## STATE OF MICHIGAN RE: JOHN DOE / MCL § 750.165

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | JC | 5 | 6 | 7 | M | 8 | CC | 9 | AT | 10 | 11 |

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

JOHN DOE, CASE No.:

Petitioner/Defendant,

v.

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF

CORRECTIONS; & THE OFFICE OF THE

ATTORNEY GENERAL,

Respondents/Plaintiff.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

CASE No.: XXXX-XXXXXX-FH

TO EACH PARTY AND TO THE ATTORNEY OF RECORD FOR EACH PARTY OF INTEREST IN THIS ACTION:

YOU ARE HEREBY NOTICED THAT PETITIONER, JOHN DOE, Sues out this Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus to the Court of Appeals, Hall of Justice, 925 W. Ottawa Street, P.O. Box 30022, Lansing, Michigan 48909-7522, on the following Grounds:

## **GROUNDS FOR ISSUING THE WRIT**

## **DEBTOR'S PRISON**

- 1. MCL § 750.165 is in violation of the Fifth, Sixth, & Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution and violates Art. I § 21 of the Michigan Constitution as a Debtor's Prison Scheme.
- 2. The Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution states in pertinent part: ". . . nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."
- 3. The United States Supreme Court has held that once a criminal defendant is sentenced to probation for a crime, it violates the Fourteenth Amendment to revoke his probation and sentence him to jail if he lacks the resources to pay it. *Bearden v. Georgia*, 461 U.S. 660,

28

667-668 (1983); See also *Banks v. United States*, 614 F.2d 95, 100 n.13 (6th Cir., 1980); and, *Gross v. State* . . . 312 F2d. 1279 (US App Ct Illinois, 1963).

- 4. Numerous Courts have overturned debtor's prison schemes as unconstitutional. The courts have held that the defendant's inability to pay precludes imprisonment for either civil or criminal contempt. If the party does not have the money, it cannot be coerced nor can it be extorted from third parties. This is true whether the party chose to frustrate the court Order or whether the inability is unintentional. See: *Rohleder*, 424 S.W.2d at 892; *Lynch v. Lynch*, 342 MD. 509, 677 A.2d 584 (1996); *Jones v. Hargrove*, 516 So.2d 1354 (Miss. 1987); *Wilborn v. Wilborn*, 258 So.2d 804 (Miss 1972); *In re: Nichols*, 749 So.2d 68 (Miss 1999); *Ex parte Rojo*, 925 S.W.2d 654 (Tex. 1996) (citing *In re Dustman*, 538 S.W.2d at 410); *Going v. Going*, 148 Ten. At 256, 256 S.W. 890 (1923); *State ex rel. Alderson v. Gentry*, 1990 WL 2976 (Tenn. Ct. App 1990); *Moss v. Moss*, LLR No. 9609060.CA (September 25, 1996).
- 5. Art. I § 21 of the Michigan Constitution states: "No person shall be imprisoned for debt arising out of or founded on contract, express or implied, except in cases of fraud or breach of trust."
- 6. The Michigan Supreme Court, using extraordinarily harsh terms, struck down a statute because it permitted the jailing of a person for failure to fix his sidewalk even though he was "so poor and indigent as to receive support from his charitable neighbors." *City of Port Huron v. Jenkinson*, 77 Mich. 414, 420 (1889). The Court held:
  - No legislative or municipal body has the power to impose the duty of performing an act upon any person which it is impossible to perform, and then make his nonperformance of such a duty a crime for which he may be punished by both fine and imprisonment. . . . It is hardly necessary to say these two sections of the statute are unconstitutional and void. . . . They are obnoxious to our constitution and laws [and] are a disgrace to the legislation of the state. [Id. At 419-420]." (Emphasis added).
- 7. In a parallel line of reasoning, the Court held that "If the court's purpose is to preserve its authority by punishing past misconduct through the imposition of an <u>unconditional</u> and fixed sentence, the proceedings are criminal. If instead of punishing past misconduct, the court seeks to compel future compliance through the imposition of a sanction of indefinite duration terminable upon compliance or inability to comply, the proceedings are civil." *Williams*

International Corp. v. Smith, 144 Mich App 257, 262-263, leave granted 425 Mich 852 (1986). See also, Spalter v. Wayne Circuit Judge, 35 Mich App 156, 160-161 (1971).

- 8. In applying the Statute, MCL § 750.165(4) reads in pertinent part: The court <u>may suspend</u> the sentence of an individual convicted under this section <u>if</u> the individual files with the court a bond in the amount and with the sureties the court requires. At a minimum, the bond must be <u>conditioned</u> on the individual's compliance with the support order. <u>If</u> the court suspends a sentence under this subsection and the individual does not comply with the support order or <u>another condition</u> on the bond, the court may order the individual to appear and show cause why the court should not impose the sentence and enforce the bond. After the hearing, the court may enforce the bond or impose the sentence, or both, or may permit the filing of a new bond and again suspend the sentence....
- 9. Thereby, MCL § 750.165(4) provides for <u>conditional</u> sentencing which allows those defendants, by whatever fate, in a financial position to pay the bond (a debt which is 25% of their arrears) to retain their freedom, and those that cannot face incarceration and additional sanctions.
- 10. MCL § 750.165 is a debtor's prison scheme where one's liberty is <u>conditioned</u>, <u>explicitly so</u>, upon an act, and wherein the Defendants' inability to meet the condition, i.e. pay the alleged debt, costs them their freedom. For the enforcement of private debt Defendants are incarcerated without the keys to their release.

## **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Petitions Prays this Honorable Court to:

- 1. Strike down MCL § 750.165(4) as an Unconstitutional Debtor's Prison Scheme, and a disgrace to the legislation of the state;
- 2. Grant other such Relief the Court deems appropriate and/or necessary for the protection of Petitioner's Rights under the United States & Michigan Constitutions.