

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

J.S., A CHILD

Plaintiff - Respondent,

v.

THE STATE OF TEXAS

Defendant - Petitioner.

**ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO
THE SEVENTH COURT OF APPEALS OF TEXAS**

John Bennett
2607 Wolflin Avenue #106
Amarillo, Texas 79109
Telephone: (806) 282-4455
Fax: (806) 398-1988
AppealsAttorney@gmail.com
Texas State Bar No. 00785691
Attorney for the Petitioner

QUESTION PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

A split exists among state courts of last resort on whether the Sixth Amendment right to confrontation extends to a hearing on whether to certify a child as an adult. This Court deems such a hearing critically important. Does *Kent v. United States*, 383 U.S. 541, 562, 86 S.Ct. 1045, 16 L.Ed.2d 84 (1966), particularly in light of *Chambers v. Mississippi*, 410 U.S. 284, 294, 93 S.Ct. 1038, 35 L.Ed.2d 297 (1973), grant a child this right?

LIST OF PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-------------------|
| Question Presented for Review | 2 |
| List of Parties to the Proceeding..... | 3 |
| Table of Cited Authorities..... | 4 |
| Opinions and Orders Entered Below | 5 |
| Jurisdiction..... | 7 |
| The Constitution Provisions Involved | 8 |
| Statement of the Case | 8 |
| Reasons for Granting the Petition | 8 |
| Conclusion | 13 |
| Word Count | 14 |
| Proof of Service | 14 |
| Index to Appendices | following page 14 |
| Appendix A: Decision from the Seventh Court of Appeals of Texas | |
| Appendix B: Waiver of Jurisdiction by Potter County Court-at-Law #1 | |
| Appendix C: Order of the Texas Supreme Court denying review | |
| Appendix D: Order of the Texas Supreme Court denying rehearing | |

TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES

Case law

| | |
|---|--------|
| <i>Allen v. Illinois</i> , 478 U.S. 364, 106 S.Ct. 2988, 92 L.Ed.2d 296 (1986)..... | 9 |
| <i>Application of Gault</i> , 387 U.S. 1, 87 S.Ct. 1428, 18 L.Ed.2d 527 (1967)..... | 10-12 |
| <i>Chambers v. Mississippi</i> , 410 U.S. 284, 93 S.Ct. 1038, 35 L.Ed.2d 297 (1973)..... | 2,9,11 |
| <i>Commonwealth v. B.H.</i> , 548 S.W.3d 238 (Ky. 2018) | 10 |
| <i>Interest of C.A.M. Jr.</i> , 644 S.W.3d 600 (Mo. Ct. App. 2022) | 13 |
| <i>Kent v. United States</i> , 383 U.S. 541, 86 S.Ct. 1045, 16 L.Ed.2d 84 (1966)..... | 2,9-12 |
| <i>State v. Fuell</i> , 172 N.E.3d 1065 (Ohio Ct.App. 2021), appeal dism'd, improvidently granted, __ N.E.2d __ (Ohio 2022) | 11 |
| <i>State v. Gary F.</i> , 432 S.E.2d 793, 189 W.Va. 523 (W. Va. 1993) | 10 |
| <i>State v. Wright</i> , 456 N.W.2d 661 (Iowa 1990) | 11 |

Rule

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sup.Ct.R. 10(b) | 8 |
|-----------------------|---|

OPINIONS AND ORDERS ENTERED BELOW

Order of the Texas Supreme Court denying reconsideration
(unpublished)

Order of the Texas Supreme Court denying review (unpublished)

Opinion from the Seventh Court of Appeals of Texas (unpublished)

Judgment from County Court-at-Law #1 of Potter County
(unpublished)

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

J.S., A CHILD
Plaintiff - Respondent,

THE STATE OF TEXAS
Defendant - Petitioner.

**ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO
THE SEVENTH COURT OF APPEALS OF TEXAS**

TO THE HONORABLE JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME COURT:

Petitioner J.S. respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment of the Seventh Court of Appeals of Texas.

JURISDICTION

1. After hearing evidence, on February 2, 2021, the Potter County Court-at-Law #1 waived jurisdiction by certifying J.S. as an adult and transferring his case to the district court for trial. J.S. filed a notice of appeal on February 23, 2021.

2. On August 11, 2021, the Seventh Court of Appeals of Texas affirmed the certification. On August 22, 2021, J.S. filed both a motion for rehearing and a motion for reconsideration *en banc*. The court of appeals overruled both on September 8, 2021.

3. On September 30, 2021, J.S. filed a petition for review in the Texas Supreme Court, but on June 3, 2022, the petition was denied. J.S. filed a motion for rehearing on June 20, 2022, but the motion was refused on July 22, 2022.

4. No motion for extension of time was filed to file this Petition.

5. No reliance on Rule 12.5 is made.

6. The Court is empowered to review cases via “writ of certiorari granted upon the petition of any party to any civil or criminal case.” 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

THE CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION INVOLVED

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him.

U.S. Const., amend VI (West 2021).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

J.S. was alleged to have committed two counts “accident involving death or personal injury,” *i.e.*, failure to stop and render aid, both committed recklessly rather than intentionally, and both occurring after a single collision when J.S. was 16 years old. After a hearing conducted via Zoom, the trial court certified J.S. to stand trial as an adult.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

A “state court of last resort has decided an important federal question in a way that conflicts with the decision of another state court of last resort...” Rule 10(b).

A hearing to transfer a juvenile to adult court need not “conform with all of the requirements of a criminal trial or even of the usual

administrative hearing,” but “*must* measure up to the *essentials of due process* and fair treatment.” *Kent v. United States*, 383 U.S. 541, 562, 86 S.Ct. 1045, 16 L.Ed.2d 84 (1966) (emphases added). Moreover,

The rights to confront and cross-examine witnesses and to call witnesses in one’s own behalf have long been recognized as *essential to due process*.

See *e.g. Chambers v. Mississippi*, 410 U.S. 284, 294, 93 S.Ct. 1038, 35 L.Ed.2d 297 (1973) (emphasis added). It is “clear beyond dispute that the waiver of jurisdiction is a ‘critically important’ action determining vitally important statutory rights of the juvenile.” *Kent*, 383 U.S. at 556. And *Application of Gault*, 387 U.S. 1, 87 S.Ct. 1428, 18 L.Ed.2d 527 (1967), abrogated on other grounds by *Allen v. Illinois*, 478 U.S. 364, 106 S.Ct. 2988, 92 L.Ed.2d 296 (1986), is also instructive even though it concerned a juvenile delinquency hearing, not a transfer one:

The rights to confront one’s accusers, to cross-examine witnesses, to present evidence and testimony of one’s own, to be unaffected by prejudicial and unreliable evidence, to participate meaningfully in the dispositional decision, to take an appeal have substantial meaning for the overwhelming majority of persons brought before the juvenile court only if they are provided with competent lawyers who can invoke those rights effectively.

Gault, 387 U.S. at 38, n. 65.

State courts of last resort are split on this matter. Those that uphold the right to confrontation at such hearings generally repeat the

Kent caveat that certification/transfer hearings are “critically important.” For example, the West Virginia Supreme Court has ruled that:

Given the “critically important” nature of the transfer hearing we hold that a juvenile is denied his constitutional right to confront his accusers when a critical witness, who has not been demonstrated as unavailable pursuant to the rules of evidence, is permitted to testify by telephone during a transfer hearing.

State v. Gary F., 432 S.E.2d 793, 802, 189 W.Va. 523 (W. Va. 1993), citing *Kent*, 383 U.S. at 556. Similarly, the Kentucky Supreme Court has quoted *Gault* to require confrontation at transfer hearings, since *Kent* “held that transfer hearings are critically important proceedings.” *Commonwealth v. B.H.*, 548 S.W.3d 238, 248-9 (Ky. 2018).

Other jurisdictions agree. But others have held the opposite, usually on the ground that a certification/transfer hearing is not adjudicatory in nature. The Iowa Supreme Court, for example, has ruled that “the right of confrontation does not apply to waiver hearings” in which the juvenile district court’s jurisdiction is waived “because such hearings are not criminal prosecutions.” *State v. Wright*, 456 N.W.2d 661, 665 (Iowa 1990). And the Ohio Supreme Court has recently let stand a court of appeals’ opinion ruling holding that:

[a] juvenile transfer hearing was non-adjudicatory, as it did not result in any conclusive factual findings that could be used against [the appellant] at a subsequent trial ... Based upon the foregoing analysis, we hold that the federal and state Confrontation Clauses were inapplicable at Fuell's transfer hearing.

State v. Fuell, 172 N.E.3d 1065, 1074 (Ohio Ct.App. 2021), appeal dismissed as improvidently granted, __ N.E.2d __ (Ohio 2022).

J.S. raised this issue on appeal, citing *Kent*, *Chambers* and *Gault*. In response the Seventh Court of Appeals noted *Kent*, but not *Chambers*. Instead the court affirmed by seizing on the *Kent* language that a certification/transfer hearing need not “conform with all of the requirements of a criminal trial or even of the usual administrative hearing...” Appendix A – Opinion of the Seventh Court of Appeals, p. 4. The court of appeals then took out of context a remark in *Kent* regarding situations in which a valid *waiver* of such a hearing exists:

we conclude that, as a condition to a valid waiver order, petitioner was entitled to a hearing, including access by his counsel to the social records and probation or similar reports which presumably are considered by the court, and to a statement of reasons for the Juvenile Court's decision.

Id. at 557. The court of appeals took this statement as *limiting* due process *simply to* a hearing, the records and reports mentioned, and a statement of reasons, even where no valid waiver exists, as here:

Kent goes on to explain that due process in a juvenile transfer hearing mandates “a hearing, including access to the social records and probation or similar reports which presumably are considered by the court, and . . . a statement of reasons for the Juvenile Court’s decision. *Id.* at 557.

Appendix A, p. 4 (ellipsis points in original). Finally, relying on unpublished state law cases, the court of appeals wrote: “We do not read *Kent* to mandate that a juvenile must have the right of confrontation in a discretionary transfer hearing.” Appendix A, 4-5. The Texas Supreme Court, after ordering briefing by both sides, refused review.

The harm resulting from the lack of a definitive ruling is clear – the Court has already underlined the importance of the matter to the petitioner and other juveniles facing certification as adults: *Gault* quoted with approval two sociologists’ conclusions endorsing the need for due process in order to promote rehabilitation:

Unless appropriate due process of law is followed, even the juvenile who has violated the law may not feel that he is being fairly treated and may therefore resist the rehabilitative efforts of court personnel.

Gault, 387 U.S. at 26.

And the question is likely to arise often in the future. Very recently a Missouri court has noted, for example, that it need not reach the question: *Interest of C.A.M. Jr.*, 644 S.W.3d 600, 608 (Mo. Ct. App.

2022) (“Because we remand for an in-person certification hearing [on state law grounds] we need not address C.A.M. Jr.’s claim that his right to confrontation was also violated”).

CONCLUSION

Petitioner J.S. therefore prays, on this the eighth day of August 2022, that the Court grant certiorari and, on hearing the case, remand the cause to the Texas state courts, or order all relief the Court may deem appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ John Bennett

John Bennett
2607 Wolflin Avenue #106
Amarillo, Texas 79109
(806) 282-4455
Fax: (806) 398-1988
email: AppealsAttorney@gmail.com
Texas State Bar No. 00785691
Attorney for the Petitioner

WORD COUNT


This is to certify that this entire Petition contains 1,976 words.

/s/ *John Bennett*
John Bennett

PROOF OF SERVICE

This is to certify that a true and correct copy of the above Petition for Writ of Certiorari was served by email on Scott Brumley, Esq., Potter County Attorney, and on Ken Paxton, Attorney General of Texas, on August 8, 2022.

/s/ *John Bennett*
John Bennett



**In The
Court of Appeals
Seventh District of Texas at Amarillo**

No. 07-21-00035-CV

IN THE MATTER OF J.S., A CHILD

On Appeal from the County Court at Law
Potter County, Texas
Trial Court No. 11246-1-JV; Honorable Walt Weaver, Presiding

August 11, 2021

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Before QUINN, CJ., PIRTLE and DOSS, JJ.

Appellant, J.S., a juvenile at the time of the order at issue, appeals the juvenile court's waiver of jurisdiction and order of transfer to criminal court. On appeal, he contends that the trial court's denial of counsel's motion for continuance until such time as the hearing could be held in-person violated his constitutional rights of confrontation and of effective assistance of counsel. He also contends the evidence was insufficient to permit the court to find probable cause that he committed the alleged offense. Finally, he contends that application of the juvenile justice code to transfer him to criminal court, on

these facts, leads to an absurd result that the Texas Legislature could not have intended. We affirm.

Background

On December 8, 2019, while J.S. was sixteen years old, he was driving his mother's vehicle after drinking with friends. Going approximately seventy-six miles per hour in a residential neighborhood, he hit a dip, lost control, hit a curb, rolled the car, crashed into a mobile home, and landed upside down in the yard. Ultimately, one of his five passengers died from blood loss from blunt force trauma. Another passenger sustained serious and long-term injuries.

Appellant was taken into the custody of the Youth Center of the High Plains and remained there unadjudicated for over a year. Approximately three weeks before he turned eighteen years old, the juvenile court heard the State's petition for waiver of jurisdiction and discretionary transfer to criminal court. After a long and detailed hearing on the matter, the juvenile court ultimately waived its exclusive jurisdiction over J.S. and transferred jurisdiction to the criminal court.

Applicable Law on Waiver of Jurisdiction and Transfer of Criminal Court

The juvenile court has exclusive, original jurisdiction over all proceedings involving a defendant who is a "child" when the alleged offense occurred. See TEX. FAM. CODE ANN. § 51.04(a) (West Supp. 2020). If, however, a juvenile court determines that certain conditions are met after an evidentiary hearing, it may waive its jurisdiction and transfer a child to the district court for criminal proceedings. See *id.* § 54.02(a), (c) (West 2014). The Texas Family Code provides the following must be proved to support a waiver of exclusive jurisdiction and transfer of a child to the adult criminal justice system:

(a) The juvenile court may waive its exclusive original jurisdiction and transfer a child to the appropriate district court or criminal district court for criminal proceedings if:

(1) the child is alleged to have violated a penal law of the grade of felony;

(2) the child was:

(A) 14 years of age or older at the time he is alleged to have committed the offense, if the offense is a capital felony, an aggravated controlled substance felony, or a felony of the first degree, and no adjudication hearing has been conducted concerning that offense; or

(B) 15 years of age or older at the time the child is alleged to have committed the offense, if the offense is a felony of the second or third degree or a state jail felony, and no adjudication hearing has been conducted concerning that offense; and

(3) after a full investigation and a hearing, the juvenile court determines that there is probable cause to believe that the child before the court committed the offense alleged and that because of the seriousness of the offense alleged or the background of the child the welfare of the community requires criminal proceedings.

Id. § 54.02(a). In making the determination required by section 54.02(a)(3), the juvenile court shall consider, among other matters, the following:

(1) whether the alleged offense was against person or property, with greater weight in favor of transfer given to offenses against the person;

(2) the sophistication and maturity of the child;

(3) the record and previous history of the child; and

(4) the prospects of adequate protection of the public and the likelihood of the rehabilitation of the child by use of procedures, services, and facilities currently available to the juvenile court.

Id. § 54.02(f).

Here, J.S. was charged with delinquent conduct under the Texas Transportation Code, relating to his failure to stop and render aid to the passenger who sustained fatal injuries as a consequence of the accident and to the passenger who sustained serious

bodily injuries, a second- and third-degree felony, respectively. See TEX. TRANSP. CODE ANN. § 550.021(a), (c)(1)(A)–(B) (West Supp. 2020).

First Issue: Right of Confrontation

In his first issue, J.S. contends that holding the hearing virtually over counsel's objections and in the face of his motion to continue until such time as the hearing could be held in person deprived J.S. of his Sixth Amendment right of confrontation. We overrule the issue.

J.S. relies heavily on United States Supreme Court cases to support his position that the Sixth Amendment's Confrontation Clause applies to a juvenile transfer hearing. The Supreme Court has recognized the waiver of the juvenile court's jurisdiction as a "critically important" action and held that the transfer "hearing must measure up to the essentials of due process and fair treatment." *Kent v. United States*, 383 U.S. 541, 562, 86 S. Ct. 1045, 1057, 16 L. Ed. 2d 84 (1966). J.S. reads *Kent*'s language to include the Sixth Amendment's right of confrontation. *Kent* itself, however, limits the breadth of its holding:

We do not mean by this to indicate that the hearing to be held must conform with all of the requirements of a criminal trial or even of the usual administrative hearing; but we do hold that the hearing must measure up to the essentials of due process and fair treatment. *Pee v. United States*, 107 U. S. App. D. C. 47, 50, 274 F.2d 556, 559 (1959).

Id.

Indeed, *Kent* goes on to explain that due process in a juvenile transfer hearing mandates "a hearing, including access to the social records and probation or similar reports which presumably are considered by the court, and . . . a statement of reasons for the Juvenile Court's decision." *Id.* at 557. We do not read *Kent* to mandate that a

juvenile must have the right of confrontation in a discretionary transfer hearing.¹ To the contrary, for decades, Texas courts have specifically held that the Sixth Amendment right of confrontation does not apply to a waiver of jurisdiction hearing in a juvenile case. See *In re A.K.*, No. 02-20-00410-CV, 2021 Tex. App. LEXIS 3499, at *40 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth May 6, 2021, pet. filed) (mem. op.) (noting that “[t]his court[] . . . has repeatedly held that a juvenile has no right of confrontation at a discretionary transfer hearing”); *Milligan v. State*, No. 03-04-00531-CR, 2006 Tex. App. LEXIS 1356, at *11 (Tex. App.—Austin Feb. 16, 2006, pet. ref’d) (mem. op.) (recognizing that it “has been held that neither the Sixth Amendment nor the hearsay rule applies to a juvenile certification hearing”); *In re S.J.M.*, 922 S.W.2d 241, 242 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1996, no pet.) (“The Sixth Amendment right applies specifically to criminal prosecutions and does not apply to a waiver of jurisdiction hearing.”); *Alford v. State*, 806 S.W.2d 581, 581 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1991) (stating that, because the limited nature of a transfer hearing is dispositional rather than adjudicatory, no constitutional right to confrontation exists and hearsay rules do not apply), *aff’d on other grounds*, 866 S.W.2d 619 (Tex. Crim. App. 1993) (en banc); *In re R.G.S.*, 575 S.W.2d 113, 117–18 (Tex. Civ. App.—Eastland 1979, writ ref’d n.r.e.) (holding that the Sixth Amendment’s right of confrontation was not applicable to a transfer hearing in juvenile case).

Here, the trial court was authorized, subject only to constitutional limitations, to order J.S. to participate remotely in the transfer hearing, even without his consent, in order to avoid the risk associated with the COVID-19 pandemic. See *Thirty-Third Emergency*

¹ To be clear, at an *adjudication* hearing as opposed to a waiver of jurisdiction or transfer hearing, “the juvenile is guaranteed the same constitutional rights as an adult in a criminal proceeding.” See *In re P.M.*, 543 S.W.3d 365, 378 (Tex. App.—El Paso 2018, no pet.) (citing *In re Winship*, 397 U.S. 358, 359, 365, 90 S.Ct. 1068, 1070, 1073, 25 L.Ed.2d 368 (1970)).

Order Regarding the COVID-19 State of Disaster, Misc. Docket No. 21-9004, § 3(c) (Tex. Jan. 14, 2021); *In re A.T.M.*, No. 13-21-00008-CV, 2021 Tex. App. LEXIS 5064, at *26 (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi June 24, 2021, no pet. h.) (mem. op.). Because J.S. did not have the right of confrontation at this discretionary transfer hearing, no such right served as a limitation of the trial court’s authority to hold the hearing remotely. That being so, the trial court’s denial of a continuance was not an abuse of discretion, and its decision to hold the hearing remotely did not deprive J.S. of any applicable constitutional guarantees.

Second Issue: Ineffective Assistance of Counsel

In his second issue, J.S. contends the trial court’s denial of a continuance to permit an in-person hearing and decision to, instead, conduct a hearing virtually denied J.S. effective assistance of counsel. We again overrule the issue.

First, we must frame the topic and distinguish it from the more traditional ineffective-assistance-of-counsel claims. Here, J.S. maintains that it was the trial court’s action in denying a continuance that operated in such a way to limit his counsel’s representation; he does not complain about acts of his counsel being deficient. So, because the focus actually lies upon the trial court’s action, as opposed to inaction or mistakes by counsel, we review the complaint to determine if the trial court erred. See *Ruiz v. State*, 891 S.W.2d 302, 305–06 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1994, pet. ref’d).

As we have intimated in our disposition of the first issue, the trial court did not abuse its discretion by refusing to delay the hearing to a time when all may appear physically together. And, to the extent that the trial court’s authority, under the emergency COVID order, to conduct the hearing remotely was limited by the constitutional right to

effective assistance of counsel, the record before us fails to establish that the remote hearing impeded counsel's representation of appellant in any meaningful way.

We know of no authority holding that a right to effective counsel mandates perfection. Nor does appellant cite us to any such authority. Glitches and certain technical issues regarding visibility did occur during the proceeding. Yet, all were addressed and seemingly remedied by adaptive approaches. The record reveals a carefully monitored hearing, one tailored to foster communication between all parties and mindful of the obstacles in a virtual setting.

J.S.'s complaints relating to assistance of counsel center on communication between counsel and J.S. He complains that he could not share contemporaneous notes with counsel, that his notes were "temporarily confiscated," and that staff in the room during phone conversations between J.S. and counsel made J.S. "uncomfortable" when speaking to counsel. Nevertheless, throughout the hearing the trial court took great care in assuring J.S. that he could consult with counsel at any time. On the occasion that J.S. did interrupt proceedings to consult with counsel, the trial court met J.S. courteously and first cautioned him to not mention anything regarding the substance of what he wanted to discuss with counsel. The trial court then provided a breakout room for J.S. and his counsel and went into recess. Upon reentering the hearing, the trial court again politely reminded J.S. that he need not divulge anything discussed and confirmed with both J.S. and counsel that the two were able to communicate.

As for the "temporarily confiscated" notes, we first observe that it was the trial court who first inquired into whether J.S. had pen and paper to take notes during the hearing and, upon hearing that he did not, suggested that he have them available in the event he

wanted to take notes. Upon the conclusion of the first day of the hearing, the trial court spoke with J.S. to let him know to fold the notes, place them in an envelope, and mark them as private attorney-client material. It then enlisted the assistance of a juvenile probation officer in the meeting to assure that the notes would remain sealed and private. The trial court also advised J.S. that the notes would be returned to him. The parties seemed to understand and accept that he would not be able to possess them in his private living area in the youth center. Furthermore, the trial court offered to contact the facility to ensure that the notes would remain sealed and private, but the juvenile probation officer assured the court that she would handle the matter. When the hearing resumed the next day, the trial court confirmed with J.S. that the notes were returned to him, and that J.S. had the opportunity to consult with counsel about them. It also reiterated to J.S. that there was no limit to the number of times he could consult with counsel during the hearing. And, though the trial court was aware that youth center staff would likely be in the room with appellant, it mentioned that if the circumstances necessitated, he would try to arrange an entirely private conversation. The latter offer was never accepted, according to the record. And, when J.S. did request to speak with counsel during the course of the proceeding, the court permitted it and often inquired about whether he was sufficiently able to consult with his attorney. J.S. generally answered in the affirmative.

All of this is to say that the record does not reveal any instance in which the virtual arrangement hindered attorney-client communication. Perhaps it was not counsel's preferred or ideal arrangement, but the trial court and the participants were very attentive in maintaining an open and communicative atmosphere in which any issues that arose were carefully considered and addressed. Again, perfection is not the standard but

reasonably effective is. See *Robertson v. State*, 187 S.W.3d 475, 483 (Tex. Crim. App. 2006) (observing that the right to effective assistance of counsel “does not mean errorless or perfect counsel”). And, we cannot find instances in which J.S. was denied same due to the virtual arena in which the hearing was held. So, the trial court’s ruling on the continuance and its decision to conduct the hearing remotely did not deprive J.S. of effective assistance of counsel.

Third Issue: Sufficiency of the Evidence

As we noted at the outset, one of the determinations the juvenile court must make in order to waive its exclusive jurisdiction over a child is that “there is probable cause to believe that the child before the court committed the offense alleged and that because of the seriousness of the offense alleged or the background of the child the welfare of the community requires criminal proceedings.” TEX. FAM. CODE ANN. § 54.02(a)(3). On appeal, J.S. challenges the sufficiency of the evidence to support the probable cause determination. More specifically, he maintains that the State failed to show he acted with the requisite intent.

In evaluating a determination of probable cause, we consider whether there are sufficient facts and circumstances to support a prudent person’s belief that the accused child committed the alleged offense. See *In re J.G.*, 495 S.W.3d 354, 374 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2016, pet. denied). Probable cause is based on “factual and practical considerations of everyday life on which reasonable and prudent [people], not legal technicians, act.” *In re C.M.M.*, 503 S.W.3d 692, 702 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2016, pet. denied) (quoting *Guzman v. State*, 955 S.W.2d 85, 87 (Tex. Crim. App. 1997) (en banc)).

The offense which is commonly referred to as failure to stop and render aid is governed by the Texas Transportation Code, which provides in pertinent part, as follows:

(a) The operator of a vehicle involved in an accident that results or is reasonably likely to result in injury to or death of a person shall:

(1) immediately stop the vehicle at the scene of the accident or as close to the scene as possible;

(2) immediately return to the scene of the accident if the vehicle is not stopped at the scene of the accident;

(3) immediately determine whether a person is involved in the accident, and if a person is involved in the accident, whether that person requires aid; and

(4) remain at the scene of the accident until the operator complies with the requirements of section 550.023.

TEX. TRANSP. CODE ANN. § 550.021(a) (“Accident Involving Personal Injury or Death”); see *Curry v. State*, 622 S.W.3d 302 (Tex. Crim. App. 2019). According to *Curry*, the culpable mental state for failure to stop and render aid is established by showing that the accused had knowledge that an accident occurred, and the accident was reasonably likely to result in injury or death of a person. *Curry*, 622 S.W.3d at 309; see *Boudreax v. State*, ___ S.W.3d ___, 2020 Tex. App. LEXIS 3831, at *12–13 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] May 7, 2020, pet. ref’d).

Here, J.S. admitted driving the crashed vehicle, waking up at the scene and discovering “there had been an accident.” So too did he acknowledge hitting something and losing control of the vehicle because he “was going too fast.” And, because he did not know what to do upon discovering “there had been an accident,” he decided to walk home.

Elsewhere in the record, we learn that appellant had been driving with five passengers, one of which was forced to ride on another passenger’s lap due to seating

constraints. We learn that the car had been travelling at approximately 76 miles per hour in a residential area when J.S. lost control, struck a curb and a fence, rolled the vehicle, and crashed into a mobile home causing serious damage to both the vehicle and the home. The vehicle came to rest upside down in the yard of the mobile home. Only two people were found in the car at the time, the passenger who died from blood loss and the passenger who was severely injured. Two other passengers who had left the scene returned to the scene to speak with officers.

So we see that an unlicensed driver who had been drinking throughout the hours preceding the crash was speeding through a residential neighborhood and lost control of the vehicle which carried passengers beyond its designed capacity. The vehicle rolled and crashed into a residence. This evidence coupled with practical experience are sufficient to support the trial court's belief that J.S. had knowledge of the circumstances surrounding his conduct, meaning he had knowledge that an accident occurred, and the accident was reasonably likely to result in injury or death of a person. See *Curry*, 622 S.W.3d at 309; *Boudreax*, 2020 Tex. App. LEXIS 3831, at *12–13. From this evidence the trial court could have determined that there was probable cause that J.S. committed the alleged offense.

Fourth Issue: Statutory Construction and Absurdity

In his fourth and final issue, J.S. contends the trial court's waiver of jurisdiction and transfer order should be deemed void as a consequence of the application of the juvenile discretionary transfer scheme to arrive at an absurd result. J.S. invites us to construe the relevant statute to exclude waiver and transfer on these facts. We decline his invitation

to hold, in effect, that only minors are immature enough to drive while intoxicated and injure others.

J.S. relies on extrajudicial sources to characterize his conduct as inherently juvenile and, that being so, to subject a juvenile to the adult criminal justice system for conduct that is characteristic of a juvenile is an absurd result that the Texas Legislature could not have intended. Yet, it is not the job of the courts to rewrite statutes or “to choose between competing policies addressed by legislative drafting.” *In re Tex. Dep’t of Family & Protective Servs.*, 210 S.W.3d 609, 614 (Tex. 2006) (orig. proceeding). “We apply the mandates in the statute as written.” *Id.*

Only when the application of the plain language of the statute produces an absurd result, would the court system intervene in such a way as to deviate from application of the plain language of the statute. See generally *In re Acad., Ltd.*, No-19-0497, 2021 Tex. LEXIS 623, at *7 (Tex. June 25, 2021) (orig. proceeding); *Stahmann v. State*, 602 S.W.3d 573, 577 (Tex. Crim. App. 2020). However, the bar to reach “absurdity” in this context is a high one, as it should be. See *City of Forth Worth v. Rylie*, 602 S.W.3d 459, 467 (Tex. 2020) (quoting *Combs v. Health Care Servs. Corp.*, 401 S.W.3d 623, 630 (Tex. 2013)). Even if the result seems to us to be unreasonable, “reasonableness is not the standard for eschewing plain statutory language.” *Jaster v. Comet II Constr., Inc.*, 438 S.W.3d 556, 570 (Tex. 2014) (quoting *In re Blair*, 408 S.W.3d 843, 859 (Tex. 2013) (orig. proceeding) (Boyd, J., concurring)).

Analyzing a particular outcome that, to some, may seem unanticipated, perplexing, or even unfair, is thorny business, as the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals has noted:

But determining whether a particular result is absurd is a dangerously subjective endeavor. Our sister court has observed that the bar for

concluding a plain-faced interpretation of a statute would lead to absurd results is, and should be, high. It should be reserved for truly exceptional cases, and mere oddity does not equal absurdity. Even if a consequence is unintended, improvident, or inequitable, it may still fall short of being unthinkable or unfathomable. The focus should be on whether it is quite impossible that a rational legislature could have intended it.

Ritz v. State, 533 S.W.3d 302, 308 (Tex. Crim. App. 2017) (citing *Combs*, 401 S.W.3d at 630–31).

Here, “[w]ithout regard to the wisdom or desirability” of the application of the transfer statute to this set of circumstance, we cannot agree that it is absurd. See *Anadarko Petrol. Corp. v. Houston Cas. Co.*, 573 S.W.3d 187, 197 (Tex. 2019). J.S. presents the matter in such a way as to suggest that transfer on these facts is somewhat paradoxical. Even were we to adopt his presentation as our own, however, we cannot agree that application of the juvenile jurisdictional waiver and transfer statutory scheme on these facts rises to the level of absurdity such that we would be authorized to re-write the plain language of the statute. Simply put, adults too drink and drive. To treat a minor as an adult when engaging in activities performed by adults is not absurd when all other statutory prerequisites are met. We overrule J.S.’s fourth and final issue.

Having overruled the issues presented to us on appeal, we affirm the trial court’s waiver of jurisdiction and discretionary transfer order.

Brian Quinn
Chief Justice

FILE COPY

RE: Case No. 21-0850
COA #: 07-21-00035-CV
STYLE: IN RE J.S.

DATE: 6/3/2022
TC#: 11246-1-JV

Today the Supreme Court of Texas denied the petition for review in the above-referenced case.

MR. JOHN C. BENNETT

* DELIVERED VIA E-MAIL *

Appendix C

FILE COPY

RE: Case No. 21-0850
COA #: 07-21-00035-CV
STYLE: IN RE J. S.

DATE: 7/22/2022
TC#: 11246-1-JV

Today the Supreme Court of Texas denied the motion for rehearing of the above-referenced petition for review.

MR. JOHN C. BENNETT

* DELIVERED VIA E-MAIL *

Appendix D