Uldaho Law **Digital Commons** @ **Uldaho Law**

Not Reported

Idaho Supreme Court Records & Briefs

4-26-2012

Dursunov v. State Appellant's Reply Brief Dckt. 38885

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.law.uidaho.edu/not reported

Recommended Citation

"Dursunov v. State Appellant's Reply Brief Dckt. 38885" (2012). *Not Reported*. 359. https://digitalcommons.law.uidaho.edu/not_reported/359

This Court Document is brought to you for free and open access by the Idaho Supreme Court Records & Briefs at Digital Commons @ UIdaho Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in Not Reported by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ UIdaho Law. For more information, please contact annablaine@uidaho.edu.

ILDAR DURSUNOV,)
Petitioner-Appellant,) NO. 38885
v .)
STATE OF IDAHO,) REPLY BRIEF
Respondent.)
)

REPLY BRIEF OF APPELLANT

APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE FIFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF IDAHO, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF TWIN FALLS

HONORABLE G. RICHARD BEVAN District Judge

SARA B. THOMAS State Appellate Public Defender State of Idaho I.S.B. #5867

ERIK R. LEHTINEN Chief, Appellate Unit I.S.B. #6247

SPENCER J. HAHN Deputy State Appellate Public Defender I.S.B. #8576 3050 N. Lake Harbor Lane, Suite 100 Boise, ID 83703 (208) 334-2712

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT-APPELLANT

KENNETH K. JORGENSEN Deputy Attorney General Criminal Law Division P.O. Box 83720 Boise, Idaho 83720-0010 (208) 334-4534



ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF-RESPONDENT



TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>PAC</u>	<u>}E</u>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIESii	
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	
Nature of the Case1	
Statement of the Facts and Course of Proceedings1	
ISSUE PRESENTED ON APPEAL 2	
ARGUMENT3	
Mr. Dursunov's Claim Is Not Waived Under State v.Zichko	
CONCLUSION4	
CERTIFICATE OF MAILING5	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>Cases</u>
Gonzales v. State, 151 Idaho 168 (Ct. App. 2011)

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Nature of the Case

On appeal, Mr. Dursunov argues that the district court erred when it summarily dismissed his post-conviction claim that he received ineffective assistance of counsel when his attorney failed to advise him that he could have obtained a confidential psychosexual evaluation prior to pleading guilty and participating in a court-ordered psychosexual evaluation.

In response, the State advances two arguments: (1) that Mr. Dursunov's "argument is waived" under *State v. Zichko*, 129 Idaho 259, 263 (1996), because he failed to cite to authority for it, and (2) that the three-factor test for evaluating the prejudicial impact of improperly-admitted psychosexual reports in post-conviction set forth in *Hughes v. State*, 148 Idaho 448 (Ct. App. 2009), either does not apply to his case or, alternatively, has not been satisfied. (Respondent's Brief, pp.8-10.)

This Reply Brief is necessary to respond to the State's *Zichko* argument. With respect to the State's *Hughes* argument, Mr. Dursunov will rely on the argument in his Appellant's Brief in which he explained why the *Hughes* test applied to his case and demonstrated a *prima facie* case of prejudice under the three-factor test. (Appellant's Brief, pp.11-14.)

Statement of the Facts and Course of Proceedings

The statement of the facts and course of proceedings were previously articulated in Mr. Dursunov's Appellant's Brief. They need not be repeated in this Reply Brief, but are incorporated herein by reference.

<u>ISSUE</u>

Is Mr. Dursunov's claim waived under State v. Zichko?

ARGUMENT

Mr. Dursunov's Claim Is Not Waived Under State v. Zichko

In its Respondent's Brief, addressing Mr. Dursunov's post-conviction claim, the State argues, *inter alia*, as follows:

Dursunov has failed to present any authority that an attorney is required, much less able, to prevent a court-ordered psychosexual evaluation in which a defendant voluntarily participates from being disclosed to the district court. Consequently, this argument is waived. See State v. Zichko, 129 Idaho 259, 263, 923 P.2d 966, 970 (1996) (arguments not supported by citations to authority are waived).

(Respondent's Brief, p.8.)

In making his claim that his attorney was ineffective for failing to advise him that he could have a confidential psychosexual evaluation, rather than a court-ordered one, 1 Mr. Dursunov cited to, and distinguished the facts of his case from, *Gonzales v. State*, 151 Idaho 168 (Ct. App. 2011). (Appellant's Brief, pp.10-11.) Appellate counsel submits that citing to authority that can be distinguished satisfies the requirements of Idaho Appellate Rule 35 as interpreted by this Court in *Zichko*.

¹ In making its *Zichko* argument, the State appears to have misinterpreted Mr. Dursunov's claim.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth in his Appellant's Brief and herein, Mr. Dursunov respectfully requests that this Court vacate the district court's order dismissing his post-conviction petition as to the claim raised on appeal, and remand this matter for an evidentiary hearing on that claim.

DATED this 26th day of April, 2012.

SPENCER J. HAHN

Deputy State Appellate Public Defender

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 26th day of April, 2012, I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing APPELLANT'S REPLY BRIEF, by causing to be placed a copy thereof in the U.S. Mail, addressed to:

ILDAR DURSUNOV INMATE # 89927 ISCI PO BOX 14 BOISE ID 83707

G RICHARD BEVAN DISTRICT COURT JUDGE E-MAILED BRIEF

MARILYN B PAUL ATTORNEY AT LAW E-MAILED BRIEF

KENNETH K. JORGENSEN
DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL
CRIMINAL DIVISION
PO BOX 83720
BOISE, ID 83720-0010
Hand delivered to Attorney General's mailbox at Supreme Court.

EVAN A. SMITH Administrative Assistant

SJH/eas