caused a wrongful conviction, and played no part in the arrest, prosecution, or trial of a convicted person, the State would nevertheless be responsible for compensating the wrongfully convicted person.

House Draft 2, Senate Draft 1 of this bill replaces the phrase “not inconsistent with innocence” in the original bill with the phrase “grounds consistent with innocence and supported by findings that clearly state such consistency.” Although the new wording is an improvement over the former, it continues to be vague, confusing, and open to multiple interpretations and will allow claims even if the person is not actually innocent. The intended scope of the bill is to require compensation for “innocent” persons, i.e., persons who did not commit criminal acts, but who were nevertheless convicted and imprisoned. However, the bill arguably allows, for example, claims by persons who could create exculpatory evidence by manipulation, such as bribing a witness to provide an alibi, or threatening witnesses to persuade them to recant their testimony.

In addition, this bill still does not preclude claims by persons who actually committed the crimes for which they were charged, but whose convictions were vacated or reversed due to a

legal deficiency. For example, a claim could be brought by a person who was convicted of possession of drugs in his home, who maintains his innocence, and whose conviction was later overturned because of the failure to obtain a search warrant before searching and recovering the drugs in his home; not because of the existence of new exculpatory evidence. As another example, a claim could be brought by a person who confessed to a crime for which the person was convicted, who later attempted to retract a confession, and whose conviction was later overturned because of the failure to read to the person Miranda rights after the person had been placed in custody.

In order to realize the intent of this bill to compensate innocent persons who have been wrongfully convicted and imprisoned, the bill needs to contain additional safeguards and criteria in order to ensure that a person is truly innocent. For example, an alternative approach may be to require that claimants prove by clear and convincing evidence that they are actually “innocent” of the crime for which they were convicted and imprisoned, and to clearly define what “innocent” means. Considering the potentially huge cost to the State, there must be careful and detailed consideration and discussion before a bill such as this can be enacted.

The Department has previously recommended the appointment of a group to study innocence redress legislation for Hawaii. The group could be tasked with the responsibility to draft carefully circumscribed legislation that would provide redress for innocent persons who have been wrongfully convicted and imprisoned, to determine what type of redress should be provided, and the mechanism for providing redress (e.g., board or commission to hear claims, making claims against a reparations fund, civil action), among other things. The group should include judges, prosecuting attorneys, public defenders, a representative of the private defense bar, a representative of the Department, and experts on DNA and other scientific testing. There are many existing compensation statutes for the group to review and consider before recommending one which may serve as a model for innocence redress legislation in Hawaii. The original H.B. 148, however, was based largely on the ‘Innocence Project’s 2011 Model State Compensation Statute,’ which has been followed by almost no other state. A broader review of existing statutes may help identify a better model for Hawaii to follow.

House Draft 2, Senate Draft 1, like the original bill, fails to specify the type of evidence required to prove one’s “innocence.” Will DNA testing exclusively be required? Will other

types of scientific evidence, such as the results of a polygraph test, or other tests of varying degrees of scientific acceptance, be sufficient? Will a “new” witness or a witness who changes or recants the witness’ former testimony be sufficient to prove one’s innocence? Without further clarification, an unintended consequence of the bill may be to provide financial incentive for persons convicted of crimes to challenge their convictions, when they might not otherwise do so, because if they succeed, they will be entitled to compensation for the reasons, and in the amounts, set out in the bill.

House Draft 2, Senate Draft 1, like the original, allows the court no discretion in awarding compensation, even where the court may find the amount to be unjustified or inappropriate. For example, on page 5 of the bill, lines 13-19, the court must award the claimant no less than \$50,000 for each year of incarceration. The court must further award \$25,000, for each year served on parole or probation. (Page 6, lines 15-21) The court must also award compensation to the claimant for child support payments owed by the claimant, which accrued during the claimant’s incarceration, plus interest, even if the claimant had refused to pay child support prior to or after the claimant’s incarceration. (Page 7, line 19, to page 8, line 2)

Although this bill provides for mandatory, comprehensive compensation to the claimant, it does not preclude a subsequent lawsuit by the claimant against the State, arising out of the same wrongful conviction and imprisonment. Section -3(e), at page 9, lines 18-21, simply requires that damages awarded under this bill be offset against the future damages awarded in a subsequent lawsuit.

Finally, this bill (section -7, at page 14, line 4, to page 15, line 7) extends eligibility for “immediate services” to persons who may not be actually innocent. Under section -7, a person whose conviction is reversed “on the basis of newly discovered evidence” must receive, at the State’s expense, up to three years of “immediate services,” which include housing, secondary or higher education, vocational training, transportation, subsistence monetary assistance, re-integrative services and physical dental, and mental health care. A person whose conviction is vacated on “purely legal grounds” may also be awarded up to three years of such “immediate services.”

We respectfully request that this bill be held.

DAVID Y. IGE
GOVERNOR



STATE OF HAWAII
HAWAII PAROLING AUTHORITY
1177 Alakea Street, First Floor
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

BERT Y. MATSUOKA
CHAIR

JOYCE K. MATSUMORI-HOSHIJO
MICHAEL A. TOWN
ANNELLE C. AMARAL
FITUINA F. TUA
MEMBERS

TOMMY JOHNSON
ADMINISTRATOR

No. _____

**TESTIMONY ON HOUSE BILL 148,HD2,SD1
RELATED TO WRONGFUL IMPRISONMENT**

By
Bert Y. Matsuoka, Chairman
Hawaii Paroling Authority

Senate Committee on Ways and Means
Senator Jill N. Tokuda, Chair
Senator Ronald D. Kouchi, Vice Chair

Monday, April 6, 2015; 9:05 a.m.
State Capitol, Conference Room 211

Chair Tokuda, Vice Chair Kouchi, and Members of the Committee:

The Hawaii Paroling Authority (HPA) opposes House Bill 148, HD2, SD1 Relating to Wrongful Imprisonment which seeks to provide compensation and services to persons who can demonstrate they were wrongfully convicted of a crime and imprisoned.

Specifically, the HPA opposes all sections of this measure which seek to provide any level of compensation to offenders and/or the offender's family members following the granting of a gubernatorial pardon.

As written, this measure does not consider the fact that a pardon does not erase the crime(s), criminal history of the offender, or the loss suffered by the victim(s). The granting of pardon forgives the offender for the offense(s) previously committed and in no way proclaims an offender's innocence. The granting of a pardon is normally based on the demonstrated changes in behavior and life style of an offender over a substantial period of time following the offender's involvement in the criminal justice system. Also, this measure does not consider the fact that some offenders are multi-state offenders, who often have several convictions in other jurisdictions similar to and/or the same as their offense(s) in Hawaii.

Implementation of this measure as written, to provide compensation for offenders granted a pardon would be very inappropriate and costly for the State.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony on HB 148, HD2, SD1.

COMMUNITY ALLIANCE ON PRISONS

P.O. Box 37158, Honolulu, HI 96837-0158

Phone/E-Mail: (808) 927-1214 / kat.caphi@gmail.com



COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Chair: Sen. Jill Tokuda

Vice Chair: Sen. Ronald Kouchi

Monday, April 6, 2015

9:05 a.m.

Room 211

SUPPORT for HB 148 HD2 SD1 - WRONGFUL IMPRISONMENT

Aloha Chair Tokuda, Vice Chair Kouchi and Members of the Committee!

My name is Kat Brady and I am the Coordinator of Community Alliance on Prisons, a community initiative promoting smart justice policies for almost two decades. This testimony is respectfully offered on behalf of the 5,600 Hawai'i individuals living behind bars, always mindful that more than 1,600, and soon to be rising number of Hawai'i individuals who are serving their sentences abroad, thousands of miles away from their loved ones, their homes and, for the disproportionate number of incarcerated Native Hawaiians, far from their ancestral lands.

HB 148 HD2 SD1 provides compensation and services to persons who can demonstrate they were wrongfully convicted of a crime and imprisoned.

Community Alliance on Prisons is in strong support of this measure. The state imprisons people who cause harm to others. Conversely, when it is the state that causes the harm, it is the moral responsibility of the state to compensate the person who suffered that harm.

Committee members, we want you to understand that this could happen to any one of us. How many times have you been mistaken for another person? What if you looked like someone who committed a crime and no one believed that you were innocent? What would you want the state to do when you were found innocent after spending years in prison? **Please understand that this is happening as we speak.** People are serving time for crimes they did not commit.

It is perplexing that crime victims are compensated in all 50 states, yet those who were wrongfully imprisoned are not afforded the same respect and accommodation. This is patently unfair and unjust. We can only infer from this that the Aloha state will demand restitution on the victim's behalf for crime, but will ignore the pain and suffering of a person caused by the state. This hurts and heaps even more pain and suffering on the wrongfully imprisoned.

The state continues to put up barriers to ignore/deny/delay their own responsibility. The message this sends to our communities is so wrong. It is the opposite of what we teach our keiki about being responsible citizens: **You take responsibility for your actions; You clean up your mess; and You take whatever steps necessary to correct the wrong you have caused.**

HOW DOES THE STATE TAKE RESPONSIBILITY FOR RUINING SOMEONE'S LIFE?

How can such an egregious wrong be made right? Currently 30 states have compensation statutes for the wrongfully convicted. **It is embarrassing to say that Hawai'i doesn't even apologize or take any responsibility for the harm they have caused.**

The Innocence Project released a report¹ in 2009 with recommendations for compensation. Applicants must have documentation that demonstrates actual innocence, and a small number of people qualify.

The Innocence Project's Recommendations

For those few qualified applicants, the state should readily and generously offer assistance. No amount of money can make up for the lost years, the trauma of prison life, or the horrible experience of being falsely branded a murderer, rapist or thief. But compassionate state assistance can at least help bring the exoneree's struggle to an end by providing him with the finances to find a home, see a doctor, get job training and counseling, and attempt to make a new life for himself.

These recommendations for state compensation laws have been developed by the Innocence Project after years of working with exonerees and their families, legislators, social workers and psychologists:

- Provide a minimum of \$50,000, untaxed, per year of wrongful imprisonment and \$100,000, untaxed, per year on death row. This amount is based on the federal government's standard created through the Innocence Protection Act of 2004.
- Cover limited and appropriate attorney's fees associated with filing for compensation.
- Provide immediate services including housing, transportation, education, workforce development, physical and mental health care through the state employee's health care system and other transitional services.
- Issue an official acknowledgment of the wrongful conviction.

By fairly compensating those who have suffered under the criminal justice system, the state reassures its citizens that the government will attempt to rectify a wrong – whether the state is at fault or not. In short, it's the right thing to do.

Pages 27-31 of this report list the statutes, support services and restrictions of the states who offer some form of compensation. In summary, it is crucial to the integrity of our justice system and to the state that Hawai'i improves the quality of justice by first apologizing and then providing support and compensation to those individuals who have been wrongfully convicted and imprisoned because of the state's error. **JUSTICE DEMANDS THIS.**

Mahalo for this opportunity to testify.

¹ **Making up for Lost Time: What the Wrongfully Convicted Endure and How to Provide Fair Compensation**, December 2009. <http://www.innocenceproject.org/news-events-exonerations/executive-summary-making-up-for-lost-time-what-the-wrongfully-convicted-endure-and-how-to-provide-fair-compensation#sthash.ohjbgKpt.dpuf>

Via: Web: www.capitol.hawaii.gov/submittestimony.aspx

SENATE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Chair: Senator Jill N. Tokuda

Vice Chair: Senator Ronald D. Kouichi

DATE: Monday, April 6, 2015

TIME: 9:05 AM

PLACE: Conference Room 211

State Capitol

415 Beretania Street

Honolulu, Hawai'i 96813

HB 148 HD2 SD1

STRONG SUPPORT

Honorable Chair Tokuda, Honorable Vice-Chair Kouichi and Honorable Members of the Committee on Ways And Means:

My name is Virginia Hench, and I am the Director and one of the founders of the Hawai'i Innocence Project, and I am here to testify in strong support of HB 148 HD 2 SD1.

In 1913, California and Wisconsin became the first states to create systematic financial restitution for citizens wrongly deprived of their liberty by wrongful convictions. For decades, they were the only states to provide this important safety net to help restore the wrongly convicted to a productive life. However, as exonerations began to be more publicized, more states began to enact statutory compensation. Between the turn of the 21st century and 2014, when Minnesota enacted a compensation statute, a total of 30 states (as well as the federal government and the District of Columbia) enacted compensation statutes. Not one of those jurisdictions has chosen to repeal a compensation statute.

As of April, 2015, however, Hawai'i remains among the minority of jurisdictions that fails to provide reasonable compensation to innocent persons who have been unjustly required to sacrifice their liberty and serve time for another person's crime.

In looking over the states with compensation, it is interesting to note that a majority of southern states, as well as a majority of "red" states over-all, have compensation statutes. This may be because compensation for the wrongly convicted is not just a liberal idea. It is sound policy, regardless of politics.

A person who is imprisoned for another person's crime loses more than liberty and connections to family and community. The exoneree loses reputation, chances for education, earning power, credit towards a pension. Moreover, upon release, the exoneree's knowledge and skills are usually outdated. Many exonerees are diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorders, which can further exacerbate their struggles in re-establishing a normal, productive life. Ironically, the exoneree does not even have access to the re-entry services available to a guilty person who has been released after serving their sentence.

Financial compensation, free tuition or job training, and other compensatory benefits can help the wrongfully convicted person make a smoother re-entry into society and increase their future self-sufficiency. Compensation also allows government and citizens to make amends to the wrongly convicted person and, more generally, helps to repair damage to the state's public legitimacy and boost public faith in the good judgment and fairness of our system.

I thank you for considering this bill, and I respectfully urge that you pass it.

Yours sincerely,

/s/ Virginia E. Hench
Director, Hawai'i Innocence Project

HB148

Submitted on: 4/3/2015

Testimony for WAM on Apr 6, 2015 09:05AM in Conference Room 211

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
De MONT R. D. CONNER	Ho'omana Pono, LLC.	Support	Yes

Comments: We STRONGLY SUPPORT this bill, as it does three important things: 1.) Sends a clear message that the State of Hawaii will hold itself accountable; 2.) It helps to restore public confidence in the Criminal Justice System, in that the average tax payer will know that the State is willing to be held accountable for its errors; & 3.) It clearly helps to lift the burden off of the wrongly convicted person, to aid them in restoring their lives.

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

Law Offices of
BROOK HART
A LAW CORPORATION
333 Queen Street, Suite 610
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

TEL: (808) 526-0811

brookhartlaw@gmail.com

FAX: (808) 531-2677

SUBMITTED BY E-MAIL TO: WAMtestimony@capitol.hawaii.gov

April 4, 2015

Senator Jill N. Tokuda
Chair, Committee on Ways & Means
Hawaii Senate
State Capitol, Room 207
415 South Beretania Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Re: House Bill No. 148 (HD2, SD1),
"Relating To Wrongful Imprisonment"

Dear Chair Tokuda and Committee Members:

I am a private practice attorney based in Honolulu and concentrating in criminal defense law. I have been a member of the Hawaii bar since 1968. Additionally, I have served as a Lecturer in Law at the William S. Richardson School of Law since 2005, co-teaching (as a founding member) the Hawaii Innocence Project courses, along with William Harrison, Esq., Susan Arnett, Esq., and Professor Virginia Hench.

This letter constitutes my written testimony (which is also submitted on behalf of the Hawaii Innocence Project) in strong support of House Bill No. 148 (HD2, SD1). That bill is scheduled for decision making by the Senate Committee on Ways & Means at 9:05 a.m. on Monday, April 6, 2015, in Conference Room 211. The original bill was introduced by the Speaker of the Hawaii House of Representatives, Rep. Joseph Souki, and several versions of the bill subsequently passed the House Judiciary Committee, the House Finance Committee, the full House of Representatives and the Senate Judiciary & Labor Committee with no legislators voting in opposition at any point in the process. This important legislation has been supported by the written testimony of the Hawaii Innocence Project, the national Innocence Project, the Community Alliance on Prisons, and William Harrison, Esq., in addition

Senator Jill N. Tokuda
Chairman, Committee on Ways & Means
April 4, 2015
Page 2

to my own written testimony and that of eight other concerned individuals.

The legislative report of the House Judiciary Committee (House Standing Committee Report No. 397) correctly recognized "that wrongful convictions and the subsequent incarceration may be the result of many causes, including eyewitness misidentification, false confessions, improper forensic science, and government misconduct." [Underlining added.] The legislative report of the House Finance Committee (House Standing Committee Report No. 813) emphasized that the "purpose of this measure is to: (1) Establish a process for wrongly convicted and incarcerated individuals to be compensated by the State; and (2) Provide for immediate services for qualifying individuals upon release."

A "fundamental value determination of our society [is] that it is far worse to convict an innocent man than to let a guilty man go free." In re Winship, 397 U.S. 358, 372 (1970) (Harlan, J., concurring). "The oft-quoted principle that it is better to let guilty men go free than to punish an innocent man is axiomatic in Anglo-American criminal law and has deep roots. Besides reflecting the fundamental value our legal system places on personal liberty and the high burden required to deprive someone of that liberty, the principle also embodies a basic admission - that the single most egregious error a justice system can commit is to punish the innocent." Note, *Re-Punishing The Innocent: False Confession As An Unjust Obstacle To Compensation For The Wrongfully Convicted*, 63 Case Western Reserve Law Review 1393, 1394 (2013) (underlining added; footnote omitted). "The natural corollary to this principle is that society has a special responsibility to make efforts toward righting the wrong when it occurs. A majority of U.S. states, along with the District of Columbia and the federal government, have recognized that responsibility by passing statutes that provide compensation for exonerees after their release." Id. (underlining added). It is now definitely time for Hawaii to join the majority of American states and the federal government in enacting a statute such as the statute proposed in House Bill No. 148 (HD2, SD1).

Senator Jill N. Tokuda
Chairman, Committee on Ways & Means
April 4, 2015
Page 3

That is especially true because of the scientific advancement of DNA testing, which has generated a "revolution in the criminal justice system." Id. at 1395 (footnote omitted). It is now "possible in certain cases to produce conclusive scientific evidence of a wrongful conviction years or even decades after the crime." Id. Indeed, DNA testing "has taught us that there are more innocent people in jail than we ever thought." Id. (footnote omitted).¹

Notably, "scholars and exoneree advocates generally agree that statutory compensation is the 'only reliable and fair response to the inevitable mistakes that occur as a byproduct of the operation of a criminal justice system as large as ours.'" The powerful social-justice rationale for a uniform compensation regime funded with public money was eloquently stated by Yale University Professor Edwin Borchard in 1941: 'Where the common interest is joined for a common end - maintaining the public peace by the prosecution of crime - each individual member being subject to the same danger (erroneous conviction), the loss when it occurs should be borne by the community as a whole and not by the injured individual alone.'" Id. at 1396 (parentheses in original; footnotes omitted).

In his written testimony submitted to the Senate Judiciary & Labor Committee, Bert Matsuoka, the Chairman of the Hawaii Paroling Authority, opposed House Bill No. 148 (HD2) so far as it would provide compensation "following the

¹ As of 2015, the national Innocence Project reports: "There have been 329 post-conviction DNA exonerations in the United States" (http://www.innocenceproject.org/cases-false-imprisonment/front-page#c10=published&b_start=0&c4=Exonerated+by+DNA). The National Registry of Exonerations at the University of Michigan Law School (<https://www.law.umich.edu/special/exoneration/Pages/about.aspx>) currently lists 1,576 total exonerations (DNA and non-DNA) in the United States since 1989.

Senator Jill N. Tokuda
Chairman, Committee on Ways & Means
April 4, 2015
Page 4

granting of a gubernatorial pardon." He claimed that the "granting of a pardon forgives the offender for the offense(s) previously committed and in no way proclaims an offender's innocence." [Underlining added.] However, the current House Bill No. 148 (HD2, SD1) effectively addresses that contention. The current bill requires that to qualify the defendant for compensation and services, a pardon be based on "grounds consistent with innocence and supported by findings that clearly state the consistency." House Bill No. 148 (HD2, SD1), page 3, lines 7 to 13 (underlining added).

In its written testimony on House Bill No. 148 submitted to the House Judiciary Committee, the State Department of the Attorney General declared that it "opposes the bill because it makes the State, in effect, the insurer of any errors in the criminal justice system," and the Department of the Prosecuting Attorney for the County of Maui subsequently agreed. Yet, that is rightfully so. The government prosecutes the cases in which wrongful convictions are obtained, the government operates the courts in which wrongful convictions occur, and it is the government that wrongfully incarcerates the defendants who are wrongfully convicted. Defendants who are wrongfully convicted do not voluntarily consent to their wrongful convictions. There is no other appropriate "insurer" of egregious errors in the criminal justice system than the government itself. That has been recognized by the federal government, the District of Columbia, and the thirty states that have enacted laws providing government compensation for wrongful convictions and incarceration.

In its written testimony on House Bill No. 148 submitted to the House Judiciary Committee, the State Department of the Attorney General "recommend[ed] the appointment of a group to study the need for innocence redress legislation" in Hawaii. Of course, the appointment of a study group would just be an expedient way to delay and derail this vitally necessary legislation. The ineffectiveness of study groups is well illustrated on even the national level by the "Review Group on Intelligence and Communications Technologies" (the NSA review

Senator Jill N. Tokuda
Chairman, Committee on Ways & Means
April 4, 2015
Page 5

group) in 2013, the "National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform" (the Simpson-Bowles commission) in 2010, and the "National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States" (the 9-11 commission) from 2002 to 2004.

In its written testimony on the original version of House Bill No. 148 submitted to the House Judiciary Committee, the State Department of the Attorney General complained: "The phrase 'not inconsistent with innocence' is vague and open to multiple interpretations. The intended scope of the bill is to require compensation for 'innocent' persons, i.e., persons who did not commit criminal acts, but who were nevertheless convicted and imprisoned. However, the bill appears to allow claims to be brought by persons who committed crimes and were convicted, and therefore not 'innocent,' but were later pardoned. Pardons almost always involve persons who actually committed the crime for which they were convicted, and later seek a pardon based on good behavior since their conviction. Therefore, pardons are inconsistent with a claim of innocence." Yet, the current House Bill No. 148 (HD2, SD1) has deleted the term "not inconsistent with innocence," and, as pointed out above, requires that a pardon be based on "grounds consistent with innocence and supported by findings that clearly state the consistency."

The written testimony of the State Department of the Attorney General submitted to the House Judiciary Committee on the original version of House Bill No. 148 further alleged: "In addition, this bill does not preclude claims for convictions that were vacated or reversed due to a legal deficiency. For example, a claim could be brought by a person who had drugs in his possession and was convicted for a drug possession offense, but whose conviction was later overturned because of the failure to obtain a search warrant before searching and recovering the drugs. As another example, a claim could be brought by a person who committed the crime for which he was convicted, but whose conviction was overturned because of the failure to read him his Miranda rights after he had been placed in custody." However, the current House Bill No. 148 (HD2, SD1) specifically mandates: "Any person

Senator Jill N. Tokuda
Chairman, Committee on Ways & Means
April 4, 2015
Page 6

convicted and subsequently imprisoned for one or more crimes that the person did not commit or for actions that did not constitute a crime, may petition for a claim for damages" House Bill No. 148 (HD2, SD1), page 2, lines 16 to 19 (underlining added). Thus, convictions reversed merely on the basis of an unlawful warrantless search or a Miranda rights violation would not qualify.

In conclusion, I and the Hawaii Innocence Project strongly urge the Senate Committee on Ways & Means to approve House Bill No. 148 (HD 2, SD1).

Very truly yours,

LAW OFFICES OF BROOK HART
A Law Corporation



BROOK HART
Hawaii Innocence Project,
William S. Richardson School of Law

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
To: [WAM Testimony](#)
Cc: walterfb@hawaii.edu
Subject: *Submitted testimony for HB148 on Apr 6, 2015 09:05AM*
Date: Thursday, April 02, 2015 5:32:18 PM

HB148

Submitted on: 4/2/2015

Testimony for WAM on Apr 6, 2015 09:05AM in Conference Room 211

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Walter Benavitz	Individual	Support	No

Comments:

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
To: [WAM Testimony](#)
Cc: maucrowe@gmail.com
Subject: Submitted testimony for HB148 on Apr 6, 2015 09:05AM
Date: Saturday, April 04, 2015 7:16:05 PM

HB148

Submitted on: 4/4/2015

Testimony for WAM on Apr 6, 2015 09:05AM in Conference Room 211

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
james crowe	Individual	Support	No

Comments: This is simply correct respect for the wronged Hawaii citizen.

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov

From: mailinglist@capitol.hawaii.gov
To: [WAM Testimony](#)
Cc: barbarapolk@hawaiiantel.net
Subject: Submitted testimony for HB148 on Apr 6, 2015 09:05AM
Date: Sunday, April 05, 2015 3:06:42 PM

HB148

Submitted on: 4/5/2015

Testimony for WAM on Apr 6, 2015 09:05AM in Conference Room 211

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Present at Hearing
Barbara Polk	Individual	Support	No

Comments: Please pass HB148. When a person is falsely convicted and imprisoned, they are owed compensation from the state to allow them to begin to rebuild their lives. Without compensation, the state continues to punish an innocent person.

Please note that testimony submitted less than 24 hours prior to the hearing, improperly identified, or directed to the incorrect office, may not be posted online or distributed to the committee prior to the convening of the public hearing.

Do not reply to this email. This inbox is not monitored. For assistance please email webmaster@capitol.hawaii.gov