

*** CAPITAL CASE ***

No. 18-7094

In the Supreme Court of the United States

FLOYD DANIEL SMITH,
Petitioner,
v.
STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
Respondent.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF
CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME
COURT OF THE STATE OF
CALIFORNIA

PETITION FOR REHEARING

MARY K. McCOMB
State Public Defender
*ELIAS BATCHELDER
Senior Deputy State Public Defender
1111 Broadway, 10th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607
(510) 267-3300
elias.batchelder@ospd.ca.gov

**Counsel of Record*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIESii
INTRODUCTION	1
ARGUMENT	2
CONCLUSION.....	5
CERTIFICATE OF GOOD FAITH.....	6
EXHIBITS.....	7
1. <i>Smith v. California</i> , No. 18-7094, Supplemental Brief in Support of Petition for Writ of Certiorari (June 25, 2019)	7
2. FedEx Tracking Information Sheet	8

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Flowers v. Mississippi</i> 139 S.Ct. 2228 (2019).....	1, 2, 4
<i>Zap v. U.S.</i> 326 U.S. 777 (1945), order vacated, 326 U.S. 802 (1946)	4
RULES	
Rule of the Supreme Court of the United States	
Rule 29.2	3
Rule 44.2	1, 5
OTHER AUTHORITIES	
<i>Smith v. California</i> , Court Docket No. 18-7094	2

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Petitioner, Floyd Daniel Smith, respectfully requests that this Court grant rehearing of its order dated June 28, 2019, which denied certiorari, and that the Court now grant certiorari or grant certiorari, vacate, and remand this case in light of this Court’s decision in *Flowers v. Mississippi*, 139 S.Ct. 2228 (2019) (*Flowers*). Rule 44.2 provides for rehearing of a denial of a petition for a writ of certiorari for “other substantial grounds not previously presented” in a petition. Because of the procedural history of the case detailed below, a substantial possibility exists that the additional, compelling grounds for certiorari submitted in his timely filed Supplemental Brief in Support of Petition for Writ of Certiorari (Supplemental Brief) may not have been considered by this Court.

The Supplemental Brief was electronically filed and mailed via FedEx overnight delivery on the evening of June 25, 2019, but was not received in hard copy by the Court until 9:24 a.m. on June 27, 2019, and was not stamped “filed” by the Court Clerk until June 28, 2019. *See infra.* Thus, the Supplemental Brief may not have been read or considered at the conference on the petition held on June 27, 2019. Because the arguments presented in the Supplemental Brief may have never been “previously presented” to the Justices of this Court prior to the conference vote, petitioner files this rehearing petition to ensure that the

arguments and evidence supporting his petition presented in the Supplemental Brief are considered by this Court.¹

Argument

Petitioner filed his petition for a writ of certiorari on December 15, 2018.

See Smith v. California, No. 18-7094 (docket). The case was set for conference on March 22, 2019. *Id.* However, no order was issued in petitioner's case until after the Court resolved *Flowers v. Mississippi*, 139 S.Ct. 2228 (2019) (*Flowers*) on Friday, June 21, 2019. On June 26, 2019, petitioner's case was set for conference on June 27, 2019.

On Tuesday, June 25, 2019 at approximately 5:43 p.m. PDT, petitioner electronically filed the Supplemental Brief, requesting that this Court grant certiorari, vacate, and remand his case in light of *Flowers*, and providing substantial additional arguments and evidence in support of the request. In addition, on the same day, petitioner mailed a hard copy of the brief via FedEx overnight delivery service. *See* Attached Exh. 2 (FedEx tracking information sheet). The Supplemental Brief was supposed to arrive on June 26, 2019 by

¹ Petitioner has attached the conformed copy of this pleading as Exhibit 1 and incorporates it herein as the substantive basis for his petition. Exhibit 1 is the same pleading that was previously filed in this Court and is provided for the Court's convenience in considering this petition for rehearing.

10:30 a.m., but for reasons of which petitioner’s counsel is unaware, it did not arrive at the Court until June 27, 2019 at 9:24 a.m. *Id.* The conference on the petition was held on the afternoon of June 27, 2019. At this time, the docket for petitioner’s case did not indicate that the Supplemental Brief had been filed, but simply that it had been “submitted.” The order from the June 27, 2019 conference was issued by this Court on June 28, 2019 and indicated that the petition had been denied.

Given the extraordinarily abbreviated timeline between the arrival of the petitioner’s Supplemental Brief and the conference on the petition, petitioner believes that the members of this Court may have never considered the additional arguments or evidence in the Supplemental Brief, despite the fact that the Supplemental Brief was timely filed prior to the vote on the petition. *See* Supreme Court Rule 29.2. Indeed, the electronic docket in this case was not changed from the Supplmental Brief being “submitted” to being “filed” until *after* the denial of the petition. And the conformed copy of the Supplemental Brief received by petitioner’s counsel, Exh. 1, was stamped “filed” on June 28, 2019, the day *after* the vote on the petition was held in conference.

If petitioner is correct that the Supplemental Brief was never considered, and further assuming that the Supplemental Brief would have been material to

this Court's ruling on the petition, petitioner submits that the appropriate remedy is to grant rehearing for the purpose of considering the Supplemental Brief on file with the Court. *See Zap v. U.S.*, 326 U.S. 777 (1945), order vacated, 326 U.S. 802 (1946) (rehearing granted where petition was denied without consideration of its substance due to procedural defect in the original pleading).

//
//

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, and for the reasons detailed in the Supplemental Brief, Petitioner respectfully requests this Court to reconsider its denial of the petition for a writ of certiorari, and grant, vacate, and remand this case for proceedings consistent with this Court's opinion in *Flowers v. Mississippi*, 139 S.Ct. 2228 (2019).

Respectfully submitted,

MARY K. MCCOMB
California State Public Defender
/s/ Elias Batchelder

ELIAS BATCHELDER
Senior Deputy State Public Defender
Counsel of Record

1111 Broadway, Suite 1000
Oakland, California 94607
elias.batchelder@ospd.ca.gov
Tel: (510) 267-3300

Counsel for Petitioner
Floyd Daniel Smith

CERTIFICATE OF GOOD FAITH

Undersigned counsel certifies, pursuant to Rule 44.2, Rules of the Supreme Court, that this petition for rehearing is limited to a substantial ground not previously raised, and is presented in good faith and not for delay.

/s/ Elias Batchelder

ELIAS BATCHELDER
Senior Deputy State Public Defender
Counsel of Record

1111 Broadway, Suite 1000
Oakland, California 94607
elias.batchelder@ospd.ca.gov
SBN: 253386
Tel: (510) 267-3300

Counsel for Petitioner
Floyd Daniel Smith

EXHIBIT 1

Smith v. California, No. 18-7094

Supplemental Brief in Support of Petition for Writ of Certiorari

June 25, 2019

STATE PUBLIC DEFENDER
OFFICE COPY

FILED
JUN 25 2019
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

*** CAPITAL CASE ***

No. 18-7094

In the Supreme Court of the United States

FLOYD DANIEL SMITH,
Petitioner,

v.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
Respondent.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF
CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME
COURT OF THE STATE OF
CALIFORNIA

SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF IN
SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR
WRIT OF CERTIORARI

MARY K. McCOMB
State Public Defender
*ELIAS BATCHELDER
Senior Deputy State Public Defender
1111 Broadway, 10th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607
(510) 267-3300
elias.batchelder@ospd.ca.gov

**Counsel of Record*

RECEIVED
JUN 28 2019
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	ii
SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI	1
I. THE <i>FLOWERS</i> DECISION FOCUSES ON THE PAST HISTORY OF THE PROSECUTOR IN PRIOR TRIALS OF THE SAME DEFENDANT – AN ANALYSIS THAT THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT FAILED TO UNDERTAKE	2
II. THE <i>FLOWERS</i> DECISION'S EXPLICATION OF THE CORRECT METHOD OF COMPARATIVE JUROR ANALYSIS ALSO NECESSITATES REMAND	5
CONCLUSION.....	9

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Batson v. Kentucky</i> , 476 U.S. 79 (1986).....	1
<i>Flowers v. Mississippi</i> , ____ U.S. ____ No. 17-9572, 2019 WL 2552489 (U.S. June 21, 2019).....	passim
<i>People v. Winbush</i> , 2 Cal. 5th 402, 443 (2017)	6
STATUTES	
CAL. CODE CIV. PROC.	
§ 231(a)	1
RULES	
Rules of the Supreme Court of the United States	
Rule 15(8)	1
OTHER AUTHORITIES	
Archive of Webcast of California Supreme Court Oral Argument of March 7, 2018 at 6:24:20-6:25:20, available at https://www.courts.ca.gov/35333.htm (last visited June 24, 2019).....	3

**SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR WRIT OF
CERTIORARI**

Petitioner, Floyd Daniel Smith, respectfully submits this Supplemental Brief pursuant to Rule 15(8) in support of his Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the California Supreme Court (“Petition”) to address the impact of this Court’s recently announced decision in *Flowers v. Mississippi*, ___ U.S. ___ No. 17-9572, 2019 WL 2552489 (U.S. June 21, 2019) (*Flowers*).

The Petition raises questions regarding the State’s alleged violation of *Batson v. Kentucky*, 476 U.S. 79 (1986) (*Batson*) during the trial in this case, a case in which the prosecutor – over two consecutive trials – struck each black prospective juror from the jury. The pattern of excluding black jurors in petitioner’s case was particularly stark because, at both trials, after singlehandedly culling all black jurors, the prosecutor immediately accepted the subsequent (African-American-free) panels, despite retaining numerous additional peremptory challenges – thus greatly increasing the likelihood that none of the other African-Americans, who were much further down the line, would even be called into the box.¹

¹ See Petition at 4-6 (in first trial, prosecutor accepted panel six times immediately after excluding final black juror with third peremptory; at second trial, prosecutor accepted panel immediately after excluding final black juror with

The Petition specifically requested that this case be held pending resolution of *Flowers*, which also dealt with a prosecutor's repeated, total exclusion of black jurors over subsequent trials of the same defendant. Petition at 36-40. On June 21, 2019, this Court issued its opinion in *Flowers*, holding that the prosecutor in that case had exercised peremptory challenges on the impermissible basis of race, in violation of *Batson*. Petitioner submits that the *Flowers* decision necessitates, at a minimum, a remand to the California Supreme Court to reconsider its decision in light of the principles of *Batson* analysis outlined in that case.

I. THE *FLOWERS* DECISION FOCUSES ON THE PAST HISTORY OF THE PROSECUTOR IN PRIOR TRIALS OF THE SAME DEFENDANT – AN ANALYSIS THAT THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT FAILED TO UNDERTAKE

Central to the *Flowers* opinion is its direction that a reviewing court can – indeed must – consider evidence presented to it of prosecutor's past pattern of suspect strikes in considering a *Batson* challenge. *See Flowers v. Mississippi*, 2019 WL 2552489, at *13 (explaining that “[w]e cannot ignore [the prosecutor's] history” and “[w]e cannot take that history out of the case.”)

eleventh peremptory); CAL. CODE CIV. PROC. § 231(a) (allotting parties twenty peremptory challenges).

The California Supreme Court in this case, however, failed to consider *any* evidence regarding the jury selection process from petitioner's first trial. There was not a single reference in the opinion below to the total exclusion of African-American jurors in the first trial. In fact, during oral argument, one of the justices of the California Supreme Court questioned the propriety of considering evidence from the first trial, despite the fact that the evidence was properly before it.² The result was that the California Supreme Court never considered the prosecutor's past pattern of total exclusion of African-Americans.

Petitioner recognizes that *Flowers* presented a particularly extreme example of a history of racially exclusive jury selection. Nonetheless, the pattern of repeated elimination of black jurors in petitioner's case is still remarkable. At the very least, the California Supreme Court should have considered that pattern in assessing whether racial discrimination occurred.

In the first trial, the prosecutor quickly removed the only two black jurors in the box. Petition at 5. Given that there were only two black jurors to strike, this itself was statistically improbable. But what followed was highly unusual:

² Archive of Webcast of California Supreme Court Oral Argument of March 7, 2018 at 6:24:20-6:25:20, <https://www.courts.ca.gov/35333.htm> (last visited June 24, 2019).

the prosecutor used only three of the twenty strikes allotted him under California law and instead immediately accepted the (African-American free) panel six consecutive times until the jury was ultimately selected.

The prosecutor's rapid exclusion of black jurors was particularly suspect. By exercising only three peremptories to exclude all the African-American jurors in the box at the beginning of jury selection, the prosecutor made it far less probable that any of the remaining African-American jurors from the venire (relatively far down the line to be called into the box) would ever be selected as jurors. This is precisely what happened at the first trial: the remaining black jurors from the venire only made it to the box during the selection of alternates (at which point the prosecutor eliminated an additional African-American juror, resulting in a *Batson* motion). Petition at 5.

Even more striking, the remarkable pattern originating in the first trial continued into the second. At the second trial, the prosecutor again succeeded in total exclusion of African-Americans from the jury by eliminating all four qualified prospective jurors with peremptory challenges. Petition at 5. Then, when the jury contained no more black jurors, the prosecutor again immediately accepted the panel. Petition at 6. Although the prosecutor retained nine additional peremptory challenges, he chose not to exercise them.

This tactic had the same effect as in the first trial. As noted by the defense counsel during the *Batson* hearing at the second trial, the remaining African-American jurors in the venire were so far down the line that the prosecutor's elimination of the four black jurors who first made it into the box resulted in only a "remote chance" that additional black prospective jurors would ever "have any opportunity to be sitting on the jury panel." 9RT:2709. And, as in the first trial, that is what happened: no additional qualified African-American prospective jurors made it into the box (even during the selection of alternates).

This is precisely the sort of highly improbable pattern that reviewing courts should consider in their analysis of the totality of the record. *Flowers*, 2019 WL 2552489, at *13 (peremptories in sixth trial "followed the same pattern" as prior trials of the defendant). The court below, however, simply ignored it.

II. THE *FLOWERS* DECISION'S EXPLICATION OF THE CORRECT METHOD OF COMPARATIVE JUROR ANALYSIS ALSO NECESSITATES REMAND

Another aspect of the *Flowers* decision which necessitates reconsideration by the California Supreme Court was its reiteration of the correct methodology for comparative juror analysis, a methodology the lower court did not properly

employ. *Flowers*, 2019 WL 2552489, at *15 (“Comparing prospective jurors who were struck and not struck can be an important step in determining whether a *Batson* violation occurred”). As argued in the Petition, the California Supreme Court employs an extremely cramped view of comparative analysis, using even minor differences in the characteristics of seated and stricken jurors to dismiss the relevance of comparisons, and has never found such analysis to prove pretext. Petition at 24-37.

Flowers demonstrates that the California approach is incorrect. As this Court explained, “[a]lthough a defendant ordinarily will try to identify a similar white prospective juror whom the State did not strike, a defendant is not required to identify an *identical* white juror for the side-by-side comparison to be suggestive of discriminatory intent.” *Flowers* 2019 WL 2552489, at *15 (emphasis in original). In contrast, under California’s approach, compared jurors must have “expressed ‘a substantially similar *combination* of responses,’ *in all material respects*, to the jurors excused.” *People v. Winbush*, 2 Cal. 5th 402, 443 (2017). In other words, California courts, unlike this Court, continue to require that seated and stricken jurors share virtually all of the same characteristics before they find similarities to be evidence of pretext.

The *Flowers* analysis of Prospective Juror Wright made clear, not each and every characteristic must be shared by seated and stricken jurors for a comparison to be evidence of pretext. In response to the prosecutor's justification, that Ms. Wright had worked with the defendant's father, the Court found it compelling that numerous other prospective jurors also had relationships with the defendant's family. *Flowers*, 2019 WL 2552489, at *16. Despite the urging of the State – and the dissent – that the comparison was invalid because "Wright had been *sued* by a witness and member of the victim's family, and worked at the same store as the defendant's father" (*Flowers*, 2019 WL 2552489, at *23 (dissenting op. of Thomas, J. (original emphasis))), the Court reaffirmed the principle that a justification for striking a black juror cannot stand if it applies with equal reason to nonblack, seated jurors.

As such, the Court's analysis stands in stark contrast to the approach taken by the California Supreme Court in this case, and in its earlier cases on which it relied. To take one of many examples, comparative analysis of jurors' responses to questions related to O.J. Simpson strongly suggest these justifications – applied to all black jurors at the second trial – were merely pretext. As set out in the Petition, the prosecutor's selective use of black jurors' views on the racially divisive O.J. Simpson case, but not similar views of

numerous seated non-black jurors, affirmatively betrayed the prosecutor's race-based stereotyping. Petition at 13-24. For instance, the prosecutor characterized as "extremely negative" and "pro OJ and anti[-] prosecution" Prospective Juror Dredd's responses that the Simpson case had taught him what he "already knew" that there are "many sides to a story" and that he was "not upset" with the verdict because "I felt that their [sic] was doubt." Petition at 8. The force of this justification was strongly undermined by comparison to similar responses of non-black jurors accepted at the first trial. Petition at 33-34.

The point is strongly underscored when one takes into account the evidence from the prior trial, ignored by the California Supreme Court. In petitioner's case, the same jury questionnaire was used in both trials, allowing straightforward comparisons between the justifications provided at the second trial (grounded largely in the questionnaire responses) and the characteristics of the seated jurors at the first trial. Such comparative analysis of the jurors seated by the prosecution in *first* trial provided additional evidence that the reasons for striking black jurors provided in the *second* trial were merely post-hoc pretext. A *significant majority* of the non-black jurors seated at the first trial by the prosecution were (like Mr. Dredd and other stricken black jurors at

the second trial) not upset with the Simpson verdict. (See, e.g., 9:SCT:2599 (Seated Juror No. 104) (not upset with Simpson verdict because “[t]he jury did it’s [sic] job – we must respect their decision”); 13:SCT:3759 (Seated Juror No. 151) (not upset with Simpson verdict because “I believe justice was served”); 1:SCT:149 (Seated Juror No. 9) (not upset and “. . . any other verdict would have been unwarranted”).

The California Supreme Court never engaged in comparative analysis of the O.J. Simpson justifications. Petition at 33-34. *Flowers* demonstrates the flaw in this oversight. See *Flowers*, 2019 WL 2552489, at *15 (“When a prosecutor’s proffered reason for striking a black panelist applies just as well to an otherwise-similar nonblack panelist who is permitted to serve, that is evidence tending to prove purposeful discrimination”) (internal quotations and citations omitted). The California court should be given the opportunity to engage in the fact-specific comparative juror analysis of both trials against petitioner in light of the *Flowers* decision.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above and in the Petition for Writ of Certiorari, a writ of certiorari should issue to review the judgment of the California Supreme Court in Petitioner’s case. In the alternative, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court

grant the petition, vacate the California Supreme Court's judgment, and remand this matter for consideration of the *Batson* claim in light of this Court's decision in *Flowers*.

Respectfully submitted,

MARY K. MCCOMB
California State Public Defender



ELIAS BATCHELDER
Senior Deputy State Public Defender
Counsel of Record

1111 Broadway, Suite 1000
Oakland, California 94607
elias.batchelder@ospd.ca.gov
Tel: (510) 267-3300


Counsel for Petitioner
Floyd Daniel Smith

EXHIBIT 2

FedEx Tracking Information Sheet



775566554395



Delivered

Thursday 6/27/2019 at 9:24 am

DELIVERED

Signed for by: D.GAMBLE

GET STATUS UPDATES

OBTAIN PROOF OF DELIVERY

FROM

Oakland, CA US

TO

U S GOVERNMENT OFFICES, DC US

Shipment Facts

TRACKING NUMBER	SERVICE	WEIGHT
775566554395	FedEx Priority Overnight	2 lbs / 0.91 kgs
DELIVERED TO	TOTAL PIECES	TOTAL SHIPMENT WEIGHT
Shipping/Receiving	1	2 lbs / 0.91 kgs
TERMS	SHIPPER REFERENCE	PACKAGING
Shipper	SmithF	FedEx Pak
SPECIAL HANDLING SECTION	STANDARD TRANSIT	SHIP DATE
Deliver Weekday	② 6/26/2019 by 10:30 am	② Tue 6/25/2019

ACTUAL DELIVERY

Thu 6/27/2019 9:24 am

Travel History

Local Scan Time

Thursday, 6/27/2019		
9:24 am	U S GOVERNMENT OFFICES, DC	Delivered
8:32 am	WASHINGTON, DC	On FedEx vehicle for delivery
7:45 am	WASHINGTON, DC	At local FedEx facility
5:37 am	DULLES, VA	At destination sort facility

2:56 am	MEMPHIS, TN	Departed FedEx location
<hr/>		
Wednesday, 6/26/2019		
6:25 pm	OAKLAND, CA	Arrived at FedEx location
5:55 pm	EMERYVILLE, CA	Left FedEx origin facility
4:59 pm	EMERYVILLE, CA	Picked up
<hr/>		
Tuesday, 6/25/2019		
6:23 pm		Shipment information sent to FedEx
6:08 pm	OAKLAND, CA	Picked up
		Tendered at FedEx Office
<hr/>		



July 18,2019

Dear Customer:

The following is the proof-of-delivery for tracking number **775566554395**.

Delivery Information:

Status:	Delivered	Delivered to:	Shipping/Receiving
Signed for by:	D.GAMBLE	Delivery location:	U S GOVERNMENT OFFICES, DC
Service type:	FedEx Priority Overnight	Delivery date:	Jun 27, 2019 09:24
Special Handling:	Deliver Weekday		

Signature image is available. In order to view image and detailed information, the shipper or payor account number of the shipment must be provided.

Shipping Information:

Tracking number:	775566554395	Ship date:	Jun 25, 2019
		Weight:	2.0 lbs/0.9 kg

Recipient: U S GOVERNMENT OFFICES, DC US	Shipper: Oakland, CA US
--	-----------------------------------

Reference	SmithF
------------------	--------

Thank you for choosing FedEx.