

CH. 24 GUILTY PLEAS	1
§24-1 Generally	1
§24-2 Waiver of Counsel	11
§24-3 Plea Bargaining.....	13
§24-4 Unfulfilled Promises.....	29
§24-5 Voluntary Pleas	37
§24-6 Admonishments.....	47
§24-6(a) Generally	47
§24-6(b) Nature of Charge	57
§24-6(c) Rights to Plead Not Guilty, Go to Trial, and Confront Witnesses.....	58
§24-6(d) Possible Sentence	58
§24-6(e) Right to Appeal	73
§24-7 Factual Basis	77
§24-8 Motion to Vacate Plea or Reconsider Sentence; Appeal	79
§24-8(a) Generally	79
§24-8(b) Procedure on Motion	101
§24-8(b)(1) Generally	101
§24-8(b)(2) Rule 604(d) Certificates.....	107
§24-9 Guilty Plea as Waiver of Errors	124
§24-10 Stipulated Bench Trial	130
§24-11 Juvenile Proceedings.....	134

CH. 24 GUILTY PLEAS

§24-1 Generally

United States Supreme Court

U.S. v. Ruiz, 536 U.S. 622, 122 S.Ct. 2450, 153 L.Ed.2d 586 (2002) The Federal Constitution does not require that before pleading guilty, a criminal defendant must receive "impeachment information relating to any informants or other witnesses" or information supporting affirmative defenses. Thus, the constitution does not prohibit use of a "fast track" plea bargaining process which requires the defendant to waive the right to receive such information. The court stressed that the right to receive exculpatory or impeachment information concerns the fairness of the defendant's trial, not the voluntariness of a guilty plea. In addition, the "fast track" plea bargaining process used here required the State to provide any evidence of actual innocence.

Godinez v. Moran, 509 U.S. 389, 113 S.Ct. 2680, 125 L.Ed.2d 321 (1993) Pleading guilty does not require a "higher" standard of competency than that used to determine fitness to stand trial.

North Carolina v. Alford, 400 U.S. 25, 91 S.Ct. 160, 27 L.Ed.2d 162 (1970) A defendant may plead guilty while proclaiming his innocence, if he intelligently concludes that his interests require entry of a guilty plea and the record before the judge contains strong evidence of guilt.

Boykin v. Alabama, 395 U.S. 238, 89 S.Ct. 1709, 23 L.Ed.2d 274 (1969) A guilty plea record must show a waiver of the rights against compulsory self-incrimination, to trial by jury and to confront one's accusers. A waiver of these rights cannot be presumed from a silent record.

U.S. v. Jackson, 390 U.S. 570, 88 S.Ct. 1209, 20 L.Ed.2d 138 (1968) A defendant does not have a constitutional right to have his guilty plea accepted by a court.

Illinois Supreme Court

People v. Shinaul, 2017 IL 120162 As part of a negotiated guilty plea agreement, defendant pled guilty to one count of aggravated unlawful use of weapons and in exchange the State nol-prossed the eight remaining counts. Years later defendant filed a 2-1401 petition for relief from judgment (735 ILCS 5/2-1401) seeking to vacate his conviction since it was void under **Aguilar**, 2013 IL 112116. The State conceded that **Aguilar** voided defendant's conviction and filed a motion to reinstate some of the charges it had nol-prossed. The circuit court vacated defendant's conviction and allowed him to withdraw his guilty plea, but denied the State's motion to reinstate the charges.

The Supreme Court, with one justice dissenting, held that the statute of limitations barred the State from reinstating the nol-prossed charges. When a circuit court vacates a judgment and allows a defendant to withdraw his guilty plea, the case returns to its status before the judgment was made. And generally the State may in this situation ask the court to reinstate nol-prossed charges. But here the statute of limitations constituted an absolute bar against reinstating the charges since the three-year limitations period had already run.

[720 ILCS 5/3-5.](#)

Although a statute of limitations period may be tolled, the court found no authority for the State's argument that it is tolled when a defendant successfully vacates his conviction after the period of limitations has expired on charges that were dismissed as part of a plea agreement. The court specifically rejected the State's argument that the "prosecution" against defendant was still pending and had not expired because defendant's case never had a final disposition on appeal. The court refused to read into the statute "exceptions, limitations, or conditions" that were not plainly spelled out.

The State was barred from reinstating the nol-prossed charges.

People v. Hughes, 2012 IL 112817 Jurisdiction stems from the Illinois Constitution, which assigns original jurisdiction to the circuit court in all "justiciable matters" except where the Supreme Court has original and exclusive jurisdiction. The court rejected the argument that the circuit court lacked jurisdiction to accept a guilty plea on a count on which a *nolle prosequi* order had been entered on the State's motion and which had not been refiled or reinstated.

To *nolle prosequi* a charge means simply that the State indicates an unwillingness to prosecute. Once the charge is *nol prossed*, the proceedings are terminated with respect to that particular charge, but the defendant is not acquitted. If a *nolle prosequi* is entered before jeopardy attaches, the State may re prosecute the defendant subject to other relevant statutory or constitutional defenses and so long as there is no harassment, bad faith, or fundamental unfairness.

Because jeopardy had not yet attached, the State's termination of the criminal prosecution by a *nolle prosequi* gave the State the right to either file a new charge or ask to vacate the dismissal and reinstate the original charge. The failure to do either did not deprive the trial court of jurisdiction, however, because an aggravated criminal sexual abuse indictment is a "justiciable matter" involving an offense created by the Criminal Code. Thus, even if the indictment was legally defective due to the *nolle prosequi*, the trial court had jurisdiction over the cause and could accept the guilty plea.

In dissent, Justices Freeman and Burke found that unless the State took steps to reinstate the *nol prossed* charge, there was no "justiciable matter" on which a guilty plea could have been entered.

People v. Absher, 242 Ill.2d 77, 950 N.E.2d 659 (2011) Generally, contract law principles apply to negotiated guilty pleas. Thus, neither party can unilaterally abrogate its obligations under the plea agreement.

By entering a fully negotiated plea and accepting an intensive probation sentence which required him to submit to searches by the probation department and agree that any evidence discovered in such searches was admissible at trial, defendant waived any Fourth Amendment issues concerning such evidence. The court acknowledged, however, that the waiver would not extend to searches that had no possible law enforcement objective or which so far exceeded any legitimate objective as to justify an inference that the officers' purpose was mere harassment. The court also stressed that it expressed no opinion concerning the validity of a similar condition where the defendant enters an open plea or is involuntarily placed on probation.

People v. Urdiales, 225 Ill.2d 354, 871 N.E.2d 669 (2007) Defendant offered to plead guilty but mentally ill, but the State objected. The parties agreed to allow the trial judge to hear evidence before determining whether to accept the plea. The Supreme Court found that the preponderance of the evidence standard applied at the evidentiary hearing. The court also

found the trial court did not abuse its discretion by rejecting the plea of guilty but mentally ill.

People v. Hall, 217 Ill.2d 324, 841 N.E.2d 913 (2005) A defendant challenging a guilty plea based on ineffective assistance of counsel must show that counsel's performance was objectively unreasonable and that defendant was prejudiced. Where defense counsel repeatedly stated that lack of knowledge of a child's presence inside a stolen vehicle was not a defense to aggravated kidnapping, and that advice was clearly erroneous, there was a substantial showing that counsel's advice was objectively unreasonable.

People v. Whitfield, 217 Ill.2d 177, 840 N.E.2d 658 (2005) Where a defendant seeks post-conviction relief from a guilty plea, two closely related constitutional claims may be raised. First, the defendant may argue that his plea was not made knowingly and voluntarily. Second, a defendant whose plea was pursuant to a plea agreement may contend that he did not receive the benefit of his bargain. Because a prosecutor's unfulfilled promise can render a plea involuntary, the second type of challenge may require the court to determine whether the plea was valid. The remedy for the second type of challenge may require either specific performance of the bargain or a remand so the defendant may withdraw his guilty plea and go to trial. Where defendant pleaded guilty in return for an agreement for "25 years IDOC" and a concurrent sentence of "six years IDOC," but the trial court failed to admonish him that a three-year term of mandatory supervised release would also be required, the addition of the three-year MSR period amounted to a "unilateral modification and breach of the plea agreement by the State, inconsistent with constitutional concerns of fundamental fairness." Where the defendant enters a guilty plea in return for a specified sentence and is not advised that an additional MSR term will be imposed, fundamental fairness requires that the total sentence not exceed that to which the defendant agreed. The court acknowledged that due process requires only substantial compliance with Supreme Court Rule 402, but held "there is no substantial compliance . . . when a defendant pleads guilty in exchange for a specific sentence and the trial court fails to advise the defendant, prior to accepting his plea, that a mandatory supervised release term will be added to that sentence."

People v. Flowers, 208 Ill.2d 291, 802 N.E.2d 1174 (2003) To appeal from a judgment based on a guilty plea the defendant must within 30 days file a written motion seeking either reconsideration of the sentence or withdrawal of the guilty plea. Although the failure to file an appropriate motion does not deprive the Appellate Court of jurisdiction, the merits of the appeal may not be considered unless the trial court failed to properly admonish the defendant of her appeal rights. Here, motions to reconsider sentence filed 16 months after sentencing, during post-conviction proceedings, occurred well after the trial court had lost jurisdiction to vacate the judgment or reconsider the sentence.

People v. Stroud, 208 Ill.2d 398, 804 N.E.2d 510 (2004) A guilty plea proceeding may be conducted by closed circuit television only if the defendant specifically consents to the procedure after being admonished by the trial judge of the right to be physically present. The court stated that unless the defendant has previously given written consent to having his guilty plea taken by closed circuit television, the trial court should begin such a plea proceeding by giving a specific admonishment about the right to be physically present.

People v. Fuller, 205 Ill.2d 308, 793 N.E.2d 526 (2002) A trial judge is not precluded from accepting a guilty plea because the defendant claims to be innocent, so long as the record

reflects a factual basis from which a jury could convict of the offenses to which the plea was entered.

People ex rel. Ryan v. Roe, 201 Ill.2d 552, 778 N.E.2d 701 (2002) A sentence which does not conform to a statutory requirement is void and may be corrected at any time. Neither the trial court nor the State is authorized to exempt from truth-in-sentencing an offense which the legislature has included in the truth-in-sentencing statute. Although plea bargaining plays an important role in the criminal justice system, neither the State nor the trial court may agree to an unauthorized sentence.

People v. Hopping, 60 Ill.2d 246, 326 N.E.2d 395 (1975) Not furnishing verbatim transcripts of misdemeanor guilty plea proceedings violates neither the State nor Federal Constitutions. See also, **People v. Barker**, 83 Ill.2d 319, 415 N.E.2d 404 (1980).

Illinois Appellate Court

People v. Ford, 2020 IL App (2d) 200252 A defendant may make a post-plea request for additional sentencing credit in a motion filed pursuant to Rule 472.

Here, defendant was arrested on Charge 1, and after spending time in jail, was indicted on Charge 2. After 172 days, he pled guilty to Charge 2, agreeing to a seven-year term with 172 days' credit for time spent in jail on Charge 2. He filed a post-plea motion under Rule 472, asking for credit for the time spend in jail in Charge 1, prior to his indictment for Charge 2. Defendant would be entitled to this credit pursuant to Section 5-4.5-100(c), because the conduct leading to Charge 2 occurred prior to his arrest. The State argued that he waived this credit when he negotiated a plea for 172 days' credit.

The Appellate Court held that the record was not clear as to whether defendant waived the credit. It is true that he negotiated for the 172 days he was entitled to for Charge 2, but that did not mean he also waived credit due for time spent in custody on Charge 1. In fact, defendant asked for the credit at the time of the plea, but the court told him he was not entitled to it. A hearing was required to determine whether defendant meant to waive that credit as part of the plea. If not, he should receive the credit.

People v. Hageman, 2020 IL App (3d) 170637 The court did not violate Rule 402(d) by sentencing defendant to term of imprisonment more than twice as long as had been presented in the partially-negotiated plea agreement. The plea agreement was conditioned on defendant's compliance with conditions of release pending sentencing, and it was undisputed that defendant violated one of those conditions. At the plea hearing, defendant had been thoroughly admonished that any violation would negate the sentencing agreement.

The aggregate sentence of 22 years of imprisonment was not an abuse of discretion where defendant violated the pre-sentencing release terms of the plea agreement and where the court heard evidence at the sentencing hearing which had not been available to it at the time of the plea.

People v. Sophanavong, 2018 IL App (3d) 170450 In order to waive preparation of a presentence investigation report as part of a fully negotiated guilty plea, the court must be informed of defendant's criminal history, including the sentences imposed on any prior convictions, prior to accepting the negotiated sentence. Where the court was told of defendant's prior convictions, but not the sentences that had been imposed, the proceedings failed to strictly comply with 730 ILCS 5/5-3-1. Defendant's sentence was vacated and the

matter was remanded for a new sentencing hearing, at which the trial court, upon being informed of defendant's prior dispositions, could either accept the agreed upon sentence or reject it and allow defendant to withdraw his plea. In reaching this conclusion, the Court declined to follow [People v. Haywood, 2016 IL App \(1st\) 133201](#), which concluded that defendant could not challenge his sentence on appeal because his negotiated guilty plea was still in effect.

[People v. Shaw, 2018 IL App \(1st\) 152994](#) A defendant who pled guilty may bring a freestanding claim of actual innocence in a post-conviction petition, without having to also challenge the knowing and voluntary nature of his plea. The burden to establish such a claim is higher than for an actual innocence claim brought after a trial, however. A guilty plea defendant who brings an actual innocence claim must present a "truly persuasive demonstration of innocence" with "compelling evidence" and must establish the traditional elements of an actual innocence claim by clear and convincing evidence. The clear-and-convincing standard is higher than the typical preponderance standard applied to post-trial actual innocence claims, but is lower than the reasonable-doubt standard.

A persuasive demonstration of innocence with compelling evidence may be satisfied by exculpatory scientific evidence, trustworthy eyewitness accounts, or critical physical evidence. Here, defendant presented an affidavit from an individual who said that the now-deceased victim admitted to him that she misidentified defendant and that she actually identified another man as the offender. The affidavit of a non-eyewitness about a conversation with the victim was not compelling evidence of innocence.

[People v. Wells, 2017 IL App \(1st\) 152758](#) A *nolle prosequi* is the formal entry by the State showing an unwillingness to prosecute a charge and leaving the matter in the same condition as it was before the prosecution began. Generally, a prosecution must be commenced within three years after the commission of a felony offense. [720 ILCS 5/3-5\(b\)](#). This period does not include any period when a prosecution is pending against a defendant for the same conduct. [720 ILCS 5/3-7\(c\)](#).

Defendant entered a negotiated guilty plea to one charge and in exchange the State nol-prossed the remaining charges. Several years later, defendant successfully withdrew his guilty plea and in response the State moved to reinstate the nol-prossed charges.

The Appellate Court held that based on the Illinois Supreme Court's decision in [Shinaul, 2017 IL 120162](#), the State could not reinstate the nol-prossed charges since they were barred by the statute of limitations. [Shinaul](#) held that the statute of limitations is not tolled where the State nol-prosses charges as part of a guilty plea.

Here, the State sought to reinstate charges that were originally nol-prossed as part of the guilty plea. But by the time defendant withdrew his plea the three-year limitations period on those charges had expired. The State was thus barred from reinstating the charges.

[People v. Gray, 2016 IL App \(2d\) 140002](#) In [United States v. Ruiz, 536 U.S. 622 \(2002\)](#), the Supreme Court held that the State was not required to disclose material impeachment evidence before entering a plea agreement with a defendant.

Here defendant entered a fully negotiated guilty plea. He later filed a post-conviction petition alleging that he agreed to plead guilty primarily because he feared a trier of fact would believe the State's three key witnesses. Later, he learned that all three witnesses had been indicted on criminal charges. Defendant contended that he could have used this information to impeach the witnesses at trial. The State, however, failed to disclose this evidence prior to his guilty plea.

The Appellate Court held that under **Ruiz**, the State had no obligation to disclose this potential impeachment evidence before defendant pled guilty. The evidence could have been used for impeachment only and was not otherwise exculpatory.

People v. Williams, 2016 IL App (1st) 133812 Generally it is left to the trial court's sound discretion whether to allow a defendant to withdraw his guilty plea. A trial court may set aside a guilty plea on its own motion without defendant's consent when it has good reason to doubt the truth of the plea.

Defendant pled guilty pursuant to a negotiated plea agreement with the State. The trial court accepted defendant's plea and sentenced him in accordance with the plea agreement. When asked if he had any questions, defendant complained about the length of his negotiated sentence, but never asked to withdraw his plea. He instead insisted on keeping the plea agreement no matter how unhappy he was with the sentence. The trial court recessed the case to give defendant time to think it over.

When the case was reconvened, the trial court directed the parties to proceed to trial without ever vacating the guilty plea. Following a bench trial, the court convicted defendant of more offenses and imposed a higher sentence.

The Appellate Court reinstated defendant's negotiated plea agreement. Defendant never asked to withdraw his plea and there was no formal decision by the trial court to vacate the plea. Instead, the trial court and the parties proceeded on the mistaken recollection that the guilty plea had not been taken. Moreover, no one ever called into question the truth of the plea, and thus the trial court had no basis for setting aside the plea on its own motion.

People v. Williams, 2016 IL App (4th) 140502 The court recommended that in order to eliminate the likelihood of post-conviction proceedings raising issues that are outside the record, trial courts "should go through a 'preflight checklist'" concerning the defendant's decision to reject a plea offer and go to trial. As part of such a "checklist," the court believed that the trial judge should:

a. Ensure that the prosecutor, defense attorney, and defendant all understand the applicable minimum and maximum sentences, including any sentencing enhancements, mandatory or discretionary consecutive sentencing options, and truth-in-sentencing considerations.

b. Inquire of the prosecution whether it entered negotiations with defense counsel, whether a guilty-plea offer was made, and the exact nature of the offer (including expiration dates, if any).

c. Confirm the plea offer with defense counsel and determine whether counsel conveyed that offer to the defendant.

d. Confirm personally with the defendant his understanding of the State's guilty-plea offer as conveyed by his counsel.

e. Ensure that the defendant understands that he or she has the right to decide whether to accept or reject the State's offer, after consultation with counsel.

f. Confirm the defendant's decision to reject the State's guilty plea offer.

g. Confirm that given his understanding of the minimum and maximum possible sentences, the defendant wishes to persist with his decision regarding the guilty-plea offer.

h. Admonish the defendant that although he or she should consider counsel's advice, it is up to the defendant whether to enter a guilty or not guilty plea and whether to have a jury or bench trial.

Where a post-conviction petitioner claims that trial counsel was ineffective in guilty plea negotiations, the **Strickland** standard applies. Thus, the petitioner must show that counsel's performance was deficient and that prejudice resulted. In the context of guilty plea negotiations, prejudice is shown where: (1) there is a reasonable probability that defendant would have accepted the plea offer absent counsel's deficient performance, and (2) the guilty plea offer would not have been withdrawn by the State or refused by the trial court.

Defendant's post-conviction petition alleged that he would have accepted the State's guilty-plea offer of an 18-year-sentence had defense counsel informed him that if he was convicted he could receive consecutive sentences and would be required to serve 85% of the sentence for first degree murder. The court concluded that the petition alleged a substantial constitutional violation and that the trial court therefore erred by entering a dismissal order at second-stage proceedings. The cause was remanded for third stage proceedings.

People v. Ware, 2014 IL App (1st) 120485 A defendant does not have an absolute right to have a guilty plea accepted by the trial court. A trial court may reject a plea in the exercise of sound judicial discretion. Here, the prosecutor informed the court, midtrial, that defendant "wants to plead to 21 years." The court said it would not accept that agreement and told the parties they could "negotiate something different."

The Appellate Court rejected defendant's argument that the trial court rejected the plea agreement on the sole basis that the trial had already begun. The record instead shows that the trial court was open to a plea agreement, but instead indicated that it would consider a different agreement and suggested further negotiations. Under these facts, no error occurred.

People v. Dodds, 2014 IL App (1st) 122268 The court accepted the State's concession that a defendant who has completed his probation sentence and is ineligible to file a post-conviction petition may raise an ineffective assistance of counsel argument by way of a §2-1401 petition. The court stressed that defendant had no other avenue to raise his claim that his plea was involuntary due to counsel's erroneous advice concerning the sex offender registration requirements that would result from a guilty plea to possession of child pornography.

Although sex offender registration is merely a collateral consequence of a guilty plea, it is a mandatory consequence which carries stigmatizing and far-reaching consequences into every aspect of the registrant's life. The court concluded that under the rationale of **Padilla v. Kentucky, 559 U.S. 356 (2010)**, which held that defense counsel must advise defendants of the possible risk of deportation resulting from a guilty plea, counsel has an affirmative duty to advise a guilty plea defendant concerning the possibility that he will be required to register as a sex offender.

Even before **Padilla**, giving erroneous advice concerning a collateral consequence of a plea was treated differently than the failure to give advice at all. Here, counsel erroneously advised defendant that his guilty plea to child pornography would result in a requirement that he register as a sex offender for 10 years. After that 10-year-period had passed, defendant learned that in fact he would be required to register for life.

Because defense counsel was ineffective in advising defendant of the sex offender registration consequences of his guilty plea, the plea was involuntary. The plea and conviction were vacated and the cause remanded for further proceedings. The court ordered that the additional proceedings be conducted by a different judge, and reminded the parties that retrial might be difficult in light of their inability to obtain a record of the original proceedings.

People v. Guzman, 2014 IL App (3d) 090464 725 ILCS 5/113-8 provides that before accepting a guilty plea, the trial court “shall” admonish the defendant that if he or she is not a U.S. citizen, the conviction may have consequences in terms of his or her immigration status. Under **People v. Delvillar**, 235 IL 2d 507, 922 N.E.2d 330 (2009) the failure to give the §113-8 admonishment concerns only a collateral consequence of a plea and does not raise questions concerning the voluntariness of the plea.

In **Delvillar**, the Illinois Supreme Court found that the failure to admonish under §113-8 requires reversal where real justice has been denied or the defendant has been prejudiced. A defendant shows prejudice by demonstrating that he was subjected to potential immigration penalties or that he would not have entered a guilty plea had he been admonished that a conviction might affect his immigration status.

Here, defendant failed to show that he was prejudiced by the absence of a §113-8 admonishment where his motion to withdraw his plea merely stated that he wanted to withdraw his plea, without asserting that he was subject to immigration penalties or that he would have pleaded not guilty had the admonishment been given. Under these circumstances, the trial court did not abuse its discretion by denying leave to withdraw the plea.

In a specially concurring opinion, Justice Holdridge acknowledged that under **Delvillar**, immigration concerns are collateral consequences of a guilty plea. However, Justice Holdridge believed that **Delvillar** did not survive the United States Supreme Court’s decision in **Padilla v. Kentucky**, 559 U.S. 356 (2010), which held that defense counsel must advise a guilty plea defendant of the risk of adverse immigration consequences resulting from a criminal conviction. Justice Holdridge also found that the trial court’s failure to give the §113-8 admonishment renders a guilty plea involuntary.

People v. Kayer, 2013 IL App (4th) 120028 A trial court lacks jurisdiction to convict a defendant based upon actions that do not constitute a criminal offense. A guilty plea must confess some punishable offense to form the basis of a sentence. The effect of a plea of guilty is a record admission of whatever is well alleged in the indictment. If the charge is insufficient, the plea confesses nothing.

Defendant pleaded guilty to a charge that he failed to register his employment change as a sex offender where he failed to report that he was no longer employed. The Sex Offender Registration Act requires sex offenders to report a change in the place of employment, but not a loss of employment. The Appellate Court vacated defendant’s conviction as void because his guilty plea was based on actions not constituting a criminal offense.

People v. Weiser, 2013 IL App (5th) 120055 A trial court does not obtain jurisdiction to sentence the defendant until it enters a judgment of conviction. The court must first adjudicate the defendant guilty.

The docket entry for defendant’s plea hearing merely stated that defendant pleaded guilty and set a sentencing hearing. But a transcript of the plea hearing showed that the court found a factual basis for the plea and accepted the plea only after finding that defendant understood both the charges against her and the rights she was giving up by pleading guilty. These findings constitute an adjudication of guilt that authorized the court to impose sentence.

People v. Young, 2013 IL App (1st) 111733 In 2004, defendant entered fully negotiated guilty pleas to first degree murder and attempt murder and received negotiated consecutive sentences of 25 and 10 years. In 2011, defendant's post-conviction petition alleging ineffective assistance of trial counsel was denied after a third-stage hearing. On appeal, defendant argued for the first time that his sentences were void because they did not include the mandatory statutory firearm enhancement of 20 years for personally discharging a firearm or 25 years to natural life if great bodily harm resulted from discharging a firearm. Defendant argued that he should be allowed to withdraw his plea and plead anew.

Defendant was estopped from challenging the sentence because it had been freely negotiated and provided him with a benefit in that he received a far lower sentence than was required under the law. The State would be disadvantaged at a trial by the passage of time and the possible unavailability of witnesses to testify.

The doctrine of judicial estoppel applies where a party takes inconsistent positions in separate judicial or quasi-judicial proceedings, intended that the trier of fact accept the truth of the facts alleged at the prior hearing, and succeeded in asserting the first position and consequently receiving some benefit. The court acknowledged that Illinois courts have never applied judicial estoppel where criminal defendants entered a fully negotiated plea agreement and then challenged the sentence as too lenient. However, courts from other jurisdictions have recognized that the State is prejudiced under similar circumstances where a guilty plea is vacated years after it was entered, and have estopped defendants from enjoying the benefits of a negotiated plea agreement while challenging its validity.

Here, defendant voluntarily entered a plea calling for negotiated sentences totaling 35 years, and nearly ten years later claimed that the sentences should have been at least 76 years. The court concluded that the doctrine of judicial estoppel applied because the State could not be restored to its original position in that witnesses may have become unavailable for trial. The court also noted that defendant did not allege that any fraud or misrepresentation had occurred in the original plea agreement.

The court concluded:

Defendant has not cited, nor has our research disclosed an Illinois case in which a defendant has been permitted to withdraw his plea entered nearly a decade earlier and some 13 years after the offenses occurred, because the sentence was not harsh enough. It defies logic to suggest that defendant actually wants to serve a longer prison sentence than the improper sentence he received. . . . Rather, defendant . . . is using the improper sentence as a vehicle to withdraw his guilty plea, 10 years after its entry, and go to trial. Defendant's belated challenge could harm the State because it might endure hardship if forced to prosecute the case, given the passage of time and the recollection of witnesses.

The order denying the post-conviction petition was affirmed.

People v. Andrews, 403 Ill.App.3d 654, 936 N.E.2d 648 (4th Dist. 2010) The Appellate Court finds the dispositive holding of **People v. Whitfield**, 217 Ill.2d 177, 840 N.E.2d 658 (2005), to be that the trial court must inform the defendant that the MSR term will be added to his negotiated sentence, not that the MSR term is part of the negotiated sentence. The defendant prevailed in **Whitfield** only because the court made no reference at all to the MSR term, not because the court failed to inform defendant that the MSR term was part of his negotiated sentence. The statutorily-mandated MSR term cannot be part of a plea negotiation

because there is nothing to negotiate. The MSR admonition is not required by Supreme Court Rule 402(b), which directs that the terms of the plea agreement be stated in open court, but by 402(a)(2), which directs the court to advise defendant of the minimum and maximum penalties prescribed by law. **People v. Morris**, 236 Ill.2d 345, 925 N.E.2d 1069 (2010), does not change this analysis, even though **Morris** also makes reference to defendant's plea agreement.

Applying this analysis, the Appellate Court found no due process violation. The prosecutor accurately stated the plea agreement without reference to the MSR term. The court mentioned as part of its 402(a)(2) admonition that if defendant was convicted and sentenced to prison, there would be a one-year MSR term.

People v. Davis, 403 Ill.App.3d 461, 934 N.E.2d 550 (1st Dist. 2010) Noting a conflict in appellate authority, the Appellate Court held that **People v. Whitfield** was not violated where the trial court admonished defendant at the plea hearing that he would be required to serve a term of mandatory supervised release, but failed to mention MSR at sentencing. (Affirming **People v. Marshall**, 381 Ill.App.3d 724, 886 N.E.2d 1106 (1st Dist. 2008)). Under **Whitfield**, a "constitutional violation occurs only when there is absolutely no mention to a defendant, before he actually pleads guilty, that he must serve an MSR term in addition to the agreed-upon sentence that he will receive in exchange for his plea of guilty."

Because defendant knew before he entered the guilty plea that he would be sentenced to the penitentiary, and was told during the plea hearing that persons sentenced to the penitentiary must serve MSR, he was placed on notice that he would have to serve an MSR term in addition to the penitentiary sentence. The court acknowledged, however, that "[t]he better practice would incorporate the mandatory supervised release admonition when the specific sentencing is announced," and that "the written sentencing judgment should also include the term of mandatory supervised release."

People v. Clark, 386 Ill.App.3d 673, 899 N.E.2d 342 (3d Dist. 2008) Due process requires that guilty pleas be knowing and voluntary. A guilty plea made in reliance on the advice of an ineffective attorney may be involuntary. Defendant's post-conviction petition raised the gist of an ineffective assistance claim where defendant stated that he pleaded guilty because defense counsel erroneously said that defendant's outstanding arrest warrants had been quashed, making him eligible for an impact incarceration program which would have reduced his prison term from eight years to no more than 180 days.

People v. Bannister, 378 Ill.App.3d 19, 880 N.E.2d 607 (1st Dist. 2007) The court held that defendant was not denied due process or a fair trial because a plea agreement between the prosecution and a co-defendant required the co-defendant to testify consistently with his prior statements. Agreements requiring a witness to testify consistently with prior statements are permissible if accompanied by a requirement that the testimony be truthful. Here, the plea agreement "repeatedly and explicitly obligated the [co-defendant] to testify truthfully," and provided that the agreement would be void if any of the representations contained in the prior statements were discovered to have been false.

People v. Shanklin, 351 Ill.App.3d 303, 814 N.E.2d 139 (4th Dist. 2004) A *pro se* post-conviction petition alleged the gist of two constitutional issues: (1) that defendant was unfit or incompetent when he entered his guilty plea, and (2) that defendant received ineffective assistance of counsel when trial counsel failed to alert the trial court of defendant's mental deficiencies. The court vacated the plea and stated that "When confronted by a defendant

who may be mentally retarded, the trial court and both the prosecution and the defense may not simply rely on affirmative answers to rote questions to conclude the defendant understands the proceedings and consequences of his plea. We do not suggest a mentally retarded defendant is always unfit or can never plead guilty. While many mentally retarded persons accused of crime are competent, we also know the mentally retarded have diminished capacity to understand and process information. It is not idle speculation to consider whether defendant may have answered questions from the court in a way that would avoid exposing his intellectual deficit."

People v. Church, 334 Ill.App.3d 607, 778 N.E.2d 251 (3d Dist. 2002) The trial judge has authority to grant an extension of the thirty-day period in which a defendant convicted by a guilty plea may move to reconsider the sentence or withdraw the plea. See also, **People v. Wyatt**, 305 Ill.App.3d 291, 712 N.E.2d 343 (2d Dist.1999).

People v. Peterson, 311 Ill.App.3d 38, 725 N.E.2d 1 (1st Dist. 1999) A trial judge has discretion whether to accept a guilty plea, and a defendant has no right to have a plea accepted. The trial court may refuse to accept a guilty plea where the defendant insists that he is innocent. The trial court did not abuse its discretion by refusing to accept a negotiated guilty plea where the defendant insisted three times that he had been "wrongly accused" and said he was pleading guilty because he was in ill health and needed medical treatment.

People v. Thomas, 246 Ill.App.3d 708, 616 N.E.2d 695 (2d Dist. 1993) The trial court did not err by refusing to accept a guilty plea where the defendant claimed he had no recollection of the offense. A criminal defendant does not have a right to have a plea accepted. A trial court may accept a plea even where the defendant cannot recall the offense, but is not required to do so.

People v. Wilkes, 232 Ill.App.3d 669, 597 N.E.2d 945 (5th Dist. 1992) The defendant's negotiated plea required him to pay court costs and fines within one week, after which he was to begin serving a three-year prison term. The agreement provided that if these obligations were not paid on time, the court could vacate the plea agreement and resentence defendant as if there had been an open plea. Defendant did not make payment within one week. The trial court stated that defendant had failed to carry out his part of the agreement and imposed a seven-year-sentence. The Court remanded the cause for the trial court to determine whether the failure to make timely payment was wilful. Although a trial judge usually need not determine whether a plea agreement violation was wilful, vacating a plea agreement is sufficiently analogous to revocation of probation that the same requirements should be followed.

§24-2

Waiver of Counsel

United States Supreme Court

Iowa v. Tovar, 541 U.S. 77, 124 S.Ct. 1379, 158 L.Ed.2d 209 (2004) A criminal defendant who faces the possibility of incarceration has the right to the assistance of counsel at all critical stages of the criminal process. Because a guilty plea hearing is a "critical stage," a defendant who received a sentence of two days incarceration for DUI was entitled to counsel at the plea hearing.

Illinois Appellate Court

People v. Dyas, 2023 IL App (3d) 220112 The appellate court concluded that Rule 401(a) admonishments are required for there to be a valid waiver of counsel even after a defendant is sentenced following a guilty plea, thereby disagreeing with **People v. Young**, 341 Ill. App. 3d 379 (4th Dist. 2003). The language in the rule, requiring that admonishments be given to one “accused” of an offense does not limit its application to the pre-trial or pre-plea context. Admonishments after the fact are equally important given that, if a defendant is successful in seeking to withdraw his plea or overturn a verdict, he could again become an “accused” facing any statutorily-available sentence. Accordingly, it is important the defendant be advised of the nature of the charges he is facing and the minimum and maximum available sentence before he chooses to waive counsel at any stage of the proceedings.

Here, the circuit court failed to substantially comply with Rule 401(a) where it provided absolutely no admonishments at the time the court discharged the public defender and permitted defendant to proceed *pro se* on his motion to withdraw guilty plea. An admonishment as to the maximum sentence, given more than six months prior, was insufficient to satisfy the substantial-compliance standard. Thus, the denial of defendant’s motion to withdraw guilty plea was vacated, and the matter was remanded for new post-plea proceedings.

People v. Hinton, 362 Ill.App.3d 229, 839 N.E.2d 124 (3d Dist. 2005) A trial court is required to determine whether a defendant who files a motion to withdraw his guilty plea is indigent and desires counsel. In addition, the trial court must admonish an indigent who pleads guilty that counsel will be appointed to assist in preparing post-plea motions. Under **People v. Ledbetter**, 174 Ill.App.3d 234, 528 N.E.2d 375 (4th Dist. 1988), the trial judge is obligated to appoint counsel in post-plea proceedings even in the absence of a specific request from an indigent defendant, unless there is a valid waiver of the right to counsel. Where the defendant waived counsel for plea proceedings, but was properly admonished after his plea that counsel would be appointed for a post-plea motion, the trial court erred by failing to appoint counsel once a post-plea motion was filed. The counsel waiver from trial did not apply to post-plea proceedings.

People v. Nikonowicz, 127 Ill.App.3d 738, 469 N.E.2d 625 (5th Dist. 1984) The record failed to show a valid waiver of counsel. There was no verbatim transcript of the proceeding, the common law record contained only a rubber-stamped notation that defendant was advised of his rights and the defendant specifically contended that he had not been informed of his right to counsel. See also, **People v. Melvin**, 28 Ill.App.3d 1090, 329 N.E.2d 890 (5th Dist. 1975) (waiver invalid where defendant was advised that he had the right to counsel, but not that an attorney would be furnished at no cost if defendant was indigent)

People v. Burke, 29 Ill.App.3d 12, 330 N.E.2d 147 (5th Dist. 1975) Plea of guilty vacated because the trial judge’s admonishments concerning the right to counsel were insufficient. The defendant may have understood that the right to counsel applied only if he went to trial, and it was not made clear that he was entitled to appointed counsel if he was indigent.

People v. Barker, 15 Ill.App.3d 104, 303 N.E.2d 504 (5th Dist. 1973) Guilty plea reversed because the record showed that defendant’s waiver of counsel was a condition of the plea.

§24-3 Plea Bargaining

United States Supreme Court

Lafler v. Cooper, 566 U.S. 156, 132 S. Ct. 1376, 182 L.Ed.2d 398 (2012) The Sixth Amendment right to counsel extends to the plea-bargaining process. The performance prong of **Strickland v. Washington**, 466 U.S. 668 (1984), requires a defendant to show that counsel's representation fell below an objective standard of reasonableness. To establish **Strickland** prejudice in the context of a plea, defendant must show that the outcome of the plea process would have been different with competent advice.

When the ineffective advice leads to the rejection of a plea offer, defendant must show that but for the ineffective advice of counsel, there is a reasonable probability that the plea offer would have been presented to the court (*i.e.*, that the defendant would have accepted the plea and the prosecution would not have withdrawn it in light of intervening circumstances), that the court would have accepted its terms, and that the conviction or sentence, or both, under the offer's terms would have been less severe than under the judgment and sentence that in fact were imposed.

The Sixth Amendment requires effective assistance at critical stages of a criminal proceeding, not just at trial. There is no rigid rule that an otherwise fair trial remedies errors not occurring at the trial itself; instead, the inquiry is whether the trial cured the particular error at issue. Even if a trial is free from error, a defendant who goes to trial instead of taking a more favorable plea may be prejudiced from a conviction on more serious counts or imposition of a more severe sentence.

There is no requirement that defendant show that ineffective assistance of counsel led to his being denied a substantive or procedural right in addition to **Strickland** prejudice. **Lockhart v. Fretell**, 506 U.S. 364 (1993), and **Nix v. Whiteside**, 475 U.S. 157 (1986), merely hold that legitimate prejudice does not exist where defendant would receive a windfall as a result of the application of an incorrect legal principle or an illegitimate defense strategy.

Any remedy for a Sixth-Amendment violation must neutralize the taint of the violation while at the same time not grant a windfall to the defendant or needlessly squander the considerable resources the State invested in the prosecution. If defendant can demonstrate a reasonable probability that but for counsel's errors he would have accepted the plea, "the court may exercise discretion in determining whether the defendant should receive the term of imprisonment the government offered in the plea, the sentence he received at trial, or something in between."

Resentencing may not suffice if the offer was for a plea to counts less serious than that for which defendant was convicted, or if a mandatory sentence confines a court's discretion after trial. "In these circumstances, the proper exercise of discretion to remedy the constitutional injury may be to require the prosecution to reoffer the plea proposal." The court "can then exercise discretion in deciding whether to vacate the conviction from trial and accept the plea or leave the conviction undisturbed."

Missouri v. Frye, 566 U.S. 134, 132 S. Ct. 1399, 182 L.Ed.2d 379 (2012) The Sixth Amendment guarantees the right to the assistance of counsel at all critical stages of the criminal process, including arraignment, post-indictment interrogations, post-indictment lineups, and entering a guilty plea. Because plea bargaining is central to the administration of the criminal justice system and more than 90% of all cases are resolved through bargaining, "the negotiation of a plea bargain . . . is almost always the critical point for a

defendant.” Thus, “defense counsel have responsibilities in the plea bargain process . . . which must be met to render the adequate assistance of counsel that the Sixth Amendment requires.”

The court acknowledged that it is difficult to define the scope of defense counsel’s duties concerning plea bargaining. It was unnecessary to resolve that issue here, however, where defense counsel failed to advise defendant of two plea offers, one of which would have allowed him to plead to a lesser charge and receive a lower sentence than was ultimately imposed on his open plea to the original charge. “[A]s a general rule, defense counsel has a duty to communicate formal offers from the prosecution to accept a plea on terms and conditions that may be favorable to the accused.”

Because counsel failed to communicate a more favorable plea offer until after it had expired, his representation was objectively unreasonable under the first prong of **Strickland**. The court added that to prevent frivolous or fabricated claims that more advantageous plea offers were made but not communicated to defendants, the prosecution and trial courts may adopt measures such as requiring that plea offers be in writing, that the negotiation process be documented, and that formal offers be made part of the record in order to ensure that the defendant has been adequately advised.

To establish prejudice under the second prong of **Strickland**, a defendant who claims that a plea offer lapsed or was rejected because of counsel’s deficient performance must demonstrate a reasonable probability that: (1) had counsel been effective, defendant would have accepted a plea offer which would have resulted in a more favorable outcome, and (2) the plea would have been entered without the prosecution cancelling the offer or the trial court refusing to accept the plea. Where defense counsel did not inform defendant of two plea offers before they expired, one of the plea offers would have allowed defendant to plead to a misdemeanor and serve a 90-day sentence, and defendant subsequently entered an open plea to the original felony charge and received a three-year sentence, defendant made an adequate showing that he would have accepted the plea offer had he been made aware of it. The state court erred, however, by failing to require defendant to show that the prosecution would have gone through with the plea and the judge would have accepted it. Because these questions are matters of state law, the court remanded the cause to Missouri courts to determine whether: (1) either the prosecution or trial court is authorized under Missouri law to refuse to accept a defendant’s attempt to accept a plea offer, and (2) there is a reasonable probability the prosecutor and judge would have adhered to the offer in this case.

Ricketts v. Adamson, 482 U.S. 1, 107 S.Ct. 2860, 97 L.Ed.2d 1 (1987) A plea agreement called for the defendant to plead guilty to second degree murder and to testify against his codefendants and for the State to dismiss a first degree murder charge. When the defendant subsequently refused to testify as promised, he breached the plea agreement and the State could properly prosecute him for the dismissed first degree murder offense. See also, **People v. Goodwin**, 148 Ill. App.3d 56, 499 N.E.2d 119 (4th Dist. 1986).

Bordenkircher v. Hayes, 434 U.S. 357, 98 S.Ct. 663, 54 L.Ed.2d 604 (1978) The prosecutor offered to recommend a five-year sentence if defendant would plead guilty, but threatened to seek an indictment designating defendant as a habitual criminal, which required a mandatory life sentence, if defendant refused to plead guilty. Defendant refused to plead, the prosecutor obtained the habitual criminal indictment and defendant was convicted and sentenced to life imprisonment. The Court held that defendant was not denied due process. The State did not punish defendant for doing what he was legally entitled to do; instead, in the "give and take" of plea bargaining the prosecutor openly presented to the defendant the

alternatives he faced concerning the charges for which he was subject to prosecution. See also, [Corbitt v. New Jersey](#), 439 U.S. 212, 99 S.Ct. 492, 58 L.Ed.2d 466 (1978) where the court held that the State may seek a guilty plea by offering substantial benefits in return for the plea.

Illinois Supreme Court

[People v. Wells](#), 2024 IL 129402 Defendant entered a negotiated guilty plea in exchange for a six-year sentence, payment of a street value fine, and the dismissal of additional charges. At the plea hearing, the court stated that defendant would receive 54 days of credit for time spent in presentence custody. Subsequently, defendant filed a motion seeking additional credit for the time he spent on home detention after posting bond, citing 730 ILCS 5/5-4.5-100(b). The circuit court denied that motion, stating that defendant was given the correct credit, and defendant appealed.

The supreme court held that defendant’s negotiated plea, which included the specific term that he would receive 54 days of credit, was a “complete and final expression” of the agreement he had reached with the State. The court acknowledged that defendant did not make a specific waiver of the home detention credit, and it was not clear whether the parties were even aware of that potential credit at the time of sentencing. On the face of the negotiated agreement itself, however, there was no ambiguity as to what the parties intended – a six year sentence with 54 days of credit.

Defendant could not now rely on “mutual mistake” to obtain the additional credit on the theory that it was simply an oversight. Where the State objected to the belated request, and nothing in the record suggested any agreement otherwise, there was no basis on which to find a mutual mistake here. And, to the extent there was an “uninduced mistake” on defendant’s part, his recourse was to seek withdrawal of his plea on the ground that it was unknowing and involuntary, a remedy he did not request.

[People v. Eubanks](#), 2021 IL 126271 Under [Illinois Supreme Court Rule 402\(f\)](#), if a guilty plea is withdrawn, “neither the plea discussion nor any resulting agreement, plea, or judgment shall be admissible against defendant in any criminal proceeding.” Here, the Illinois Supreme Court affirmed that defendant’s confession was not a part of the “plea discussion” and therefore was properly admitted at defendant’s trial after he withdrew his guilty plea.

Defendant had agreed to plead guilty to murder in exchange for a 35-year sentence. The agreement required him to provide a statement detailing his involvement in the offense. Detectives interviewed defendant, elicited his confession, then left the room to ask the State’s attorney whether the statement was satisfactory. The State’s attorney accepted the statement, and defendant ultimately pled guilty.

Defendant successfully moved to withdraw the plea, after being admonished that the confession could be used against him at trial. Defendant was found guilty after trial and received a 50-year sentence. He filed a post-conviction petition, arguing the admission of his confession at trial violated [Rule 402\(f\)](#). The circuit court denied the petition after an evidentiary hearing. A majority of the Appellate Court affirmed, and the Supreme Court agreed. The court held that the confession was not a part of plea discussions because it was made after the plea agreement had been reached. It rejected defendant’s argument that the agreement was not final until the prosecutor deemed the confession satisfactory, noting that the circuit court’s conclusion otherwise, based in part on defense counsel’s testimony that the confession would not have occurred “but for the plea agreement,” was entitled to deference.

The court also rejected defendant's argument that policy considerations militate against admission of any statement made prior to a guilty plea. The court saw no reason to believe that admission of such statements would reduce the likelihood of plea agreements, because a defendant will confess only when intent on taking advantage of a favorable plea deal.

People v. Brown, 2017 IL 121681 The Sixth Amendment guarantees a criminal defendant the right to effective assistance of counsel at all critical stages of the criminal proceeding, including at a guilty plea proceeding. A claim that a guilty plea defendant was denied the effective assistance of counsel is governed by the **Strickland** test, which requires the defendant to establish that counsel's performance fell below an objective standard of reasonableness and caused prejudice.

To satisfy the prejudice requirement of **Strickland**, a guilty plea defendant must show a reasonable probability that, but for counsel's errors, he would have pleaded not guilty and insisted on going to trial. Where an ineffective assistance claim involves a matter of strategy related to the chances for acquittal, defendant is required to show that he would have been acquitted or would have had a viable defense at trial. Where the claim is related to defendant's understanding of the consequences of pleading guilty, however, the prejudice prong is satisfied where defendant shows that had counsel informed him of the consequences of a guilty plea, it would have been a rational decision to reject the plea bargain and go to trial.

Here, defendant could not show that it would have been rational for him to reject the plea bargain and go to trial. Defendant pleaded guilty to the Class X felony of being an armed habitual criminal, in return for an 18-year sentence and dismissal of a home invasion charge which would have carried a mandatory 15-year enhancement. The court concluded that given defendant's significant criminal history, if he had been convicted after a trial his sentences would have been toward the higher end of the authorized sentencing range. Under these circumstances, it would not have been rational to reject the plea bargain providing a lower sentence even had his trial counsel correctly informed him that his armed habitual criminal conviction was subject to an 85% good time requirement. Because defendant could not show that it would have been rational to reject the plea bargain, he failed to make an adequate showing of prejudice.

People v. Hale, 2013 IL 113140 The Sixth Amendment right to the effective assistance of counsel applies to the plea bargaining process. Thus, a defendant has the right to be reasonably informed about the direct consequences of accepting or rejecting a plea offer, even if he rejects the offer and ultimately receives a fair trial.

Defendant was unable to establish that defense counsel's faulty advice constituted ineffective assistance where he was unable to show that he would have accepted the State's plea offer had counsel accurately advised him that consecutive sentencing was mandatory.

People v. Bannister, 236 Ill.2d 1, 923 N.E.2d 244 (2009) The credibility of a witness (a co-defendant) was not undermined to the extent that a fair trial was denied, although the witness's plea agreement with the State provided that in return for truthfully testifying against the defendant, two first degree murder convictions would be vacated so the witness could plead guilty to one first degree murder and be resentenced to 60 years in a medium security institution. Although the witness was required to testify consistently with his prior statements, the agreement specifically provided that it would be "null and void" if the co-

defendant's representations concerning the defendant were found to be false. It is not unreasonable to plea bargain for specific trial testimony that is consistent with information which the witness represents to be factually true, even if the benefit of the bargain is withheld until the witness has testified, so long as the "overriding requirement" of a plea agreement is that the testimony be truthful.

Defendant did not have standing to challenge the validity of a plea agreement between the State and its witness. Absent due process concerns, the validity of a plea agreement is governed by contract law. Under contract law, there is a strong presumption that the agreement benefits only the parties who made it, and not a third party. Overcoming this presumption requires evidence manifesting an affirmative intent to benefit a third party.

Because the defendant was not an intended beneficiary of the plea agreement between the State and the co-defendant, he lacked standing to argue that the agreement was invalid.

People v. Jones, 219 Ill.2d 1, 845 N.E.2d 598 (2006) Plea discussions are inadmissible in criminal proceedings. To show that statements are plea-related, the defendant must show that: (1) he had a subjective expectation to negotiate a plea, and (2) such an expectation was reasonable under the totality of the circumstances. Whether a statement is plea-related is a fact-specific question. Offers to negotiate are not plea-related if the rudiments of the negotiation process are absent. Here, the defendant disclosed no information about the crime, did not confess, and was attempting to exonerate himself rather than seek leniency, and the circumstances indicate that defendant "was simply not plea bargaining."

People v. Hart, 214 Ill.2d 490, 830 N.E.2d 527 (2005) The purpose of Supreme Court Rule 402(f) is to encourage a negotiated disposition of criminal cases by eliminating any risk that the jury will hear statements or admissions made during plea negotiations. A two-part test is utilized to determine whether a particular statement is plea-related. First the court must decide whether the defendant exhibited a subjective expectation to negotiate. Second, the court must determine whether that expectation was reasonable under the circumstances. Before a discussion can be characterized as plea-related, it must contain the "rudiments of the negotiation process, i.e., a willingness by defendant to enter a plea of guilty in return for concessions by the State." Rule 402(f) was not intended to exclude a defendant's offer to cooperate with police where such an offer is not accompanied by the "rudiments of the negotiation process." Mere "offers to cooperate, without more, do not constitute plea negotiations or offers to enter into plea negotiations. The court concluded that the rudiments of the negotiation process were not present here; defendant expressed a possible willingness to cooperate with a detective, but did not ask what concessions the prosecutor might make, ask the detective to contact the State's Attorney's office, or suggest that he was willing to plead guilty or even discuss pleading guilty.

People v. Curry, 178 Ill.2d 509, 687 N.E.2d 877 (1997) An attorney's failure to disclose a plea offer may give rise to a constitutional violation, even if the defendant subsequently receives a fair trial. In addition, the right to effective assistance of counsel extends to the right to reject a plea offer. Here, defendant was denied the effective assistance of counsel where, in advising defendant to reject an offer to dismiss two counts in exchange for a plea to one, counsel was unaware that consecutive sentences were mandatory upon conviction.

People v. Palmer, 162 Ill.2d 465, 643 N.E.2d 797 (1994) Defendant pleaded guilty to first degree murder and a death sentence was imposed. Defendant asserted that his plea was involuntary because trial counsel had advised him to enter a "blind plea," without first

attempting to negotiate a plea agreement for a non-death sentence. The Court held that an attorney's duty to engage in plea negotiations depends upon the circumstances of each case. Not pursuing plea negotiations under some circumstances may constitute ineffective assistance of counsel, but in other situations may be an acceptable strategic decision. Here, trial counsel advised an open plea because he felt defendant would receive a non-death sentence if he cooperated. Thus, the decision not to pursue plea negotiations was a matter of defense strategy.

People v. McCutcheon, 68 Ill.2d 101, 368 N.E.2d 886 (1977) Where the defendant pleads guilty to a lesser offense and the greater offense was nol-prossed, the State could properly prosecute the greater offense after defendant had the plea vacated. See also, **People v. McGrath**, 182 Ill.App.3d 389, 538 N.E.2d 855 (2d Dist. 1989) (before granting a motion to withdraw a guilty plea, the judge is required under Rule 605(b)(4) to advise the defendant that any charges dismissed as part of the plea agreement will be reinstated by the State).

Illinois Appellate Court

People v. Bruce, 2022 IL App (1st) 210811 The sentencing court abused its discretion when, on a remand for resentencing pursuant to **Miller v. Alabama**, it rejected the parties' agreement to a reduction from natural life to 23 years' imprisonment, and instead imposed a 28-year term.

Defendant was convicted for a double-murder committed at age 16. He was found guilty on a theory of accountability, having pushed the gunman to the scene in a wheelchair at the behest of a 25-year-old. Defendant left the scene prior to any shooting. He had significant cognitive impairments, including a 76 IQ. At the resentencing hearing, the defense presented substantial evidence of mitigation and rehabilitation, including the fact that defendant had become a model inmate.

Although a dissent would have affirmed because defendant took part in a murder that had been planned days in advance, the majority did not view the offense as fully thought out. The 25-year-old made a single comment about killing one of the victims, and defendant's role wasn't conceived until the moment he was ordered to push the wheelchair. Defendant never touched the weapon and wasn't there for the shooting, two facts the resentencing judge failed to consider. The trial court also abused its discretion when it refused to consider defendant's explicit apology as evidence of remorse.

When reviewing a trial court's rejection of a plea agreement, the question is not what the trial court would have done were it the prosecuting attorney, but whether the decision of the prosecuting attorney is such a departure from sound prosecutorial principle as to make it an abuse of prosecutorial discretion. The 23-year sentence in this case was not an abuse of prosecutorial discretion where it was supported by defendant's limited role in the offense and the substantial mitigating evidence presented at resentencing.

People v. Eubanks, 2020 IL App (3d) 180117 Defendant entered into a plea agreement with the State which required that he provide a truthful statement and testify against his codefendants. He provided a videotaped statement and pled guilty, but ultimately withdrew the plea. Defendant sought to suppress his statement under the fifth and fourteenth amendments. His motion was denied and the matter proceeded to a stipulated bench trial at which defendant was convicted. On direct appeal, defendant argued that his statement was made during plea negotiations and was therefore inadmissible. The Appellate Court could

not determine whether the statement was made pursuant to plea negotiations and recommended that defendant raise the issue in a post-conviction petition.

In post-conviction proceedings, defendant asserted ineffective assistance of trial counsel for failing to move to suppress his statement under Rule 402(f), which provides that if a plea is withdrawn, plea discussions and the resulting agreement are not admissible against defendant. Defendant argued that his video statement was part of the plea discussions within the meaning of Rule 402(f). Following an evidentiary hearing, defendant's petition was denied, and the Appellate Court affirmed.

The Appellate Court held that defendant's video statement was given as a result of the plea agreement, but it was not made during plea discussions. Therefore, Rule 402(f) did not apply to exclude defendant's statement. The statement was not a condition precedent to the plea agreement; had defendant not provided a truthful statement, he simply would have been in breach of the agreement.

The dissenting justice would have barred use of the statement on the basis that Rule 402(f) does not distinguish between statements made during plea negotiations and statements offered pursuant to such negotiations.

People v. Hudson, 2017 IL App (3d) 160225 Defendant was charged with offenses that in combination with his prior convictions would have made him subject to mandatory life imprisonment. Trial counsel erroneously told defendant that he was only subject to a maximum term of 60 years imprisonment and that he would most likely get a sentence of 44 years if convicted. Prior to trial, the State offered a plea deal of 20 years imprisonment. While the jury was deliberating, the State offered defendant 16 years. Defendant rejected both offers. The jury convicted defendant and the court sentenced him to life imprisonment.

The federal district court eventually granted defendant's habeas petition finding that his trial counsel had been ineffective for failing to advise defendant of the mandatory life sentence. The court ordered the State to re-offer defendant a 20-year plea deal. If defendant accepted the deal, the trial court could exercise its discretion to decide whether to resentence defendant according to the plea agreement.

In State court, the prosecutor re-offered the 20-year plea deal and defendant accepted the offer. The trial court rejected the deal stating that it would not have accepted it at the time defendant was initially tried. The court reimposed a life sentence.

The trial court abused its discretion in rejecting the plea agreement. The first plea offer of 20 years best placed the parties in the same situation they were in at the beginning of the plea process. Although the trial court had discretion to reject the details of the plea, such discretion was limited by the need to neutralize the taint of the constitutional violation, making the reimposition of a life sentence impermissible.

The case was remanded to the trial court to accept the plea agreement.

People v. Williams, 2016 IL App (4th) 140502 The court recommended that in order to eliminate the likelihood of post-conviction proceedings raising issues that are outside the record, trial courts "should go through a 'preflight checklist'" concerning the defendant's decision to reject a plea offer and go to trial. As part of such a "checklist," the court believed that the trial judge should:

a. Ensure that the prosecutor, defense attorney, and defendant all understand the applicable minimum and maximum sentences, including any sentencing enhancements, mandatory or discretionary consecutive sentencing options, and truth-in-sentencing considerations.

b. Inquire of the prosecution whether it entered negotiations with defense counsel, whether a guilty-plea offer was made, and the exact nature of the offer (including expiration dates, if any).

c. Confirm the plea offer with defense counsel and determine whether counsel conveyed that offer to the defendant.

d. Confirm personally with the defendant his understanding of the State's guilty-plea offer as conveyed by his counsel.

e. Ensure that the defendant understands that he or she has the right to decide whether to accept or reject the State's offer, after consultation with counsel.

f. Confirm the defendant's decision to reject the State's guilty plea offer.

g. Confirm that given his understanding of the minimum and maximum possible sentences, the defendant wishes to persist with his decision regarding the guilty-plea offer.

h. Admonish the defendant that although he or she should consider counsel's advice, it is up to the defendant whether to enter a guilty or not guilty plea and whether to have a jury or bench trial.

Where a post-conviction petitioner claims that trial counsel was ineffective in guilty plea negotiations, the **Strickland** standard applies. Thus, the petitioner must show that counsel's performance was deficient and that prejudice resulted. In the context of guilty plea negotiations, prejudice is shown where: (1) there is a reasonable probability that defendant would have accepted the plea offer absent counsel's deficient performance, and (2) the guilty plea offer would not have been withdrawn by the State or refused by the trial court.

Defendant's post-conviction petition alleged that he would have accepted the State's guilty-plea offer of an 18-year-sentence had defense counsel informed him that if he was convicted he could receive consecutive sentences and would be required to serve 85% of the sentence for first degree murder. The court concluded that the petition alleged a substantial constitutional violation and that the trial court therefore erred by entering a dismissal order at second-stage proceedings. The cause was remanded for third stage proceedings.

People v. Neese, 2015 IL App (2d) 140368 Under Supreme Court Rule 402(f), if a plea discussion does not result in a guilty plea then any such discussion is not admissible against the defendant. But not all statements made by a defendant hoping to obtain a concession constitute plea discussions. Any person who voluntarily speaks to the police probably hopes to benefit, and Rule 402(f) was not designed to discourage legitimate interrogation. Rule 402(f) thus does not exclude mere offers to cooperate with the police unless such offers are accompanied by the rudiments of the plea-negotiation process.

Courts employ a two-part test for deciding whether particular statements are part of plea discussions: (1) whether the defendant had a subjective expectation to negotiate a plea, and (2) whether his expectation, assuming it existed, was objectively reasonable.

Here, an officer called defendant about the theft of coins from an apartment building. Defendant stated that he wanted to speak in person to the officer and the complainant. The officer told defendant that if he came to the station and gave a full written confession, he would consider, but not guarantee, charging him with a misdemeanor. When defendant agreed to come to the station, the officer asked him what he would say. Defendant admitted that he took the coins.

Rule 402(f) did not apply to defendant's statements. First, there was no evidence defendant subjectively expected that he was involved in a plea discussion. He never mentioned a plea or indicated that he expected to plead guilty. Second, any belief would not have been reasonable since there was no indication that the officer had the authority to enter

into a plea agreement, especially since the officer never mentioned a plea during the conversation. The Appellate Court reversed the trial court's order suppressing defendant's statements.

People v. McDermott, 2014 IL App (4th) 120655 Defendant was convicted in five counties of charges relating to the fraudulent buying and selling of motor vehicles. He was sentenced to imprisonment.

Subsequently, defendant pleaded guilty in Champaign County to aggravated battery. The prosecutor set forth the terms of the plea agreement in open court and stated that defendant would receive 222 days sentencing credit. Defendant asked the trial court to clarify that he would receive 222 days credit, and the court did so.

In McLean County, defendant agreed to plead guilty to several counts relating to odometer fraud and unlawful altering of title documents, in exchange for a sentence of five years imprisonment. The plea agreement stated that defendant would receive credit for 233 days. Defendant asked the trial court to clarify that he would receive 233 days credit against the five-year sentence, which was to be served consecutively to the sentences for convictions in two other counties. The trial court clarified that defendant would receive the credit.

Defendant subsequently filed post-conviction petitions seeking to obtain the sentencing credits involved in the Champaign and McLean County cases. He claimed that DOC assumed that the credits had already been given on defendant's sentences from other counties, and that giving double credit would violate Illinois law. Defendant's post-conviction petitions were dismissed as frivolous and patently without merit.

Where a specified amount of sentence credit is included in the terms of a plea agreement, defendant is entitled to that credit even if **People v. Latona, 184 Ill. 2d 260, 703 N.E.2d 901 (1998)**, which holds that a defendant may not earn two sentence credits for a single day of custody, is violated. **People v. Clark, 2011 IL App (2d) 091116**; **People v. Lenoir, 2013 IL App (1st) 113615**. Similarly, a defendant who agrees to forgo sentencing credit as part of a plea agreement may not subsequently seek to obtain such credit. **People v. Williams, 384 Ill. App. 3d 415, 892 N.E.2d 129 (4th Dist. 2008)**. In other words, when a defendant enters a negotiated plea of guilty in exchange for a specified sentence credit, both the State and the defendant are bound by the agreement. To deny credit that is an essential part of the plea agreement would violate the due process right to receive the benefit of one's plea bargain.

Here, the credits were clearly essential conditions of the plea agreements. Thus, defendant was entitled to receive them.

People v. Holloway, 2014 IL App (1st) 131117 Where a guilty plea is based on a plea agreement, the terms of the agreement must be stated in open court. In addition, Rule 402 requires that the trial court confirm the terms of the agreement by questioning the defendant personally in open court and determining whether force or threats or promises apart from the plea agreement were used to obtain the plea. Whether reversal is required because the trial court failed to give the required admonishments depends on whether real justice has been denied or defendant was prejudiced by the inadequate admonishments.

Defendant pleaded guilty under an agreement which provided that if he swore to the facts alleged by the State (which were based on defendant's post-arrest comments), he would receive boot camp. However, if defendant did not respond consistently with his prior statements, he would be sentenced to seven years of imprisonment. The terms of the agreement were not stated in open court or explained to defendant by the trial judge. Instead, defense counsel said that he had explained the agreement to defendant and that defendant

wanted to accept the offer of boot camp with a condition that he swear under oath to the facts alleged by the State. So far as the record showed, defendant was never advised of the possibility of a seven-year-sentence or of the specific facts to which he was required to swear in order to receive boot camp.

Because the trial court failed to explain the terms of the plea agreement in open court and ascertain defendant's knowledge of those terms, it was impossible to determine whether defendant fully understood the consequences of his plea. Because the defendant was prejudiced by the trial court's failure to comply with Rule 402(b), plain error occurred.

The trial court's denial of the motion to withdraw the guilty plea was reversed, defendant's conviction and sentence were vacated, and the cause was remanded for further proceedings.

People v. Gooch, 2014 IL App (5th) 120161 A defendant who is convicted pursuant to a negotiated guilty plea may not challenge his sentence by filing a motion to reconsider, and must instead file a motion to withdraw the plea. The court concluded that a "negotiated" plea is one in which the parties reach an agreement concerning sentencing. In other words, where there is no agreement as to sentence but the parties agree that some charges will be dismissed in exchange for the plea, the plea is not "negotiated" for purposes of Rule 604(d).

The court rejected the argument that sentencing considerations are involved in a plea whenever the State loses the ability to obtain sentences on dismissed charges. The court distinguished **People v. Diaz, 192 Ill.2d 211, 735 N.E.2d 605 (2000)**, in which the plea agreement specified that the State agreed not to seek consecutive or extended term sentencing, and held that a "plea bargain that is silent as to sentencing is equivalent to an open plea."

Because defendant agreed to plead guilty to one count of criminal sexual assault in exchange for the dismissal of two counts of predatory criminal sexual assault, and there was no agreement concerning sentencing, the plea was not negotiated. Therefore, defendant could challenge the sentence by filing a motion to reconsider the sentence and was not required to move to withdraw the plea.

People v. Douglas, 2014 IL App (4th) 120617 Defendant pled guilty to a Class 2 offense, knowing that he would be eligible for Class X sentencing, in exchange for a sentencing cap of 10 years imprisonment. On appeal, defendant successfully argued that he was ineligible for Class X sentencing due to his age. The Appellate Court held that the appropriate remedy was not to vacate the plea agreement. Instead, since defendant was eligible for an extended term on his Class 2 offense (with a sentencing range of 3 -14 years), the interests of both parties could be served by remanding the matter to resentence defendant for his Class 2 offense, with a permissible sentence of between three and 10 years.

People v. Barghout, 2013 IL App (1st) 112373 A defendant has the constitutional right to be reasonably informed with respect to the direct consequences of accepting or rejecting a plea offer. Counsel thus has the obligation to inform his or her client about the maximum and minimum sentences applicable for the charged offenses.

Here, the petition alleged that trial counsel failed to advise defendant that if he rejected the State's 12-year plea offer and was found guilty, he faced a prison term of 6 to 60 years; instead counsel erroneously advised defendant that he would be eligible for probation. The petition also alleged that defendant would have accepted the State's offer if counsel had properly advised him of the correct sentencing range. These allegations made an arguable claim that trial counsel provided ineffective assistance and that defendant suffered prejudice

because he would have accepted the plea bargain if he had received accurate advice about the sentencing range.

People v. Buckner, 2013 IL App (2d) 130083 Defendant agreed to plead guilty to three counts in exchange for the State's agreement to nolle three other counts. There was no agreement with respect to the sentence. Defendant filed no motion to withdraw her plea, but filed a motion to reconsider her sentence contending that two of the counts to which she pleaded guilty should merge under the one-act, one-crime doctrine.

Generally, a defendant who pleads guilty must file a motion to withdraw his guilty plea if he seeks to challenge his conviction. Where a defendant agrees to plead guilty to certain charges and the State agrees to drop the remaining charges, the defendant forfeits any consideration of a claim that two of the counts to which he pleaded guilty should merge under the one-act, one-crime rule, where he fails to file a motion to withdraw his guilty plea raising this issue. There is no plain error review. To do so would allow the defendant to receive the full benefit of his bargain under the plea agreement, while later avoiding his own obligation by unilaterally reducing the convictions to which he had agreed.

Defendant could not challenge the convictions to which she pleaded guilty where she filed no motion to withdraw the plea. She could not seek to vacate one of her convictions by filing a motion to reconsider sentence.

People v. Young, 2013 IL App (1st) 111733 (No. 1-11-1733, 12/6/13)

In 2004, defendant entered fully negotiated guilty pleas to first degree murder and attempt murder and received negotiated consecutive sentences of 25 and 10 years. In 2011, defendant's post-conviction petition alleging ineffective assistance of trial counsel was denied after a third-stage hearing. On appeal, defendant argued for the first time that his sentences were void because they did not include the mandatory statutory firearm enhancement of 20 years for personally discharging a firearm or 25 years to natural life if great bodily harm resulted from discharging a firearm. Defendant argued that he should be allowed to withdraw his plea and plead anew.

Defendant was estopped from challenging the sentence because it had been freely negotiated and provided him with a benefit in that he received a far lower sentence than was required under the law. The court also stressed that the State would be disadvantaged at a trial by the passage of time and the possible unavailability of witnesses to testify.

The doctrine of judicial estoppel applies where a party takes inconsistent positions in separate judicial or quasi-judicial proceedings, intended that the trier of fact accept the truth of the facts alleged at the prior hearing, and succeeded in asserting the first position and consequently receiving some benefit. The court acknowledged that Illinois courts have never applied judicial estoppel where criminal defendants entered a fully negotiated plea agreement and then challenged the sentence as too lenient. However, courts from other jurisdictions have recognized that the State is prejudiced under similar circumstances where a guilty plea is vacated years after it was entered, and have estopped defendants from enjoying the benefits of a negotiated plea agreement while challenging its validity.

Here, defendant voluntarily entered a plea calling for negotiated sentences totaling 35 years, and nearly ten years later claimed that the sentences should have been at least 76 years. The court concluded that the doctrine of judicial estoppel applied because the State could not be restored to its original position in that witnesses may have become unavailable for trial. The court also noted that defendant did not allege that any fraud or misrepresentation had occurred in the original plea agreement.

The court concluded:

Defendant has not cited, nor has our research disclosed an Illinois case in which a defendant has been permitted to withdraw his plea entered nearly a decade earlier and some 13 years after the offenses occurred, because the sentence was not harsh enough. It defies logic to suggest that defendant actually wants to serve a longer prison sentence than the improper sentence he received. . . . Rather, defendant . . . is using the improper sentence as a vehicle to withdraw his guilty plea, 10 years after its entry, and go to trial. Defendant's belated challenge could harm the State because it might endure hardship if forced to prosecute the case, given the passage of time and the recollection of witnesses.

The order denying the post-conviction petition was affirmed.

People v. Burse, 2012 IL App (4th) 100973 It is not unlawful for the State and defendant to bargain for a plea of guilty to a nonexistent crime, if defendant benefits from the bargain.

Without deciding whether the statutory provisions relating to delivery of a controlled substance preempt the general attempt statute, the Appellate Court held that defendant's negotiated plea of guilty to a charge of attempt (delivery of a controlled substance) based on the general attempt statute was not void.

The charge was filed as a result of a fully-negotiated resolution of the case. As part of the negotiated disposition, the State dismissed two counts that carried mandatory prison time, filed a probationable charge, and agreed to a sentence of probation in exchange for defendant's stipulation that the evidence was sufficient to convict him of attempt. Only after twice violating his probation, being twice resentenced, and having the court grant his motion to modify his sentence, did the defendant attack the plea. Defendant benefitted from his bargain with the State and should not be heard to complain.

People v. Hudson, 2012 IL App (2d) 100484 Noting a conflict in Illinois authority, the Appellate Court rejected the argument that a plea agreement is void if it calls for a longer sentence than is statutorily authorized (rejecting **People v. Gregory, 379 Ill.App.3d 414, 883 N.E.2d 762 (4th Dist. 2008)**).

Due process entitles a defendant to the benefit of his bargain in a plea agreement. There are two possible remedies when a defendant does not receive the benefit of the bargain - either the promise must be fulfilled, or the defendant must be given the opportunity to withdraw the plea. Where a plea agreement calls for a sentence that is longer than that statutorily authorized, the sentence can be reduced to that which is statutorily authorized. Under such circumstances, the defendant is afforded a better bargain than he negotiated, because he serves a lower sentence than that to which he agreed.

The court acknowledged that where a plea agreement provides for a sentence less severe than is legally possible, due process may require that defendant be allowed to withdraw his plea. Where the plea agreement requires a sentence which is longer than statutorily authorized, however, due process is satisfied if the defendant is given a windfall by being placed in a better position than the agreement contemplated.

Defendant's five-year-sentence for aggravated DUI was reduced to three years.

People v. Trujillo, 2012 IL App (1st) 103212 A defendant has the right to decide whether to plead guilty. An attorney's failure to disclose a plea offer to the defendant may give rise to a constitutional claim, regardless of whether defendant subsequently received a fair trial.

Defendant filed a *pro se* post-conviction petition supported by his affidavit alleging that defense counsel failed to communicate a plea offer to him, that he would have accepted the offer had he known of it, and that he only learned of the offer from a letter his counsel sent to the ARDC, a copy of which was appended to the petition, in which counsel represented that the State had offered defendant a six-year sentence if he would plead guilty, but defendant rejected the offer.

If counsel had failed to inform defendant of the plea offer, it is arguable that his assistance was deficient. Because defendant alleged that he would have accepted the offer had he been advised of it, he has arguably been prejudiced by counsel's deficient performance if he can establish that the offer was not communicated to him. Therefore, the claim did not lack legal merit.

People v. Robinson, 2012 IL App (4th) 101048 Whether to accept a plea agreement is a decision left to the defendant rather than to defense counsel. However, the defendant is limited to either accepting or rejecting the plea agreement that has been negotiated by defense counsel. In other words, defendant is not entitled to direct counsel in his or her negotiations with the prosecutor.

Because plea negotiations are generally governed by principles of contract law, the legal effect of making a counteroffer is to reject a standing offer. Furthermore, a rejected offer cannot be revived by a subsequent attempt at acceptance.

Defense counsel was not ineffective where, after he negotiated a plea agreement with an eight-year sentencing cap, he declined defendant's request to attempt to negotiate a seven-year-cap but to accept the eight year offer if further negotiations were unsuccessful. Counsel's refusal to follow the defendant's instruction was not objectively unreasonable, because counsel likely realized that making a counteroffer for seven years would operate as a rejection of the State's eight year offer. Because counsel's actions were objectively reasonable, defendant could not satisfy the first element of **Strickland**.

People v. Guerrero, 2011 IL App (2d) 090972 A defendant does not have a constitutional right to plea bargain. If the State chooses to bargain, however, there is a right to effective assistance of counsel during the negotiations. Providing effective assistance of counsel during plea negotiations includes accurately informing the accused concerning the direct consequences of accepting or rejecting a plea offer, including the maximum and minimum sentences that could be imposed if the defendant is convicted of the charged offenses.

The right to the effective assistance of counsel extends to the decision to reject a plea offer, even if the defendant subsequently receives a fair trial.

Although counsel acted unreasonably where he did not realize that defendant was subject to mandatory consecutive terms and advised that defendant would likely get probation if convicted, defendant could not show prejudice where there the State had not offered a plea agreement and showed no interest in conducting negotiations. In the absence of any reason to believe that plea negotiations would have occurred had defendant asked, there was no reasonable probability that the outcome would have been different had counsel given accurate information.

The trial court has no obligation to inform the defendant of possible sentences except in guilty plea situations, where the defendant must make a knowing and voluntary waiver of the right to trial. Where the trial court has no obligation to inform the defendant of the possible sentences, due process is not violated if the trial court elects to advise defendant of the penalties but gives erroneous advice.

People v. Smith, 406 Ill.App.3d 879, 941 N.E.2d 975 (1st Dist. 2010) Supreme Court Rule 402(d) prohibits a court from initiating plea discussions, but also contemplates the court's limited participation in negotiations, allowing the court to indicate its concurrence in a plea agreement reached by the parties. To show that a court's participation in plea negotiations rendered a guilty plea involuntary, the defendant must demonstrate that the court departed from its judicial function and participated in the negotiation process to the extent that improper influence was exerted on the defendant to plead guilty, or that defendant reasonably believed that he was no longer able to receive a fair and impartial trial so he must plead guilty and accept the sentence approved by the court. A court's improper involvement in a plea agreement does not render a conviction obtained pursuant to that agreement void.

Before trial began, the court participated in a conference with the defense and the prosecution pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 402(d)(2). Defendant did not plead guilty, but proceeded to trial. After the State had presented most of its case, defendant asked if he could accept the court's offer of a 32-year sentence that had resulted from the conference. The court accepted the defendant's plea of guilty and imposed a 32-year sentence, but failed to admonish defendant at the plea hearing of the applicable three-year MSR term.

Defendant filed a motion to vacate plea on the ground that the court had failed to admonish defendant of the MSR term. Instead, the court reduced defendant's sentence, indicating that the defendant had asked for the court's offer of 32 years and that the plea had not been negotiated with the State.

On appeal, defendant argued that his plea was involuntary and his conviction void because the court had no authority to negotiate a guilty plea. Not only did the defendant forfeit any error arising from the court's participation in the plea agreement by failing to include the error in his post-plea motion, but defendant cannot complain because he invited the error. To allow a defendant to use the exact action he procured in the trial court to obtain a reversal on appeal would offend every notion of fair play and encourage duplicitous conduct.

Defendant's plea was not involuntary. The record did not support defendant's argument that he negotiated his plea with the court rather than the State.

Even though defense counsel asked the court to reinstate its offer of 32 years when defendant sought to plead guilty during trial, and the court stated that it would reinstate the offer it had made before trial, this language does not unequivocally show that it was the trial court that first suggested the 32-year sentence, rather than that the court merely consented to the parties' agreement to a 32-year sentence

To determine the appropriate remedy where the defendant has not received the benefit of his bargain due to the court's failure to inform him that a MSR term will be added to his negotiated sentence, the court must consider not only the defendant's preference, but whether permitting the defendant to withdraw his plea based on the absence of a MSR admonition would be unduly prejudicial to the prosecution.

The trial court indicated that it would have allowed defendant to withdraw his plea if he had pled guilty before his trial began. The State had already presented witnesses in support of its case when the defendant asked to plead guilty. The State expended resources to present a significant portion of its case. Even though the witnesses may still be available or the State may be able to use a transcript of the testimony it did present at a new trial, such evidence would be a poor substitute for live testimony presented by witnesses with fresh memories. The defendant twice changed his mind about whether to plead guilty, and there is no guarantee that he will not change it a third time. Therefore the court did not err in finding that reducing defendant's sentence was a more appropriate remedy than allowing him to vacate his plea.

People v. Evans, 391 Ill.App.3d 470, 907 N.E.2d 935 (4th Dist. 2009) The court reiterated that a defendant may, as part of a negotiated plea, agree to a specified sentence credit and a public defender fee. Where the plea agreement covers those issues, the defendant may not challenge either the sentence credit or the trial court's failure to hold a hearing on the defendant's ability to pay a public defender fee.

People v. Williams, 384 Ill.App.3d 415, 892 N.E.2d 129 (4th Dist. 2008) A defendant is not entitled to sentence credit if he agreed to forego such credit as part of a negotiated sentence.

People v. Collier, 376 Ill.App.3d 1107, 879 N.E.2d 982 (4th Dist. 2007) Defendant pleaded guilty with an agreement that the State would cap its recommendation at two years in DOC. After accepting the plea, the trial court asked the attorneys whether a condition of the plea agreement was that the defendant appear for sentencing. After receiving an affirmative answer, the judge informed the defendant that if she did not appear for sentencing, the two-year cap might be exceeded. Defendant failed to appear for sentencing, and the trial court imposed a four-year prison sentence. The Court held that the sentence was improper. If the trial court opts to conditionally concur with the terms of a plea agreement but reserve various sentencing options, it may accept the guilty plea only if it: (1) states, on the record, the matters that it intends to reserve, and (2) ascertains that the defendant understands both the limits of the concurrence and the reserved sentencing options. If the defendant continues with the guilty plea despite the trial court's conditional concurrence, and the trial court subsequently withdraws its conditional concurrence, defendant must be advised of the change and given an opportunity to withdraw her guilty plea. Here, the trial court had the right to withdraw its concurrence to the plea agreement when defendant did not appear for sentencing, but the court was required to notify defendant that it was doing so and allow her an opportunity to withdraw her plea.

People v. Walton, 357 Ill.App.3d 819, 829 N.E.2d 396 (2d Dist. 2005). 730 ILCS 5/5-3-1 provides that a defendant shall not be sentenced for a felony before the trial court considers a written presentence report, except that a negotiated plea including a specific sentence may be accepted if there is a finding of the defendant's history of delinquency or criminality. [Section 5/5-3-1](#) imposes a mandatory requirement for the benefit of the trial court as well as the defendant which cannot be waived except as directed in the statute. Where the trial court erroneously accepts a negotiated guilty plea without making the required finding of the defendant's criminal history, however, the error does not invalidate the guilty plea. Rather this failure means only that the court's approval of the negotiated sentence was flawed, and the appropriate remedy is to remand the cause for a new sentencing hearing where the trial court can consider the defendant's criminal history before deciding whether the negotiated sentence is appropriate.

People v. Allen, 351 Ill.App.3d 599, 815 N.E.2d 426 (4th Dist. 2004) Although a trial court may reject a proposed plea agreement, it must use sound judicial discretion in doing so. Here, the trial judge abused his discretion by refusing to consider a plea agreement merely because it was tendered on the day of the trial, prospective jurors were waiting, and the prosecutor

had not drafted a reduced charge. The trial judge had not given the parties notice of any deadline by which plea agreements had to be tendered, and because defendant was in DOC he had been unable to consult with counsel until the night before the agreement was presented.

People v. Moore, 345 Ill.App.3d 1043, 804 N.E.2d 595 (4th Dist. 2003) Before trial, defense counsel filed a motion to require the State to disclose the name and address of a confidential informant, who had made a number of controlled buys. Before complying with the motion, the prosecutor informed defense counsel that no plea offer would be made in any case in which the defendant demanded the name of a confidential source, and no plea offers would be made in any cases in which defendant's trial attorney was involved. The prosecutor also stated that all prior plea offers were void. The State then disclosed the name and criminal history of the informant. Defendant was subsequently convicted in a jury trial. The trial court denied defendant's motion to dismiss for prosecutorial misconduct, finding that the State was not required to engage in plea bargaining. A prosecutor is entrusted with broad discretion in negotiating plea agreements. Although a defendant is entitled to know the name of an informant, he has no right to that information before plea bargaining and due process is not violated by the prosecution's refusal to plea bargain unless defendant agrees to protect the identity of the informant.

People v. Caban, 318 Ill.App.3d 1082, 743 N.E.2d 600 (1st Dist. 2001) Due process does not require that a defendant receive the benefit of a plea bargain calling for a sentence that is not legally available. While noting contrary authority in other jurisdictions, the court held that a plea agreement which embodies a sentence that cannot be legally imposed is void ab initio and must be vacated.

People v. Hare, 315 Ill.App.3d 606, 734 N.E.2d 515 (2d Dist. 2000) Plea agreements are governed, to some extent, by principles of contract law. However, parties may not negotiate guilty plea agreements which require the trial court to impose unauthorized sentences. The trial court acted properly by vacating a negotiated four-year-sentence where Class X sentencing was mandatory due to defendant's prior record. The court rejected the argument that because the State had negotiated an agreement for an unauthorized sentence, the prosecution was bound to recommend the minimum sentence authorized for the offense. A plea agreement calling for a illegal sentence is fatally defective, and does not bind the State in any way.

People v. Rossman, 309 Ill.App.3d 662, 722 N.E.2d 1216 (4th Dist. 2000) Rule 402(d)(2) provides that where a tentative plea agreement has been reached, the trial court may be advised of the agreement, the reasons for it, and (with the defendant's consent) the evidence in aggravation and mitigation. The trial court may then indicate whether it will concur in the agreed sentence, or may give conditional concurrence. If the trial court later withdraws its concurrence, the defendant is allowed to either withdraw or affirm the plea. If the plea is withdrawn, the trial judge must recuse himself. Acceptance of a plea agreement may be conditioned only on matters disclosed to the defendant before the plea is entered. Where the trial court accepted the guilty plea without conditioning that acceptance on defendant's appearance at sentencing, it could not subsequently decide that if defendant failed to appear for sentencing, there "wouldn't be a plea agreement anymore." Once defendant failed to appear for sentencing and the trial judge decided to impose a greater sentence than provided by the plea agreement, it in effect withdrew its concurrence to the plea agreement. At that

point, "the only alternatives" were to "impose the agreed-upon sentence or continue the hearing and allow defendant to affirm or withdraw her guilty plea at such time as she was brought before the court."

People v. Brown, 309 Ill.App.3d 599, 723 N.E.2d 362 (3d Dist. 1999) Defense counsel was ineffective during plea negotiations for failing to accurately advise defendant that he faced a mandatory natural life sentence if convicted of one of the charges.

People v. Price, 227 Ill.App.3d 253, 591 N.E.2d 99 (4th Dist. 1992) The defendant pleaded guilty to one drug charge and as part of the plea agreement the State dismissed a second count which charged a separate cocaine sale. The trial court imposed a \$380 street value fine which included the substances involved in both charges. Although a trial judge normally cannot impose a street value fine which includes contraband seized in a dismissed charge, a different rule applies where the defendant knowingly enters a plea agreement which provides for what would otherwise be an unauthorized sentence.

People v. Darnell, 190 Ill.App.3d 587, 546 N.E.2d 789 (2d Dist. 1989) Rule 402 prohibits the trial judge from initiating plea discussions.

People v. Fearing, 110 Ill.App.3d 643, 442 N.E.2d 939 (4th Dist. 1982) The right to appeal, like other rights, may be waived. Where, as part of the plea agreement, defendant waived his right to appeal, and that waiver was knowingly and voluntarily made, the appeal should be dismissed.

People v. Collins, 100 Ill.App.3d 611, 426 N.E.2d 1274 (4th Dist. 1981) Defendant entered a negotiated guilty plea, and the State promised to recommend a three-year-sentence. The trial court admonished defendant that it had not participated in the negotiations, had not concurred in the agreement, and was not bound to follow the State's recommendation. The defendant stated that she understood. After the judge imposed a five-year sentence, the defendant asked to withdraw the plea, claiming that "based on the information given by the public defender" she was entitled to withdraw the plea. The Appellate Court held that defendant was entitled to withdraw her plea because the judge failed to inform her, as is required by Rule 402(d)(3), that he was not bound by the agreement and that "if the defendant persists in the plea [the] disposition may be different from that contemplated by the agreement."

§24-4

Unfulfilled Promises

United States Supreme Court

U.S. v. Benchimol, 471 U.S. 453, 105 S.Ct. 2103, 85 L.Ed.2d 462 (1985) Defendant pleaded guilty pursuant to a plea agreement in which the prosecutor agreed to recommend a sentence of probation. At sentencing, the prosecutor concurred with defense counsel's statements requesting probation but a sentence of six years was imposed. Defendant claimed that the prosecutor breached the plea agreement by making no effort to explain the reasons for agreeing to the lenient sentence, thus giving the impression that he was less than enthusiastic about it. The Court held that the prosecutor did what he agreed to do and was not required to make the recommendation "enthusiastically" nor to offer reasons for the

recommendation.

Mabry v. Johnson, 467 U.S. 504, 104 S.Ct. 2543, 81 L.Ed.2d 437 (1984) The prosecutor offered to recommend a concurrent sentence of 21 years if defendant pleaded guilty. The defendant accepted this offer, but the prosecutor said a mistake had been made, withdrew the offer, and instead offered to recommend a consecutive sentence of 21 years. Plea negotiations resumed and defendant accepted the offer of a consecutive sentence. The Court rejected the defendant's claim that his acceptance of the prosecutor's plea bargain to recommend a concurrent sentence created a constitutional right to have the bargain specifically enforced. A conviction cannot stand where the defendant pleads guilty in reliance on a false premise, but here the plea "was in no sense induced by the prosecutor's withdrawn offer." When defendant pleaded guilty "he knew the prosecutor would recommend a 21-year consecutive sentence".

Santobello v. New York, 404 U.S. 257, 92 S.Ct. 495, 30 L.Ed.2d 427 (1971) When a guilty plea rests in any significant degree on a promise of the prosecutor, so that the promise can be said to be part of the inducement or consideration, it must be fulfilled. See also, **Machibroda v. U.S.**, 368 U.S. 487, 82 S.Ct. 510, 7 L.Ed.2d 473 (1962). A guilty plea made in reliance on a broken promise by prosecutor cannot stand. See also, **People v. Washington**, 38 Ill.2d 446, 232 N.E.2d 738 (1967) (a plea induced by the prosecutor's unfulfilled promise cannot stand).

Illinois Supreme Court

People v. Donelson, 2013 IL 113603 The plea-bargaining process is vital to and highly desirable for the criminal justice system. Plea bargaining leads to prompt disposition of cases, preserves finite judicial and financial resources, and allows the State to focus its prosecutorial efforts where they are most needed. Because an agreement is comparable to an enforceable contract, when interpreting a plea agreement courts apply contract law principles where appropriate.

Under general principles of contract law, a mutual mistake by the parties may be rectified where the parties are in actual agreement and their true intent may be discerned. Where the defendant and the State agreed to concurrent sentences of 50, 30, and 30 years, but mandatory consecutive sentences were required under Illinois law, both parties entered the agreement in the mistaken belief that concurrent sentences were permissible. Although concurrent sentences totaling 50 years were not statutorily authorized, the court concluded that the intent of the parties can be satisfied by imposing consecutive terms totaling 50 years, so long as such sentences are within the authorized sentencing ranges for the offenses. The cause was remanded with instructions to reconfigure defendant's sentences to consecutive terms totaling 50 years.

People v. Boyt, 109 Ill.2d 403, 488 N.E.2d 264 (1985) Defendant and a co-defendant were charged with armed robbery. The defendant agreed to plead guilty and testify against her co-defendant in exchange for reduction of the charge to robbery. After being told the State "had defendant's testimony, if needed" the co-defendant plead guilty. The State then refused to agree to defendant's guilty plea to the reduced charge. The Court held that due process did not require enforcement of the agreement. Even if the State accepted defendant's plea proposal, its later repudiation of the agreement is of no constitutional significance. The State's refusal to abide by the agreement did not deprive defendant 'of liberty or any other

constitutionally protected interest' . . . since she did not plead guilty to a charge in reliance on the agreement. The defendant, although understandably disappointed, was not prejudiced by the State's refusal to consummate the agreement. See also, [People v. Navaroli](#), 121 Ill.2d 516, 521 N.E.2d 891 (1988) (even if the prosecutor agreed to reduce charges in return for defendant's cooperation, and even if defendant fulfilled his part of the bargain, the prosecutor's refusal to comply with the agreement did not deprive defendant of due process; defendant did not enter a guilty plea or relinquish any rights in reliance on the agreement).

[People v. Starks](#), 106 Ill.2d 441, 478 N.E.2d 350 (1985) Defendant was convicted of armed robbery and sentenced to 11 years imprisonment. He argued that before trial an Assistant State's Attorney agreed to dismiss the charge if defendant passed a polygraph examination. The defendant passed the examination, but the charge was not dismissed. The Supreme Court held that if such an agreement was found to have been made it was enforceable. "We believe that if the State made an agreement with the defendant, it is bound to abide by that agreement" Cause remanded for a hearing to determine if there was an agreement and, if so, its terms.

[People v. Lambrechts](#), 69 Ill.2d 544, 372 N.E.2d 641 (1977) Defendant was not allowed to withdraw his guilty plea after the judge imposed a sentence higher than that recommended by the State. The trial judge did not give his concurrence or conditional concurrence in the plea agreement and stated that defendant might be sentenced to a substantially longer term.

[People v. Riebe](#), 40 Ill.2d 565, 241 N.E.2d 313 (1968) Where the judge changed his mind about imposing an agreed-upon sentence, he must allow defendant to withdraw the plea.

Illinois Appellate Court

[People v. Talavera](#), 2021 IL App (4th) 190200 Defendant pled guilty to two counts of aggravated battery in exchange for the dismissal of two counts of domestic battery and the State's agreement to recommend a sentence of no more than 9 years in prison. At sentencing, however, the State recommended a 10-year sentence, defendant did not object, and the court sentenced defendant to 10 years in prison. Defendant filed a motion to reconsider sentence, which was denied, and defendant appealed.

The Appellate Court first held that it could consider defendant's appeal from his negotiated guilty plea. Rule 604(d), which normally requires the filing of a motion to withdraw plea prior to taking an appeal from a negotiated plea, does not apply where the State did not fully abide by the terms of the agreement. Because the State recommended 10 years, despite its agreement to recommend no more than 9, the State breached the agreement. Accordingly, the court remanded the matter to the trial court with directions to conduct a new sentencing hearing at which the State must honor its agreement.

Defendant also argued on appeal that the State had not established his eligibility for extended-term sentencing. The Appellate Court did not reach the merits of that claim, but did note that the State must establish a qualifying conviction to impose extended-term sentences on remand. The court also ordered the appointment of new counsel for defendant and that proper appeal admonishments be provided at the conclusion of the new sentencing hearing.

[People v. Jones](#), 2021 IL App (1st) 182392 Defendant's post-conviction petition failed to make a substantial showing of prejudice stemming from plea counsel's erroneous advice

about sentencing credit. Defendant pled guilty in exchange for a minimum sentence of two years. He claimed in a post-conviction petition that his attorney assured him he would receive 283 days of credit, but that he later learned the credit had been applied to a prior sentence and would not be applied to the instant case.

The Appellate Court rejected the State's untimeliness argument, noting the record did not contradict defendant's claim that he did not learn his attorney's advice was erroneous until he began serving this sentence, long after the three-year deadline for filing the petition. But it affirmed the second-stage dismissal on the merits. Under [People v. Brown, 2017 IL 121681](#), defendant had to show that absent counsel's erroneous advice, there was a reasonable probability he would have rejected the plea and gone to trial. Defendant did not make that showing here because he did not outline any potential defenses or weaknesses in the State's case that would have made it rational for him to go to trial instead of accepting a minimum sentence.

[People v. Dodds, 2014 IL App \(1st\) 122268](#) The court accepted the State's concession that a defendant who has completed his probation sentence and is ineligible to file a post-conviction petition may raise an ineffective assistance of counsel argument by way of a §2-1401 petition. The court stressed that defendant had no other avenue to raise his claim that his plea was involuntary due to counsel's erroneous advice concerning the sex offender registration requirements that would result from a guilty plea to possession of child pornography.

Although sex offender registration is merely a collateral consequence of a guilty plea, it is a mandatory consequence which carries stigmatizing and far-reaching consequences into every aspect of the registrant's life. The court concluded that under the rationale of [Padilla v. Kentucky, 559 U.S. 356 \(2010\)](#), which held that defense counsel must advise defendants of the possible risk of deportation resulting from a guilty plea, counsel has an affirmative duty to advise a guilty plea defendant concerning the possibility that he will be required to register as a sex offender.

The court also noted that even before [Padilla](#), giving erroneous advice concerning a collateral consequence of a plea was treated differently than the failure to give advice at all. Here, counsel erroneously advised defendant that his guilty plea to child pornography would result in a requirement that he register as a sex offender for 10 years. After that 10-year-period had passed, defendant learned that in fact he would be required to register for life.

Because defense counsel was ineffective in advising defendant of the sex offender registration consequences of his guilty plea, the plea was involuntary. The plea and conviction were vacated and the cause remanded for further proceedings. The court ordered that the additional proceedings be conducted by a different judge, and reminded the parties that retrial might be difficult in light of their inability to obtain a record of the original proceedings.

[People v. McDermott, 2014 IL App \(4th\) 120655](#) Defendant was convicted in five counties of charges relating to the fraudulent buying and selling of motor vehicles. He was sentenced to imprisonment.

Subsequently, defendant pleaded guilty in Champaign County to aggravated battery. The prosecutor set forth the terms of the plea agreement in open court and stated that defendant would receive 222 days sentencing credit. Defendant asked the trial court to clarify that he would receive 222 days credit, and the court did so.

In McLean County, defendant agreed to plead guilty to several counts relating to odometer fraud and unlawful altering of title documents, in exchange for a sentence of five

years imprisonment. The plea agreement stated that defendant would receive credit for 233 days. Defendant asked the trial court to clarify that he would receive 233 days credit against the five-year sentence, which was to be served consecutively to the sentences for convictions in two other counties. The trial court clarified that defendant would receive the credit.

Defendant subsequently filed post-conviction petitions seeking to obtain the sentencing credits involved in the Champaign and McLean County cases. He claimed that DOC assumed that the credits had already been given on defendant's sentences from other counties, and that giving double credit would violate Illinois law.

Where a specified amount of sentence credit is included in the terms of a plea agreement, defendant is entitled to that credit even if [People v. Latona](#), 184 Ill. 2d 260, 703 N.E.2d 901 (1998), which holds that a defendant may not earn two sentence credits for a single day of custody, is violated. [People v. Clark](#), 2011 IL App (2d) 091116; [People v. Lenoir](#), 2013 IL App (1st) 113615. Similarly, a defendant who agrees to forgo sentencing credit as part of a plea agreement may not subsequently seek to obtain such credit. [People v. Williams](#), 384 Ill. App. 3d 415, 892 N.E.2d 129 (4th Dist. 2008). To deny credit that is an essential part of the plea agreement would violate the due process right to receive the benefit of one's plea bargain.

Because the record clearly shows that the plea agreements included specified amounts of sentence credit, and defendant was not advised that those credits could not be given under Illinois law, the agreed-upon credits must be given. The court reversed the orders dismissing the post-conviction petitions and remanded the causes with instructions to reduce the sentences.

[People v. Stone](#), 2013 IL App (1st) 111344 Where due to mutual mistake, the parties enter into a plea agreement for illegal concurrent sentences, but the parties can be given the benefit of their bargain by refashioning the sentences to legal consecutive sentences whose aggregate term is identical to the sentence under the plea agreement, the remedy is to remand for resentencing in accordance with the plea agreement and applicable statutes, rather than to vacate the plea. [People v. Donelson](#), 2013 IL 113603.

Defendant pled guilty to four counts of criminal sexual assault and one count of aggravated criminal sexual assault in return for concurrent sentences of 24 years for aggravated criminal sexual assault, 15 years each on three counts of criminal sexual assault, and a consecutive term of nine years on the remaining count of criminal sexual assault. By statute, all of the sentences for criminal sexual assault should have run consecutively to each other and consecutively to the sentence for aggravated criminal sexual assault.

Defendant has never asserted that his plea agreement was premised on specific sentences or that he would be deprived of the benefit of his bargain if his sentences were reconfigured to be in line with the applicable statutes. Therefore his plea agreement can be fulfilled by affirming defendant's convictions and remanding for resentencing to consecutive terms totaling 24 years.

[People v. Hudson](#), 2012 IL App (2d) 100484 Noting a conflict in Illinois authority, the Appellate Court rejected the argument that a plea agreement is void if it calls for a longer sentence than is statutorily authorized (rejecting [People v. Gregory](#), 379 Ill.App.3d 414, 883 N.E.2d 762 (4th Dist. 2008)).

Due process entitles a defendant to the benefit of his bargain in a plea agreement. There are two possible remedies when a defendant does not receive the benefit of the bargain - either the promise must be fulfilled, or the defendant must be given the opportunity to

withdraw the plea. Where a plea agreement calls for a sentence that is longer than that statutorily authorized, the sentence can be reduced to that which is statutorily authorized. Under such circumstances, the defendant is afforded a better bargain than he negotiated, because he serves a lower sentence than that to which he agreed.

The court acknowledged that where a plea agreement provides for a sentence less severe than is legally possible, due process may require that defendant be allowed to withdraw his plea. Where the plea agreement requires a sentence which is longer than statutorily authorized, however, due process is satisfied if the defendant is given a windfall by being placed in a better position than the agreement contemplated.

Defendant's five-year-sentence for aggravated DUI was reduced to three years.

People v. Clark, 2011 IL App (2d) 091116 The due process clause mandates that when a plea rests in any significant degree on a promise or agreement of the prosecutor, so that it can be said to be part of the inducement or consideration, such promise must be fulfilled. **Santobello v. New York**, 404 U.S. 257, 262 (1971). Supreme Court Rule 402(b) requires that if a plea is the result of the plea agreement, the agreement must be stated in open court. This requirement prevents misunderstandings as to the terms of an agreement and ensures that the agreement will be visible for examination, deterring future unfounded claims by a defendant that an agreement entered into was not honored. Consistent with this policy, the terms of the agreement as stated in open court control in discerning the parties' understanding of the agreement.

Defendant entered a guilty plea to two separate charges. The second offense was committed 28 days after defendant was released on bond on the first charge. Defendant thereafter remained in custody for 311 days on both charges. The prosecutor stated in open court that the terms of the plea agreement were that defendant would be sentenced to consecutive eight-year terms, and would receive 339 days' credit for time served on the first charge and 311 days' credit on the second charge. No one clarified that by statute defendant would only receive a total credit of 339 days, not 650 days, against his aggregate sentence. **People v. Latona**, 184 Ill.2d 260, 703 N.E.2d 901 (1998).

Defendant filed a motion to withdraw his plea, complaining that he did not receive the credit promised as part of his plea agreement. Contradicting defendant's testimony at the hearing on the motion, the defendant's attorney testified that he had informed the defendant that the State would not agree to a 650-day sentencing credit. The court denied the motion.

After noting that the trial court had made no specific finding resolving the conflict in the testimony, the Appellate Court concluded that the terms of the plea agreement as stated by the prosecutor at the plea hearing controlled. The court rejected the argument that it was not logical for defendant to expect that he would receive a total of 650 days' credit against his sentence. To allow defendant the benefit of his bargain, the court reduced his eight-year sentence on the second charge by 622 days to approximate the additional 311 days' credit defendant was promised he would receive as a result of his plea.

People v. Smith, 406 Ill.App.3d 879, 941 N.E.2d 975 (1st Dist. 2010) Before trial began, the court participated in a conference with the defense and the prosecution pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 402(d)(2). Defendant did not plead guilty, but proceeded to trial. After the State had presented most of its case, defendant asked if he could accept the court's offer of a 32-year sentence that had resulted from the conference. The court accepted the defendant's plea of guilty and imposed a 32-year sentence, but failed to admonish defendant at the plea hearing of the applicable three-year MSR term.

Defendant filed a motion to vacate plea on the ground that the court had failed to

admonish defendant of the MSR term. Defendant asked that he be allowed to vacate his plea rather than that his sentence be reduced by three years. The State responded that there had been no “traditional negotiated plea” between the parties, but an offer from the court, and that the proper remedy was to reduce the defendant’s sentence to give him the benefit of the bargain. The court reduced defendant’s sentence, indicating that the defendant had asked for the court’s offer of 32 years and that the plea had not been negotiated with the State.

To determine the appropriate remedy where the defendant has not received the benefit of his bargain due to the court’s failure to inform him that a MSR term will be added to his negotiated sentence, the court must consider not only the defendant’s preference, but whether permitting the defendant to withdraw his plea based on the absence of a MSR admonition would be unduly prejudicial to the prosecution.

The trial court indicated that it would have allowed defendant to withdraw his plea if he had pled guilty before his trial began. The State had already presented witnesses in support of its case when the defendant asked to plead guilty. The State expended resources to present a significant portion of its case. Even though the witnesses may still be available or the State may be able to use a transcript of the testimony it did present at a new trial, such evidence would be a poor substitute for live testimony presented by witnesses with fresh memories. The defendant twice changed his mind about whether to plead guilty, and there is no guarantee that he will not change it a third time. Therefore the court did not err in finding that reducing defendant’s sentence was a more appropriate remedy than allowing him to vacate his plea.

People v. Andrews, 403 Ill.App.3d 654, 936 N.E.2d 648 (4th Dist. 2010) The Appellate Court finds the dispositive holding of **People v. Whitfield**, 217 Ill.2d 177, 840 N.E.2d 658 (2005), to be that the trial court must inform the defendant that the MSR term will be added to his negotiated sentence, not that the MSR term is part of the negotiated sentence. The defendant prevailed in **Whitfield** only because the court made no reference at all to the MSR term, not because the court failed to inform defendant that the MSR term was part of his negotiated sentence. The statutorily-mandated MSR term cannot be part of a plea negotiation because there is nothing to negotiate. The MSR admonition is not required by Supreme Court Rule 402(b), which directs that the terms of the plea agreement be stated in open court, but by 402(a)(2), which directs the court to advise defendant of the minimum and maximum penalties prescribed by law. **People v. Morris**, 236 Ill.2d 345, 925 N.E.2d 1069 (2010), does not change this analysis, even though **Morris** also makes reference to defendant’s plea agreement.

Applying this analysis, the Appellate Court found no due process violation. The prosecutor accurately stated the plea agreement without reference to the MSR term. The court mentioned as part of its 402(a)(2) admonition that if defendant was convicted and sentenced to prison, there would be a one-year MSR term.

People v. Dasaky, 303 Ill.App.3d 986, 709 N.E.2d 635 (1st Dist. 1999) The Attorney General is the chief legal officer of the State of Illinois, and has "duties and powers that may be prescribed by law." The Attorney General's authority may be exercised concurrently with or independently of the power of the State's Attorney to initiate and prosecute "all actions in his or her county." The Attorney General has no authority to take exclusive charge of cases over which prosecutorial authority is shared with the State's Attorney, but is authorized to "consult with and advise" State's Attorneys, "attend the trial of any party accused of a crime, and assist in the prosecution." Where the Attorney General offers a specific sentence in return for cooperation, that offer should be honored by the State's Attorney.

People v. Bray, 186 Ill.App.3d 394, 542 N.E.2d 512 (4th Dist. 1989) Pursuant to a plea agreement, the defendant pleaded guilty to burglary. The State agreed to a maximum sentence of three years but allowed defendant to seek a lesser sentence. The defendant received a sentence of probation which was subsequently revoked. The Court held that a five year sentence imposed upon revocation of probation was not a violation of the plea agreement especially where the judge had specifically admonished defendant before the plea that if probation was given and later revoked, a sentence of three to seven years could be imposed.

People v. Jorgensen, 182 Ill.App.3d 335, 538 N.E.2d 758 (2d Dist. 1989) Pursuant to a plea agreement, defendant pleaded guilty to two charges and the State agreed to dismiss other charges. At the sentencing hearing the State introduced evidence regarding the dismissed charges. The Court held that the evidence pertaining to the dismissed charges was proper, because such use did not violate the plea agreement.

People v. Umfleet, 190 Ill.App.3d 804, 546 N.E.2d 1013 (5th Dist. 1989) Defendant was charged with offenses in Illinois and Missouri, and entered a negotiated guilty plea in Missouri in return for a 17-year sentence. The Missouri prosecutor stated that he had talked to an Illinois prosecutor (Mudge), who had agreed to recommend a 17-year concurrent sentence on the Illinois charge. Defense counsel also stated that defendant would not have pleaded guilty without the above recommendation in Illinois. Months later, defendant pleaded guilty to the Illinois charge but the State recommended a sentence of 21 years, and that sentence was imposed. The defendant filed a post-conviction petition in Illinois alleging that the prosecutor had breached his agreement to recommend a 17-year sentence. At the evidentiary hearing, Illinois prosecutor Mudge initially testified that he had no recollection of any such agreement. Defendant's Illinois lawyer testified that the defendant had voiced concern about the original plea agreement not being followed. The Court found that the Illinois prosecutor's testimony regarding the plea agreement was "equivocal," since he did not recall the agreement but the records from the Missouri plea proceeding clearly showed that the Missouri prosecutor, the Missouri defense counsel, and defendant all believed that the Illinois prosecutor had agreed to recommend a 17-year sentence. The Court held that "an objective evaluation of the evidence . . . compels us to find that such a plea agreement was made." The Court then ordered that the defendant be given the benefit of his bargain or be allowed to vacate his Illinois plea.

People v. Woods, 169 Ill.App.3d 126, 523 N.E.2d 190 (2d Dist. 1988) The trial court in Kane County found that there was an agreement between defendant and the State's Attorney of DeKalb County that: (1) defendant would plead guilty to a certain DeKalb County charge, (2) a Kane County burglary charge would be dismissed, (3) that defendant pleaded guilty in DeKalb County in reliance on the agreement, and (4) that he was entitled to specific performance by dismissal of the Kane County charge. The Court held that the State's Attorney in one county cannot bind the State's Attorney in another county without the latter's knowledge and approval.

People v. Graham, 140 Ill.App.3d 273, 488 N.E.2d 617 (5th Dist. 1986) Defendant pleaded guilty to a city charge and to the misdemeanor offense of resisting arrest. He was subsequently charged with burglary, and moved to dismiss the charge because the State had promised that in return for his guilty pleas it would not file any other charges. The trial judge found that such an agreement existed and dismissed the charges. Defense counsel had

testified that when he appeared at defendant's sentencing hearing he intended to move to withdraw the pleas because they had been entered without counsel. He said he talked to the city attorney, who told him that as far as he was concerned no burglary charge would be brought if the pleas were allowed to stand. Defense counsel told the prosecutor that he would let the guilty pleas stand provided "we could wrap the case," and such an agreement was worked out. The prosecutor testified that he had no recollection of any negotiations with defense counsel but in his years of practice he had never agreed to not file felony charges in return for a plea to a misdemeanor. The trial judge found that defense counsel's testimony was uncontradicted. The court placed little weight on the prosecutor's testimony that he always made a record of plea negotiations, noting that the events in question took place after the pleas had been entered. In light of defense counsel's testimony and the fact his actions were consistent with the existence of an agreement, the trial judge's finding was not against the manifest weight of the evidence.

People v. Davis, 94 Ill.App.3d 809, 419 N.E.2d 724 (3d Dist. 1981) Pursuant to a plea agreement, the defendant pleaded guilty to voluntary manslaughter and the prosecutor agreed to dismiss a murder charge and to make no sentencing recommendation. At sentencing, however, the prosecutor stated that he did not believe defendant to be a "probationable person" and that "an individual [with a prior record] is not likely to comply with the terms of probation." The defendant was sentenced to 5½ years imprisonment. The Court held that the prosecutor breached the plea agreement. Although the trial judge said that the prosecutor's argument had no influence concerning the sentence, "defendant did not get what she bargained for."

People v. Cangelosi, 68 Ill.App.3d 489, 386 N.E.2d 295 (1st Dist. 1979) Defendant contended that the State failed to keep a promise that induced his guilty plea to theft. The trial court found that the State merely promised that the guilty plea would not be used to revoke defendant's probation in another case and that this promise was not broken; the probation was revoked not on the basis of the guilty plea, but on evidence of the theft introduced at the revocation hearing. The Court held that it was unclear whether the plea agreement contemplated that the theft charge would not be used to revoke probation or merely that the guilty plea would not be used. However, such a fine distinction may be meaningless to a defendant. "It makes little difference whether petitioner was mistaken as to the terms of the agreement or whether the [State] breached the agreement. In either case the plea would not be voluntarily and intelligently made."

People v. Reher, 60 Ill.App.3d 32, 376 N.E.2d 402 (2d Dist. 1978) Defendant was given the opportunity to withdraw his guilty plea when the prosecutor promised not to oppose probation, but at sentencing sought a sentence of imprisonment. The prosecutor's conduct constituted "plain error." See also, **U.S. v. Canada**, 960 F.2d 263 (1st Cir. 1992) (prosecutor breached a plea agreement to recommend a 36-month sentence where she never affirmatively asked for such a sentence, emphasized defendant's role in the offense, and urged the judge to impose a long prison term to "send a very strong message").

§24-5 Voluntary Pleas

United States Supreme Court

Bradshaw v. Stumpf, 545 U.S. 175, 125 S.Ct. 2398, 162 L.Ed.2d 143 (2005) A guilty plea is not knowing and voluntary where the defendant is not informed of the elements of the crime to which he pleads guilty. However, the trial judge need not personally explain the elements of each charge on the record; a plea is valid where the record indicates that the nature of the charge and the elements of the crime were explained to the defendant by defense counsel. "Where a defendant is represented by competent counsel, the court usually may rely on that counsel's assurance that the defendant has been properly informed of the nature and elements of the charge to which he is pleading guilty." Where defense counsel represented on the record that they had explained to the defendant the elements of aggravated murder, and defendant confirmed this representation, the plea was knowing and voluntary.

Hill v. Lockhart, 474 U.S. 52, 106 S.Ct. 366, 88 L.Ed.2d 203 (1985) Defendant was not entitled to relief because his attorney misinformed him of the parole eligibility date on the negotiated sentence; defendant failed to allege that he would not have pleaded guilty had he been correctly advised, and failed to allege any special circumstances to show that he placed particular emphasis on his parole eligibility in deciding whether to plead guilty.

Corbitt v. New Jersey, 439 U.S. 212, 99 S.Ct. 492, 58 L.Ed.2d 466 (1978) State statute which provided for a mandatory life sentence upon conviction of first degree murder, but allowed a lesser sentence upon a plea of non vult or nolo contendere, did not improperly burden a defendant's Fifth, Sixth or Fourteenth Amendment rights. A State may encourage guilty pleas by offering substantial benefits or leniency in return for guilty pleas.

McMann v. Richardson, 397 U.S. 759, 90 S.Ct. 1441, 25 L.Ed.2d 763 (1970) A guilty plea following a coerced confession can only be challenged where defendant was not assisted by counsel, counsel was incompetent, or the circumstances which coerced the confession have an abiding impact that tainted the plea.

Brady v. U.S., 397 U.S. 742, 90 S.Ct. 1463, 25 L.Ed.2d 747 (1970) Fear of the death penalty does not invalidate a guilty plea. Pleas must be made understanding and voluntary without the threat of physical harm or mental coercion. A plea made in light of then applicable law does not become invalid if later court decisions indicate that the plea rested on a faulty premise. See also, **Parker v. North Carolina**, 397 U.S. 790, 90 S.Ct. 1458, 25 L.Ed.2d 785 (1970).

Illinois Supreme Court

People v. Jones, 2021 IL 126432 A five-justice majority held that a juvenile defendant who faces a mandatory natural life sentence, and pleads guilty to a negotiated *de facto* life sentence, cannot allege that the subsequent holding in **Miller v. Alabama**, 567 U.S. 460 (2012), rendered the plea invalid. Defendant alleged that under **Miller**, the mandatory life sentence he faced at the time he pled guilty was now unconstitutional, and because **Miller** is retroactive, he pled under false pretenses. Moreover, defendant received a *de facto* life sentence without consideration of his youth and attendant circumstances. The majority disagreed.

A guilty plea agreement forecloses any claim of error. By entering into the contract, defendant waived any future favorable legal developments. The majority relied on two federal cases which held that guilty pleas that spared the defendant the potential for the death

penalty were not invalidated by later changes in the law which made the death penalty inapplicable to the defendants. Thus, the plea must be considered voluntary despite the subsequent change in law.

Finally, the majority found no error in the 50-year sentence itself, where **Jones v. Mississippi**, 593 U.S. ___ (2021) authorizes the imposition of a discretionary life sentence as long as the court was not precluded from considering the defendant's youth and attendant circumstances. Here, the court could have rejected the plea agreement had therefore exercised discretion in accordance with **Jones**.

The dissenting justices would have found the plea invalid where defendant was deprived of the protections provided by **Miller**. Defendant pled guilty for a crime committed at age 16 and agreed to a *de facto* life sentence after waiving his right to a pre-sentence investigation report and a hearing on mitigation and aggravation. Without these facts, the sentencing court could not have possibly considered the **Miller** factors. Furthermore, the federal cases are distinguishable because in both cases, the defendants faced only the possibility of the death penalty, while in the instant case the defendant faced a mandatory, unconstitutional life sentence. Regardless, the instant case cannot be compared to cases involving adults, because juveniles are different according to United States Supreme Court precedent. Finally, the court stressed that having made no findings with regard to any of the **Miller** factors, the sentencing court's imposition of a 50-year sentence was unconstitutional.

People v. Guzman, 2015 IL 118749 725 ILCS 5/113-8 states that before accepting a guilty plea, the trial court must advise the defendant in open court that if he or she is not a U.S. citizen, the conviction may have immigration consequences including deportation, exclusion from admission to the United States, or denial of naturalization. In **People v. Delvillar**, 235 Ill. 2d 507, 922 N.E.2d 330 (2009), the Illinois Supreme Court held that the trial court's duty to give the §113-8 admonishments is directory rather than mandatory and involves only a collateral rather than a direct consequence of the plea. Under **Delvillar**, the failure to give the statutory admonishment does not affect the voluntariness of the plea. Thus, a defendant seeking to withdraw a guilty plea based on the trial court's failure to give the statutory admonishments must demonstrate either prejudice or a denial of justice.

In **Padilla v. Kentucky**, 559 U.S. 356 (2010), the U.S. Supreme Court held that because deportation is a near certain result of many criminal convictions, it is difficult to classify the immigration consequences of a guilty plea as either a direct or a collateral consequence of the plea. Thus, to provide effective assistance under the Sixth Amendment, defense counsel is obligated to advise a guilty plea defendant of the possible immigration consequences of the plea.

Here, the court stressed that **Padilla** concerned the Sixth Amendment right to counsel, and not due process under the Fifth Amendment or the trial court's duty to admonish a guilty plea defendant. The court rejected the argument that the **Padilla** discussion of collateral and direct consequences was intended to apply beyond the Sixth Amendment context.

The court reiterated that under Illinois law, the trial court is required to admonish only of direct consequences of a guilty plea. Despite **Padilla**, therefore, Illinois law does not bar the acceptance of a guilty plea in the absence of statutory admonishments concerning immigration consequences.

The court stressed that although a plea is not involuntary merely because the trial court failed to give statutory admonishments, non-citizen guilty plea defendants are not left without remedies. First, to provide constitutionally effective assistance, defense counsel must

advise a non-citizen client concerning the possibility of adverse immigration consequences. Second, as **Delvillar** held, a guilty plea may be withdrawn where the defendant has been denied real justice or suffered prejudice.

People v. Hughes, 2012 IL 112817 The court rejected the argument that defendant's plea was involuntary because he was not aware that the Attorney General could use the guilty plea as a basis to file a sexually dangerous person's petition. Due process principles provide that a guilty plea is knowing and voluntary only if the defendant has been advised of the "direct consequences" of the plea. A "direct consequence" is one which "has a definite, immediate and largely automatic effect on the range of the defendant's sentence."

By contrast, the trial court need not advise the defendant of the "collateral consequences" of a guilty plea. A "collateral consequence" is one which the circuit court has no authority to impose and which results from a discretionary action by an agency that is outside the trial court's control. Whether a consequence of a guilty plea is direct or collateral is a question of law which is reviewed *de novo*.

The possibility of commitment under the Sexually Violent Person's Commitment Act is merely a collateral consequence of a guilty plea, because it does not follow directly from the fact of a conviction and requires a petition by a prosecuting authority. Thus, a person who is convicted of a predicate sexual offense may or may not become the subject of a sexually violent person's petition, depending on action by an entity that is outside the trial court's control. Because a sexually violent person's proceeding is merely a collateral consequence of a plea, the trial court need not advise the defendant of the possibility of such a proceeding before accepting a guilty plea.

The court concluded, however, that in order to render effective assistance of counsel, defense counsel must inform a defendant who pleads guilty to a sexually violent offense that he will be subject to evaluation for possible commitment under the Sexually Violent Persons Act.

People v. Manning, 227 Ill.2d 403, 883 N.E.2d 492 (2008) Defense counsel was not ineffective for failing to advise a guilty plea defendant of the possibility of pleading guilty but mentally ill. Furthermore, defendant's plea was not involuntary despite counsel's failure to give such advice.

People v. Jamison, 197 Ill.2d 135, 756 N.E.2d 788 (2001) The court rejected the argument that a guilty plea was involuntary because it was a product of depression and psychotropic medication - the evidence showed that defendant was able to comprehend the consequences of his decision to plead guilty and made a conscious choice to do so.

People v. Williams, 188 Ill.2d 365, 721 N.E.2d 539 (1999) A guilty plea is voluntary where the defendant was "fully aware" of the "direct consequences" of the plea. A defendant need not be admonished of "collateral" consequences to enter a voluntary plea. A "direct" consequence is one that is related to the penal consequences of the plea - in other words, "the consequences that relate to the sentence imposed on the basis of the plea. A "collateral" consequence is one that is not related to the length or nature of the sentence or which results from actions taken by some agency other than the trial court. The use of a guilty plea at a subsequent trial for a different offense has no relationship to the sentence imposed on the plea, and is therefore a "collateral" consequence.

People v. Johnson, 154 Ill.2d 356, 609 N.E.2d 294 (1993) After pleading guilty to murder

and other felonies defendant was sentenced to death. He contended that he should have been allowed to withdraw his pleas because he was unaware that he would be automatically eligible for death because the murder occurred in the course of a felony. Although conceding that the argument, if true, would require withdrawing the plea, the Supreme Court found that defendant had been warned eight separate times that he could receive a death sentence.

People v. Huante, 143 Ill.2d 61, 571 N.E.2d 736 (1991) Defense counsel failed to advise defendant that he might be deported if he pleaded guilty to drug charges. However, unlike **People v. Correa**, 108 Ill.2d 541, 485 N.E.2d 307 (1985), in which counsel responded incorrectly to defendant's specific questions regarding deportation, counsel "did not provide any misleading or incorrect advice with respect to the immigration consequences of a criminal conviction." Awareness of the collateral consequences of a guilty plea is not required for a knowing and voluntary plea, and an attorney cannot be said to act unreasonably because he fails to volunteer information about possible collateral consequences of pleading guilty. Also this record does not demonstrate a "reasonable probability" that advising defendant of the deportation consequences of his plea would have caused him to reject the plea agreement.

People v. St. Pierre, 146 Ill.2d 494, 588 N.E.2d 1159 (1992) The Court rejected the contention that a guilty plea was involuntary because it was motivated by the dangerous and intolerable conditions in the Cook County Jail. Defendant was fully admonished under Rule 402, the judge "repeatedly" stated the plea would not be accepted if it was being entered only so defendant could leave the jail, and defendant said that the "main reason" for the plea was that he was "guilty." Finally, defendant failed to allege any specific acts of abuse or coercion.

People v. Correa, 108 Ill.2d 541, 485 N.E.2d 307 (1985) Defendant alleged that his pleas were involuntary and that he was denied effective assistance of counsel because his attorney misrepresented the effect of the pleas on his status as an immigrant. Before pleading guilty defendant asked his counsel what effect the guilty pleas would have on his immigration status, and counsel replied while he did not know what the Immigration Service would do, he had represented "a lot of people who have been aliens, and none have been deported." When defendant told counsel that his wife was an American citizen, counsel stated: "If your wife is an American citizen, then a plea of guilty would not affect your status." Counsel agreed that he told defendant, "I don't think you have anything to worry about." After defendant was released from prison, he was taken into custody by the Immigration Service. The Supreme Court held that it was counsel's responsibility, and not that of the court, to advise defendant of the collateral consequences of the plea. Here, the advice given by counsel was "erroneous and misleading and, under the facts of this case, was not within the range of competence required of counsel in such situations. The defendant's questions to his counsel show that the effect of his pleas of guilty on his status as an immigrant was a prime factor in making his decision whether to plead guilty." The pleas were reversed. See also, **People v. Sak**, 186 Ill.App.3d 816, 542 N.E.2d 1155 (1st Dist. 1989).

People v. Hale, 82 Ill.2d 172, 411 N.E.2d 867 (1980) Defendant, after being properly admonished pursuant to Rule 402, pleaded guilty to armed robbery. Within 30 days he filed a motion to withdraw the plea, alleging that he entered the plea on the understanding that he could change his mind within 30 days. Defendant testified he would not have pleaded guilty if he had known he did not have the right to change his mind and withdraw the plea. Upon being asked what led to this belief, the defendant replied "my attorney." Whether to allow withdrawal of a guilty plea is a matter for the trial court's discretion; it cannot be said

that the trial court abused its discretion here where the only evidence before the judge was the defendant's own subjective impression. "A defendant's mistaken subjective impression gained from conferences with his legal counsel, in the absence of substantial objective proof showing that they were reasonably justified, do not provide sufficient grounds upon which to set aside his guilty plea. The petitioner must bear the burden of showing that the circumstances as they existed at the time of the plea, judged by objective standards, reasonably justified his mistaken impression." See also, [People v. Kempfer, 194 Ill.App.3d 521, 551 N.E.2d 667 \(5th Dist. 1990\)](#) (guilty plea was not involuntary though entered out of concern for family; "[e]motional upset and family pressure do not render a guilty plea involuntary where defendant understood the rights he was waiving").

[People v. Riebe, 40 Ill.2d 565, 241 N.E.2d 313 \(1968\)](#) "The least surprise or influence causing a defendant to plead guilty when he has any defense should be sufficient cause to permit a change of the plea to not guilty."

Illinois Appellate Court

[People v. McCants, 2024 IL App \(1st\) 220837](#) Before his trial for aggravated battery with a firearm, the State moved *in limine* to impeach defendant, should he testify, with his prior conviction for aggravated unlawful use of a weapon. The trial court granted the motion, prompting defendant to waive his right to a trial and accept the State's plea offer. The court accepted the plea and sentenced defendant to 12 years in prison, after considering the prior AUUW conviction in aggravation.

After the supreme court invalidated the AUUW statute as unconstitutional, defendant successfully moved to vacate his AUUW conviction. He then filed a post-conviction petition challenging his guilty plea and sentence. His petition alleged that counsel was ineffective for failing to challenge the AUUW conviction, and that the trial court erred in considering the conviction in aggravation. At the second stage, post-conviction counsel also argued that the ruling on the motion *in limine* was improper and led to an involuntary, unknowing guilty plea.

The appellate court remanded for an evidentiary hearing. Once the AUUW statute was declared unconstitutional, defendant's conviction became a nullity. It could not be used for any purpose. The record showed that the ruling on the motion *in limine* led to defendant's plea, and that the sentencing court considered the unconstitutional conviction in aggravation. Thus, defendant's petition made a substantial showing of a constitutional violation and warranted an evidentiary hearing.

[People v. Shaw, 2023 IL App \(1st\) 221358](#) Defendant made a substantial showing of an involuntary guilty plea, where his post-conviction petition alleged that both the trial court and defense counsel misled him about MSR. Specifically, he was told MSR could not affect his release date from prison, yet he was ultimately "violated at the door" and served over four years in prison beyond the term agreed to in the plea.

Defendant pled to criminal sexual assault in exchange for a five-year prison term. The MSR term was 3 years to life along with registration as a sex offender. At the guilty plea hearing, defendant specifically asked if the MSR term affects his release date. The judge said, "No, it does not," and defendant agreed to plead guilty. On his release date, IDOC informed defendant he would not be released because he could not find an approved host site that complied with the restrictions placed on sex offenders.

Defendant's post-conviction petition alleged that his plea was not voluntary because the trial court, and his attorney, misled him about the nature of MSR. If he had known about the living restrictions, and that an inability to comply would lead to a "violation at the door," he would not have pled guilty. He alleged that he would have gone to trial and presented a defense of consent. The circuit court granted the State's motion to dismiss.

The appellate court reversed. Although the trial court had no obligation to inform defendant of the collateral consequences of the plea, including the need to find an approved host site in order to be released from prison, it did have an obligation to provide accurate information once defendant asked about those details. Here, the court's statement was false – MSR could, and did, affect defendant's release date. Where these false statements induced the plea, defendant made a substantial showing of an involuntary plea.

Defendant also made a substantial showing of plea counsel's ineffectiveness by alleging that counsel assured him the MSR restrictions were not onerous and would not affect his release date. Defense counsel is not obligated to inform a defendant of all collateral consequences of the plea, but courts have recognized exceptions to this rule. "Where consequences are severe, certain to occur, 'enmeshed' in the criminal process, and are of predictable importance to a defendant's calculus, they are not categorically excluded from **Strickland's** purview despite being traditionally categorized as collateral." **People v. Hughes**, 2012 IL 112817, ¶49, citing **Padilla v. Kentucky**, 559 U.S. 356 (2010). The appellate court agreed with defendant that the risk of being "violated at the door" and held indefinitely is one such consequence, meaning that defendant's allegations, taken as true, made a showing of unreasonable assistance. The petition further made a showing of prejudice by detailing the consent defense he would have presented at trial. The court remanded for a third-stage evidentiary hearing.

People v. Dodds, 2014 IL App (1st) 122268 The court accepted the State's concession that a defendant who has completed his probation sentence and is ineligible to file a post-conviction petition may raise an ineffective assistance of counsel argument by way of a §2-1401 petition. Defendant had no other avenue to raise his claim that his plea was involuntary due to counsel's erroneous advice concerning the sex offender registration requirements that would result from a guilty plea to possession of child pornography.

Although sex offender registration is merely a collateral consequence of a guilty plea, it is a mandatory consequence which carries stigmatizing and far-reaching consequences into every aspect of the registrant's life. The court concluded that under the rationale of **Padilla v. Kentucky**, 559 U.S. 356 (2010), which held that defense counsel must advise defendants of the possible risk of deportation resulting from a guilty plea, counsel has an affirmative duty to advise a guilty plea defendant concerning the possibility that he will be required to register as a sex offender.

Even before **Padilla**, giving erroneous advice concerning a collateral consequence of a plea was treated differently than the failure to give advice at all. Here, counsel erroneously advised defendant that his guilty plea to child pornography would result in a requirement that he register as a sex offender for 10 years. After that 10-year-period had passed, defendant learned that in fact he would be required to register for life.

Because defense counsel was ineffective in advising defendant of the sex offender registration consequences of his guilty plea, the plea was involuntary. The plea and conviction were vacated and the cause remanded for further proceedings. The court ordered that the additional proceedings be conducted by a different judge, and reminded the parties that retrial might be difficult in light of their inability to obtain a record of the original

proceedings.

People v. Hubbard, 2012 IL App (2d) 101158 A judgment is void only when it is entered by a court lacking jurisdiction. There are three elements of jurisdiction: (1) personal jurisdiction; (2) subject-matter jurisdiction; and (3) the power to render the particular judgment or sentence. A court does not lose jurisdiction because it makes a mistake in determining either the facts, the law, or both.

Judgments entered in violation of due process are not void. Therefore, a guilty plea that is involuntary because the court misadvised defendant of the sentencing range is not void.

The United States Supreme Court in **Boykin v. Alabama**, 395 U.S. 238 (1969), characterized an involuntary guilty plea as void, and the Illinois Supreme Court adopted that language in **People v. Williams**, 188 Ill.2d 365, 721 N.E.2d 539 (1999). But in cases where the voidness of a judgment has been specifically at issue, the Illinois Supreme Court has consistently held that a judgment is void only where the court lacks jurisdiction. Therefore, reliance on federal cases and **Williams** for the proposition that an involuntary guilty plea is void is misplaced.

Because defendant's guilty plea was not void and therefore not subject to attack at any time, the court properly found that defendant's §2-1401 petition challenging his guilty plea as involuntary was untimely.

People v. McKinney, 2012 IL App (1st) 103364 The Veterans Court Act (730 ILCS 167/1) establishes a veterans court and corresponding programs which allow a veteran who is charged with a crime to obtain dismissal of the charges, termination of his sentence, or discharge from further proceedings in exchange for completing a program which may include substance abuse, mental health, or other treatment. Here, because defense counsel and the trial judge gave defendant erroneous information concerning his eligibility for veterans court, defendant entered the guilty plea in the mistaken belief that he was ineligible for the program. Furthermore, although the Veterans Court Act requires the prosecutor's agreement and the approval of the veterans court for admission to the program, the parties' mistaken belief concerning defendant's eligibility meant that none of the parties seriously considered whether veterans court was an appropriate disposition. Under these circumstances, "while it is entirely possible that defendant would not have been able to obtain the agreement of the prosecutor or the approval of the court to be admitted into a veterans court program, it is clear from the record that defendant never had the opportunity to explore such a possibility."

Because the defendant entered his guilty plea in the mistaken belief that he was ineligible for veterans court, the trial court abused its discretion by denying the motion to withdraw the plea. The trial court's ruling was reversed and the cause remanded for further proceedings.

People v. Edmonson, 408 Ill.App.3d 880, 946 N.E.2d 997 (2d Dist. 2011) A guilty plea is involuntary due to defense counsel's erroneous advice where the misadvice amounts to ineffective assistance of counsel. To establish that counsel was ineffective, defendant must show that: (1) counsel's performance was objectively unreasonable; and (2) there is a reasonable probability that, absent counsel's error, defendant would not have pleaded guilty but would have insisted on going to trial.

Defendant pleaded guilty with the State's agreement to a sentencing cap of 20 years. Both defense counsel and defendant mischaracterized this agreement on the record as an open plea, both defense counsel and the court misadvised defendant that he could move to

reconsider the sentence prior to an appeal, and defendant did move to reconsider his sentence prior to appealing. The Appellate Court remanded due to the absence of a 604(d) certificate and with directions that defendant be admonished that his only option was to move to withdraw his plea because his plea was negotiated. On remand, defendant moved to withdraw his plea on the ground that he would not have entered the plea had counsel advised him that he would not have the right to challenge his sentence.

As defendant was misinformed by the court and defense counsel that he could challenge his sentence after pleading guilty, and that misinformation was central to his decision to plead guilty, defendant was prejudiced and the plea was involuntary. Defendant need not establish that his sentence was excessive to establish prejudice.

People v. Smith, 406 Ill.App.3d 879, 941 N.E.2d 975 (1st Dist. 2010) Supreme Court Rule 402(d) prohibits a court from initiating plea discussions, but also contemplates the court's limited participation in negotiations, allowing the court to indicate its concurrence in a plea agreement reached by the parties. To show that a court's participation in plea negotiations rendered a guilty plea involuntary, the defendant must demonstrate that the court departed from its judicial function and participated in the negotiation process to the extent that improper influence was exerted on the defendant to plead guilty, or that defendant reasonably believed that he was no longer able to receive a fair and impartial trial so he must plead guilty and accept the sentence approved by the court. A court's improper involvement in a plea agreement does not render a conviction obtained pursuant to that agreement void.

Before trial began, the court participated in a conference with the defense and the prosecution pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 402(d)(2). Defendant did not plead guilty, but proceeded to trial. After the State had presented most of its case, defendant asked if he could accept the court's offer of a 32-year sentence that had resulted from the conference. The court accepted the defendant's plea of guilty and imposed a 32-year sentence, but failed to admonish defendant at the plea hearing of the applicable three-year MSR term. On appeal, defendant argued that his plea was involuntary and his conviction void because the court had no authority to negotiate a guilty plea.

Defendant's plea is not involuntary. The record does not support defendant's argument that he negotiated his plea with the court rather than the State.

In asking the court for a 402 conference prior to trial, defense counsel represented that there had been informal talks with the State regarding "maybe resolving the matter." Even though defense counsel asked the court to reinstate its offer of 32 years when defendant sought to plead guilty during trial, and the court stated that it would reinstate the offer it had made before trial, this language does not unequivocally show that it was the trial court that first suggested the 32-year sentence, rather than that the court merely consented to the parties' agreement to a 32-year sentence.

People v. Beronich, 334 Ill.App.3d 536, 778 N.E.2d 385 (2d Dist. 2002) Whether a guilty plea is intelligent and voluntary is judged by the law in effect when the plea was entered. A voluntary plea is not invalidated by later changes in the law.

People v. Dorethy, 331 Ill.App.3d 504, 771 N.E.2d 609 (3d Dist. 2002) Defendant's guilty plea was not knowingly and voluntarily entered where, although consecutive sentences were mandatory, the trial court advised defendant that his sentences could run either consecutively or concurrently. The trial court remanded the cause with instructions that defendant be allowed to withdraw his plea and plead anew.

People v. Urr, 321 Ill.App.3d 544, 748 N.E.2d 235 (1st Dist. 2001) A guilty plea is not necessarily involuntary because the defendant claims it was entered due to prison conditions. To establish that such a plea was involuntary, the defendant must allege that a specific instance of abuse caused him to plead guilty and establish a nexus between the alleged violence and the plea. Defendant established such a nexus here, where he claimed that his plea was the result of specific acts of violence. Where defendant made it clear he was pleading guilty only because of specific acts of violence and threats, the trial court abused its discretion by denying a subsequent motion to withdraw the plea.

People v. McCracken, 237 Ill.App.3d 519, 604 N.E.2d 1104 (3d Dist. 1992) A guilty plea based on inaccurate admonishments about possible sentences is involuntary. Because defendant was told that any sentences would be concurrent "unless someone told [him] ahead of time they were going to be otherwise," the trial court erred by imposing a six-year sentence to run consecutively with a previously imposed sentence from another county.

People v. Corby, 139 Ill.App.3d 214, 487 N.E.2d 374 (5th Dist. 1985) A guilty plea based on counsel's estimate of the likely sentence is not involuntary. A plea based upon "a prediction rather than a promise would not be rendered involuntary when such prediction was unfulfilled." See also, **People v. Roesler**, 195 Ill.App.3d 1007, 552 N.E.2d 1242 (5th Dist. 1990).

People v. Otis, 135 Ill.App.3d 718, 479 N.E.2d 40 (2d Dist. 1985) The defendant's attorney told him that he had to plead guilty to the non-probationable offense of residential burglary in order to elect treatment under the Dangerous Drug Abuse Act. In response to a question from the judge, the defendant stated the same belief. After the parole board refused to consent to defendant's election to receive treatment, defendant was sentenced to eight years in prison. On appeal, he contended that he was denied effective assistance of counsel because: (1) counsel was incorrect in believing defendant had to plead guilty before electing drug treatment, and (2) counsel failed to determine before the guilty plea whether the parole board would consent to treatment. The Court found that defense counsel did misapprehend the law, and "it would have been advisable for defendant's attorney to make a determination in this regard before advising his client to plead guilty in order to elect treatment under the Act. Had the defendant not been misadvised, he may not have pleaded guilty." See also, **People v. Cunningham**, 286 Ill.App.3d 346, 676 N.E.2d 998 (4th Dist. 1997) (plea involuntary where all parties erroneously believed that defendant would be able to appeal the denial of a motion to suppress).

People v. Cosby, 137 Ill.App.3d 854, 484 N.E.2d 1165 (4th Dist. 1985) Plea vacated where the defendant pleaded guilty to aggravated criminal sexual abuse in the mistaken belief that he did not have a defense, and testified that he would not have pleaded guilty had he known that a reasonable belief that the complainant was at least sixteen was a defense to the charge.

People v. Smithey, 120 Ill.App.3d 26, 458 N.E.2d 87 (2d Dist. 1983) Subjectively mistaken impressions of a defendant are insufficient to vacate a guilty plea, in the absence of substantial objective proof showing that those beliefs were reasonably justified. Here, the defendant was not justified in his beliefs that another State would impose an identical sentence to be served concurrently or that he would be incarcerated in a federal prison.

§24-6 Admonishments

§24-6(a) Generally

Illinois Supreme Court

People v. Burge, 2021 IL 125642 Supreme Court Rule 402 requires that prior to accepting a plea of guilty, the court admonish the defendant of the nature of the charge, the sentencing range, the right to persist in a plea of not guilty, and that a plea waives the right to trial and to be confronted with the witnesses against him or her. Separately, 725 ILCS 5/113-4, requires certain additional admonishments, including that there may be consequences on the defendant's ability to retain or obtain employment. 725 ILCS 5/113-4(c).

Subsection 113-4(a) states that "When called upon to plead at arraignment," the defendant must be provided a copy of the charge and "shall plead guilty, guilty but mentally ill, or not guilty." Section 113-4(c) does not contain language limiting it to arraignment. The Supreme Court concluded that subsection (a) is a "general provision that sets the scope for the remainder" of the statute, and the admonishments in subsection (c) are required only when a defendant pleads guilty "at arraignment." Other subsections of the statute define the procedure if a defendant stands silent, pleads guilty but mentally ill, or pleads not guilty. In subsection (e), for instance, the statute specifically provides that when a defendant pleads not guilty, the court shall warn the defendant about the possibility of trial *in absentia* "at that time or at any later court date on which he is present." Thus, the legislature knew how to express its intent that a particular subsection not be limited to arraignment. Given the absence of such language in subsection (c), and considering the statute as a whole, the Court concluded that the legislature intended the subsection (c) admonishments be required only where a defendant pleads guilty at arraignment.

Further, a separate statute – 725 ILCS 5/115-2 – governs the acceptance of guilty pleas before or during trial. If Section 113-4(c) applied to all pleas, there would be no need for Section 115-2. The more detailed admonishments required by Section 113-4(c) provide safeguards to defendants who plead guilty at arraignment, often without having had the ability to consult with counsel.

The Court also rejected the argument that a manifest injustice occurred when defendant pled guilty without understanding that she would lose her employment as a result of the plea. Loss of employment is a collateral consequence, and due process does not require that a defendant be advised of collateral consequences prior to pleading guilty. Also, under the specific facts here, the court held that defendant should have known, as a matter of common sense, that her employment would be at risk where her theft charge was based on stealing from one of her clients during the course of her employment.

People v. Guzman, 2015 IL 118749 725 ILCS 5/113-8 states that before accepting a guilty plea, the trial court must advise the defendant in open court that if he or she is not a U.S. citizen, the conviction may have immigration consequences including deportation, exclusion from admission to the United States, or denial of naturalization. In **People v. Delvillar**, 235 Ill. 2d 507, 922 N.E.2d 330 (2009), the Illinois Supreme Court held that the trial court's duty to give the §113-8 admonishments is directory rather than mandatory and involves only a collateral rather than a direct consequence of the plea. Under **Delvillar**, the failure to give the statutory admonishment does not affect the voluntariness of the plea. Thus, a defendant

seeking to withdraw a guilty plea based on the trial court's failure to give the statutory admonishments must demonstrate either prejudice or a denial of justice.

In [Padilla v. Kentucky, 559 U.S. 356 \(2010\)](#), the U.S. Supreme Court held that because deportation is a near certain result of many criminal convictions, it is difficult to classify the immigration consequences of a guilty plea as either a direct or a collateral consequence of the plea. Thus, to provide effective assistance under the Sixth Amendment, defense counsel is obligated to advise a guilty plea defendant of the possible immigration consequences of the plea.

Here, the court stressed that **Padilla** concerned the Sixth Amendment right to counsel, and not due process under the Fifth Amendment or the trial court's duty to admonish a guilty plea defendant. The court rejected the argument that the **Padilla** discussion of collateral and direct consequences was intended to apply beyond the Sixth Amendment context.

Under Illinois law, the trial court is required to admonish only of direct consequences of a guilty plea. Despite **Padilla**, therefore, Illinois law does not bar the acceptance of a guilty plea in the absence of statutory admonishments concerning immigration consequences.

The court stressed that although a plea is not involuntary merely because the trial court failed to give statutory admonishments, non-citizen guilty plea defendants are not left without remedies. First, to provide constitutionally effective assistance, defense counsel must advise a non-citizen client concerning the possibility of adverse immigration consequences. Second, as **Delvillar** held, a guilty plea may be withdrawn where the defendant has been denied real justice or suffered prejudice.

[People v. Hughes, 2012 IL 112817](#) The court rejected the argument that defendant's plea was involuntary because he was not aware that the Attorney General could use the guilty plea as a basis to file a sexually dangerous person's petition. Due process principles provide that a guilty plea is knowing and voluntary only if the defendant has been advised of the "direct consequences" of the plea. A "direct consequence" is one which "has a definite, immediate and largely automatic effect on the range of the defendant's sentence."

By contrast, the trial court need not advise the defendant of the "collateral consequences" of a guilty plea. A "collateral consequence" is one which the circuit court has no authority to impose and which results from a discretionary action by an agency that is outside the trial court's control. Whether a consequence of a guilty plea is direct or collateral is a question of law which is reviewed *de novo*.

The court concluded that the possibility of commitment under the Sexually Violent Person's Commitment Act is merely a collateral consequence of a guilty plea, because it does not follow directly from the fact of a conviction and requires an petition by a prosecuting authority. Thus, a person who is convicted of a predicate sexual offense may or may not become the subject of a sexually violent person's petition, depending on action by an entity that is outside the trial court's control. Because a sexually violent person's proceeding is merely a collateral consequence of a plea, the trial court need not advise the defendant of the possibility of such a proceeding before accepting a guilty plea.

The court concluded, however, that in order to render effective assistance of counsel, defense counsel must inform a defendant who pleads guilty to a sexually violent offense that he will be subject to evaluation for possible commitment under the Sexually Violent Persons Act.

[People v. Delvillar, 235 Ill.2d 507, 922 N.E.2d 330 \(2009\)](#) 725 ILCS 5/113-8, which

requires the trial court to admonish a guilty plea defendant of the possibility of immigration consequences before accepting a plea to a felony or a misdemeanor, requires such an admonishment in every case, whether or not the defendant indicates that he is a U.S. citizen. However, the failure to give the statutory admonishment concerning the immigration consequences of a plea does not necessarily require that a motion to withdraw the plea be granted. Instead, the failure to admonish concerning a potential immigration consequence is one factor to be considered by the court when determining whether a guilty plea was made voluntarily and intelligently.

To afford the defendant an opportunity to enter a voluntary plea, the trial court must provide information concerning the direct consequences of the plea. Direct consequences are those which affect the sentence and other punishment which the trial court may impose. Collateral consequences are consequences which are beyond the trial court's authority to control. Admonishments concerning collateral consequences, including immigration consequences, are not required for a voluntary plea.

Although §113-8 provides that defendants are to be advised of one collateral consequence – the potential immigration consequences of the plea – the failure to give such an admonishment does not affect the constitutional voluntariness of the plea. Thus, unless real justice has been denied or the defendant has been prejudiced, a plea is not rendered involuntary because the trial court failed to give an admonishment concerning immigration consequences.

Because the defendant failed to demonstrate that he was subject to any potential immigration penalty or that he would not have pleaded guilty had he been admonished of any potential consequences, he was not prejudiced by the omission of the statutorily-required admonishment. The court also noted that defendant informed the court at the plea hearing that he was an American citizen, appeared to have no trouble understanding the court's admonishments in English, and made no attempt to prove that he was not a citizen. Thus, he failed to carry his burden of showing that he suffered prejudice as a result in the trial court's failure to admonish concerning immigration consequences.

Because the trial court did not abuse its discretion by denying defendant's motion to withdraw his guilty plea, the order denying the motion was affirmed.

People v. Burton, 184 Ill.2d 1, 703 N.E.2d 49 (1998) Where the trial court fails to fully admonish a guilty plea defendant under Supreme Court Rule 605(b) and no motion to withdraw the guilty plea or reconsider the sentence is filed, the cause must be remanded to allow defendant an opportunity to file an appropriate motion. Where two post-sentencing motions were filed on defendant's behalf, one before the transcripts were received and the second several months later, and the trial court held a hearing and fully considered the issues raised by those motions, the failure to comply with Rule 605(b) was harmless error.

People v. Walker, 109 Ill.2d 484, 488 N.E.2d 529 (1985) Defendant pleaded guilty to murder and was sentenced to death. He contended that his plea was not voluntary because the trial judge failed to admonish him that a plea of guilty but mentally ill could be offered. The trial judge had no duty to admonish as to the plea of guilty but mentally ill, because the judge had been given no reason to believe that such a plea could be made in this case. The Court noted that "defendant did not offer any evidence that such a plea might be warranted, and specifically denied to the court that he suffered from a dependence on alcohol, the ground upon which he now submits his plea of guilty but mentally ill would rest."

Illinois Appellate Court

People v. Blackmon, 2024 IL App (1st) 220586 The trial court did not substantially comply with Rule 605(c)(5) where it failed to admonish defendant that he had a right to appointed counsel for the filing of the motion to vacate his guilty plea. The trial court’s only mention of appointed counsel occurred when it stated, “If I deny your motion, you will have 30 days from the date of that denial to file a written notice of appeal. If you are indigent and cannot afford an attorney or transcript, both will be provided to you at no cost to help with the appeals process.” The court’s mention of the “appeals process” indicated that defendant would be appointed counsel only if he filed an appeal, not if he filed a motion to vacate his guilty plea in the trial court.

A dissenting justice cited **People v. Dominguez, 2012 IL 111336**, as evidence that the trial court substantially complied with the rule. The majority pointed out, however, that the defendant in **Dominguez** received the correct admonishments in writing, and the trial court there made additional statements suggesting the right to counsel applied to the filing of the 604(d) motion.

People v. Higgins, 2023 IL App (4th) 220837 Defendant pled guilty to three counts of aggravated battery to a child (two Class X and one Class 3) and was sentenced to concurrent terms of imprisonment of 20 years, 20 years, and 5 years. On appeal, defendant argued that the trial court failed to admonish him in accordance with Rule 402 prior to accepting his plea. Specifically, defendant argued that the court erred in referring to his plea as an “open” plea where the parties agreed that the sentences would be served concurrently and where an unrelated felony charge was dismissed as part of the plea agreement here. The appellate court observed, however, that whether the court called the plea “open” or “partially negotiated” did not matter because the court thoroughly admonished defendant that the sentences would run concurrently, that he could be sentenced to a term anywhere between 6 and 30 years of imprisonment, and that the separately charged felony was being dismissed. Thus, Rule 402 was satisfied, and defendant’s plea was affirmed.

The court also rejected defendant’s argument that counsel’s facially valid Rule 604(d) certificate was refuted by the record. Defendant argued that the transcript of the sentencing hearing was not certified until after the date that counsel filed his certificate and thus counsel could not have reviewed the transcript of the sentencing hearing as he had certified. Citing **People v. Little, 2011 IL App (4th) 090787**, the court noted that “the date the court reporter certified the transcripts in preparation of the record on appeal is not evidence of the first date a defense attorney could have reviewed the transcripts.”

In an “epilogue” to the opinion, the court criticized the use of Rule 402 conferences generally, quoting a special concurrence from its prior decision in **People v. Anderson, 2016 IL App (4th) 140402-U**. And, the court discussed the misleading nature of the 402 conference here where the judge indicated that he believed a fair sentence would be somewhere in the 7-or-8-year range but ultimately sentenced defendant to 20 years. The appellate court noted that while Rule 402(d) specifically provides for such pre-plea conferences, they “need not and should not ever be conducted,” or at a minimum, they should be conducted on the record.

People v. Pagsisihan, 2020 IL App (1st) 181017 The trial court erred in entering a second-stage dismissal of defendant’s post-conviction petition which alleged that plea counsel failed to advise him of the immigration consequences of his guilty plea to murder. While the record showed that defendant had been subject to deportation proceedings previously, he was never removed from the United States following those proceedings, he subsequently obtained a

marriage license in the United States, and he was granted work authorization through INS. Defendant alleged that he informed plea counsel about his prior dealings with immigration, and counsel never told him that a murder conviction would render him subject to deportation. Defendant also alleged that he would not have pled guilty had he known of the immigration consequences because he has lived in the United States nearly his entire life, has children and family here, and has no connection to the Philippines where he was born.

The Appellate Court agreed that defendant made a substantial showing that counsel's performance was deficient for failing to advise defendant of the certain immigration consequences of his plea to murder, even though defendant knew from prior immigration proceedings that his removal was already possible. And, the court concluded that defendant made a substantial showing of prejudice because under the circumstances here, it would have been rational to reject the plea and proceed to trial had defendant known that deportation was a statutory certainty and not merely a possibility.

While a conviction after trial may have resulted in a longer term of imprisonment than that imposed as part of the negotiated plea, that is not the only consideration when considering whether a noncitizen defendant's decision to insist on trial would have been rational. The Appellate Court noted that defendant had no memory of the Philippines, knows nobody there, and has significant family ties to the United States. While not everyone in defendant's position would choose to reject the plea here, the court could not say it would be irrational to do so. The Appellate Court reversed and remanded for an evidentiary hearing.

People v. Stevenson, 2020 IL App (4th) 180143 Rule 402(a) requires the trial court to provide admonitions "personally in open court," and to ensure the defendant "understands" them. The trial court does not violate Rule 402(a) by providing the admonitions to a group of defendants at the same time, so long as they are given in person. Nor does the court violate the rule if, after the admonitions, it takes a recess before determining whether defendant understood them. The rule does not require a court to immediately determine whether defendant understood the admonitions.

People v. Burge, 2019 IL App (4th) 170399 The trial court did not err in failing to admonish defendant that her guilty plea to theft may impact her ability to maintain or retain employment. That admonishment requirement is contained in [725 ILCS 5/113-4](#). Over a dissent, the majority held that by its plain language, section 113-4 requires certain admonishments when a guilty plea is entered at the time of arraignment. When a defendant pleads guilty at any later court date, the only requirement is substantial compliance with the requirements of Supreme Court Rule 402. Even if section 113-4 did apply, it is directory, not mandatory. And, given that defendant's theft conviction was premised on her stealing money from a client in the course of her employment as a home health worker, it was common sense that her job could be negatively impacted by her guilty plea.

People v. Stefanski, 2019 IL App (3d) 160140 Defendant unsuccessfully sought to withdraw his fully-negotiated guilty plea on the basis that he was not aware of the employment consequences of pleading guilty. While his case was on appeal, [725 ILCS 5/113-4\(c\)](#) was amended to require that the court admonish a defendant of potential employment consequences before accepting a guilty plea. The Appellate Court determined that the employment-admonishments amendment created a new right for defendants and was therefore substantive and not retroactive. Although a different panel of the Third District found the amendment procedural in **People v. Young, 2019 IL App (3d) 160528**, the majority here declined to follow **Young**. The concurring justice would have followed **Young** and found

that the amendment is procedural but that it could not be applied retroactively because defendant's case was pending on appeal, not in the trial court, at the time it was enacted.

People v. Curry, 2019 IL App (3d) 160783 Defendant entered a fully negotiated guilty plea to a charge of aggravated DUI in exchange for two years of probation; at the time of the plea, he was misadvised that the maximum prison sentence for the charge was 2 years, when the actual sentencing range was 3-to-14 years. Subsequently, defendant's probation was revoked, and he was sentenced to 3 years of imprisonment.

Although defendant received a longer prison sentence than he had been admonished about at the time of the plea, the Appellate Court was without jurisdiction to vacate the plea because a motion to withdraw plea had not been filed within 30 days of the original sentencing and the erroneous admonishments did not render the plea void. Likewise, the Appellate Court could not reduce defendant's sentence to 2 years to conform to the admonishments because that would be an unauthorized sentence.

The Court did vacate defendant's admission to the petition to revoke probation, however, because the 402A admonishments were defective. Defendant had not been advised of his right to present witnesses and evidence at a hearing on the petition to revoke, that the State had the burden of proving the violation, or that he had a right to counsel at such a hearing. The circuit court also failed to determine that defendant understood the applicable sentence range. While defendant did not raise this issue below, it is not subject to forfeiture. Citing **In re Westly A.F., Jr.**, 399 Ill. App. 3d 791 (2000), the Court concluded that it is not defendant's responsibility to ensure his own admonishment in accordance with due process.

People v. Young, 2019 IL App (3d) 160528 An amendment to 725 ILCS 5/113-4, which became effective while defendant's case was on appeal, did not apply retroactively in accordance with **People v. Hunter**, 2017 IL 121306. While the amendment was procedural, requiring certain additional admonishments be given to a defendant before accepting his or her guilty plea, no proceedings remained to which the amendment could be applied on appeal. The court's failure to give the new admonishments was not error. Defendant was not otherwise entitled to withdraw her plea where the record showed only that defendant had changed her mind shortly after entering the plea, which is not a valid basis on which to withdraw a knowing and voluntary plea.

People v. Campbell, 2015 IL App (3d) 130614 A stipulated bench trial is tantamount to a guilty plea when the State's whole case is presented by stipulation and the defendant does not present or preserve a defense, or when the stipulation states that the evidence is sufficient to convict. When a stipulated bench trial is tantamount to a guilty plea, the trial court must admonish the defendant pursuant to **Illinois Supreme Court Rule 402(a)**. And if relevant, the court must admonish the defendant that by stipulating that the evidence is sufficient to convict, he waives his right to a jury trial.

Prior to trial and after receiving proper admonitions, defendant waived his right to a jury. On the next court date, defendant agreed to plead guilty in exchange for a sentencing cap. The court properly admonished defendant pursuant to **Rule 402(a)**, including re-admonishing him about his right to a jury trial, and then accepted his plea.

Following sentencing, defendant successfully moved to withdraw his guilty plea. The parties then reached an agreement that in exchange for a 15-year sentence defendant would proceed with a stipulated bench trial. The trial court again admonished defendant pursuant to **Rule 402(a)**, but did not admonish him about his right to a jury trial. The State presented

a stipulated factual basis including a provision that the evidence was sufficient to prove defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. The trial court found defendant guilty.

The Appellate Court held that the stipulated bench trial was tantamount to a guilty plea and thus the trial court had an obligation to fully admonish defendant pursuant to [Rule 402\(a\)](#), including his right to a jury trial, and that by proceeding with a stipulated bench trial defendant would be waiving his right to a jury trial. Although the trial court had previously admonished defendant about his right to a jury trial, because defendant had previously waived his right to a jury trial, it was critical that the court inform him that the right was reinstated when he withdrew his guilty plea and his prior waiver had no effect.

The failure to properly admonish defendant about his right to a jury trial affected his fundamental right to a jury and thus was reviewable under the second prong of plain error. Defendant's conviction was reversed and remanded for further proceedings after proper admonitions.

People v. Unzueta, 2015 IL App (1st) 131306 Under **Padilla v. Kentucky**, 559 U.S. 356 (2010), to afford effective representation under the Sixth Amendment defense counsel must inform his client whether a guilty plea carries a risk of deportation. Under **Padilla**, the failure to so advise the defendant constitutes deficient representation.

However, the **Padilla** court expressly stated that it was not addressing the prejudice prong of **Strickland**. A finding of prejudice is required for a finding that counsel was constitutionally ineffective.

The Appellate Court noted a conflict in Illinois Appellate Court authority concerning whether a defendant who claims that his attorney was ineffective under **Padilla** establishes prejudice merely by showing that it would have been rational to reject the plea agreement had proper advice been afforded, or whether he must assert a claim of actual innocence or a plausible defense that could have been raised at trial. The court declined to reach this issue, stating that because the trial court complied with [725 ILCS 5/113-8](#) by advising the defendant that his guilty plea might carry immigration consequences, any prejudice caused by counsel's failure to comply with **Padilla** was cured. The court stressed that in addition to curing any deficiency in counsel's representation, the trial court's admonishments belied defendant's allegation that he would not have entered a guilty plea had he understood that his plea would have immigration consequences.

The court rejected the argument that the statutory admonitions were insufficient to cure defense counsel's shortcomings because they merely informed defendant that he might suffer immigration consequences, and not that deportation was mandatory upon conviction. "Defendant cites no authority for the proposition that there is a meaningful distinction . . . between being told that one *may* be deported versus being told that one *would* be deported."

People v. Cowart, 2015 IL App (1st) 131073 Before accepting a guilty plea, the trial court must admonish the defendant about the direct consequences of his plea; the court does not need to admonish the defendant about collateral consequences. A direct consequence "has a definite, immediate and largely automatic effect" on defendant's punishment. Illinois courts have held that mandatory sex offender registration is a collateral consequence, since it is neither a restraint on liberty nor a punishment.

Defendant argued that the reasoning of **Padilla v. Kentucky**, 559 U.S. 356 (2010) should be extended to require a trial court to admonish a defendant who is pleading guilty about mandatory sex offender registration. In **Padilla**, the defendant argued that his trial counsel was ineffective for failing to inform him that his guilty plea made him eligible for deportation. The United States Supreme Court held that even though deportation is a civil

consequence of a guilty plea, given its enmeshment with criminal law, it could not be “categorically removed” from defense counsel’s duty to provide proper advice to a client who is pleading guilty.

The Appellate Court rejected defendant’s argument. It held that unlike deportation, sex offender registration is not a punishment or restraint on liberty. Registration remains a collateral consequence and thus there was no need for admonitions about it. Additionally, **Padilla** involved an issue about ineffective assistance of counsel, not trial court admonitions. Since defendant raised no claim about ineffective counsel, **Padilla** does not change the outcome.

People v. Fredericks, 2014 IL App (1st) 122122 In 2012, defendant entered a guilty plea to one count of possession of methamphetamine and was sentenced to two years probation. As a result of a 1999 conviction for attempted aggravated criminal sexual abuse, the plea required defendant to register as a sex offender for life.

The trial court did not advise defendant of the lifetime registration requirement before it accepted the guilty plea on the possession offense. Defendant had completed the 10-year registration period for the 1999 conviction before the possession offense occurred.

The court concluded that a requirement to register as a sex offender is merely a collateral consequence of the plea. Therefore, due process does not require that a guilty plea defendant be admonished that he will be required to register as a sex offender.

The court acknowledged that in **Padilla v. Kentucky, 559 U.S. 356 (2010)**, the Supreme Court held that the Sixth Amendment right to the effective assistance of counsel requires defense counsel to advise a client of the immigration consequences of a guilty plea. The Illinois Supreme Court has extended **Padilla** to an attorney’s failure to inform a client that a guilty plea can lead to involuntary commitment as a sexually violent person. **People v. Hughes, 2012 IL 112817**.

Here, however, defendant contended not that his attorney rendered ineffective assistance, but that due process was violated by the trial court’s failure to provide admonishments that he would be required to register as a sex offender for the rest of his life. Whether or not counsel had a duty to advise defendant of the registration requirement, the trial court had no such duty before it could accept a guilty plea.

730 ILCS 150/5-7 requires that a defendant who is to be released on probation or conditional discharge and who is subject to a sex offender registration requirement must be advised of that requirement. In addition, **730 ILCS 150/5** requires that the trial court provide written notice of the registration requirement to an offender who is to be released on probation. Although defendant was sentenced to probation on his guilty plea, the statutory notice was not provided.

The failure to comply with the notice requirements of the Registration Act did not provide a basis for defendant to withdraw the plea. The purpose of §§5 & 5-7 is to prevent a defendant from inadvertently violating probation because he or she lacks knowledge of the registration requirement. The notification requirements are directory rather than mandatory, however, and do not prevent the trial court from accepting a guilty plea.

People v. Greco, 2014 IL App (1st) 112582 Under **725 ILCS 5/113-8**, the trial court is required to admonish a defendant about the immigration consequences of his guilty plea. The statutory provision, however, is directory, not mandatory, because no specific consequence results from noncompliance with the statute. A defendant is thus not automatically entitled to withdraw his plea where the court fails to give the proper admonitions. And since

immigration consequences are collateral, the failure to admonish does not violate due process or affect the constitutional voluntariness of a guilty plea.

The Court rejected defendant's argument that following [Padilla v. Kentucky, 559 U.S. 356 \(2010\)](#) (where the Supreme Court held that counsel is deficient if he does not inform defendant that a guilty plea may have immigration consequences), immigration consequences should no longer be viewed as collateral, and hence trial courts should be constitutionally required to admonish defendants about the immigration consequences of guilty pleas. The holding in [Padilla](#) was purposefully narrow and only applied to the duties of counsel. It did not apply to the trial court. Accordingly, the trial court's failure to admonish defendant about the immigration consequences of his plea was not an error of constitutional magnitude. Defendant's post-conviction petition was properly dismissed for failing to state a constitutional claim.

[People v. Holloway, 2014 IL App \(1st\) 131117](#) Where a guilty plea is based on a plea agreement, the terms of the agreement must be stated in open court. In addition, Rule 402 requires that the trial court confirm the terms of the agreement by questioning the defendant personally in open court and determining whether force or threats or promises apart from the plea agreement were used to obtain the plea. Whether reversal is required because the trial court failed to give the required admonishments depends on whether real justice has been denied or defendant was prejudiced by the inadequate admonishments.

Defendant pleaded guilty under an agreement which provided that if he swore to the facts alleged by the State (which were based on defendant's post-arrest comments), he would receive boot camp. However, if defendant did not respond consistently with his prior statements, he would be sentenced to seven years imprisonment. The terms of the agreement were not stated in open court or explained to defendant by the trial judge. Instead, defense counsel said that he had explained the agreement to defendant and that defendant wanted to accept the offer of boot camp with a condition that he swear under oath to the facts alleged by the State. So far as the record showed, defendant was never advised of the possibility of a seven-year-sentence or of the specific facts to which he was required to swear in order to receive boot camp.

The court concluded that because the trial court failed to explain the terms of the plea agreement in open court and ascertain defendant's knowledge of those terms, it was impossible to determine whether defendant fully understood the consequences of his plea. Because the defendant was prejudiced by the trial court's failure to comply with Rule 402(b), plain error occurred.

[People v. Carr, 407 Ill.App.3d 513, 944 N.E.2d 859 \(2d Dist. 2011\)](#) Although the trial court did not inform the defendant before his guilty plea that he would be required to serve 85% of the sentence for aggravated kidnapping, the court concluded that good time provisions constitute a collateral consequence of a plea and need not be explained before the plea is entered.

[People v. Bilelegne, 381 Ill.App.3d 292, 887 N.E.2d 564 \(1st Dist. 2008\)](#) The legislature's use of the word "shall" may create a mandatory duty, but does not necessarily do so. A strong indication of an intent to create a mandatory duty occurs where the legislature proscribes consequences for failing to comply with a statutory requirement. [725 ILCS 5/113-8](#) provides that the trial court "shall" admonish a guilty plea defendant that if he or she is not a citizen of the United States, the plea may result in deportation, exclusion from admission to the United States, or denial of naturalization. The court concluded that §113-8 was not intended

to create a mandatory duty to give such an admonishment. In support of its conclusion, the court noted that the bill which created §113-8 was amended before passage to delete the requirement that in the absence of an admonishment, the plea must be vacated if the defendant demonstrated that it had immigration consequences.

People v. Perper, 359 Ill.App.3d 863, 834 N.E.2d 1008 (2d Dist. 2005) After imposing judgment on a non-negotiated guilty plea, the trial court must admonish the defendant that: (1) he has the right to appeal; (2) before taking an appeal he must file a timely, written motion to reconsider the sentence or to withdraw the plea; (3) if the motion is allowed the sentence will be modified or the guilty plea vacated and a trial date set; (4) at the State's request any charges dismissed as part of the plea agreement will be reinstated; (5) an indigent defendant is entitled to a free report of the proceedings and the appointment of counsel; and (6) any issue not raised in the motion to reconsider the sentence or withdraw the plea shall be deemed waived. Here, the trial judge failed to inform the defendant of the consequences of successfully moving to withdraw his plea or reconsider the sentence, that he had the right to a free transcript, and that any issue not raised in the post-judgment motion would be waived.

People v. Day, 311 Ill.App.3d 271, 724 N.E.2d 994 (2d Dist. 2000) The trial court abused its discretion by denying a motion to withdraw a guilty plea where the court failed to substantially comply with Supreme Court Rule 402 before accepting the plea. The judge failed to inform defendant of the nature of the charge, the minimum and maximum sentences, and that a three-year-mandatory supervised release term would be required. The judge also failed to ascertain whether any promises had been made or advise defendant that he had the right to persist in a not guilty plea. The judge also made conflicting statements about the State's burden of proof, failed to respond to defendant's remark that he was pleading guilty because he was afraid his witnesses would not appear for trial, and failed to personally read the guilty plea form aloud when defendant indicated he had trouble reading. The deficiencies in the admonitions were not cured by the fact that defendant was represented by counsel during the plea. "Courts have rejected the argument that counsel's advice is a substitute for the required admonishments. It is the duty of the court to address the defendant personally on the record and to ascertain that he understands the consequences of his plea."

People v. Horton, 250 Ill.App.3d 944, 620 N.E.2d 437 (4th Dist. 1993) Supreme Court Rule 402, which governs the admonitions to be given to a defendant who seeks to plead guilty, and Supreme Court Rule 605, which defines the admonitions to be given after sentence is imposed, apply to indirect criminal contempt cases.

People v. Brown, 217 Ill.App.3d 66, 576 N.E.2d 887 (5th Dist. 1991) The trial judge did not substantially comply with the requirements of Supreme Court Rule 402 where defendant was not informed of the nature of the charge or his rights to plead not guilty and confront witnesses, and was not told that a consecutive sentence was mandatory.

People v. Sutherland, 128 Ill.App.3d 415, 470 N.E.2d 1210 (4th Dist. 1984) The Court set out a lengthy discussion concerning substantial compliance with Rule 402, citing numerous court decisions, and held that the trial judge here did not substantially comply with Rule 402.

People v. Henderson, 104 Ill.App.3d 62, 432 N.E.2d 660 (4th Dist. 1982) The trial court advised several defendants, en masse, of the consequences of their pleas and their rights to a jury trial and to testify. The judge also informed each defendant, individually, as to the

nature of the charge and the possible sentence, and asked whether he understood his rights. The Court held that Rule 402 does not require that each defendant be admonished individually.

People v. Cummings, 7 Ill.App.3d 306, 287 N.E.2d 291 (2d Dist. 1972) Signing a printed waiver of rights form violates Rule 402, which requires that the judge personally admonish the defendant. See also, **People v. Carle**, 8 Ill.App.3d 56, 288 N.E.2d 876 (3d Dist. 1972).

§24-6(b)

Nature of Charge

United States Supreme Court

Henderson v. Morgan, 426 U.S. 637, 96 S.Ct. 2253, 49 L.Ed.2d 108 (1976) Defendant was charged with first degree murder, and ultimately pleaded guilty to second degree murder. Following an evidentiary hearing the judge found that the defendant had not been advised by counsel or the court that intent to cause death was an essential element of second degree murder. The Court held that because defendant "did not receive adequate notice of the offense his plea was involuntary and the judgment . . . was entered without due process of law."

Illinois Supreme Court

People v. Stewart, 101 Ill.2d 470, 463 N.E.2d 677 (1984) The record showed that defendant understood the nature of the charges; though the trial judge did not explain the charges, counsel advised the defendant "at length" about the consequences of his plea, defendant changed his plea in response to the State's nolle pros of counts to which defendant claimed defenses, and the defendant and his counsel acquiesced in the State's recital of the facts.

People v. Barker, 83 Ill.2d 319, 415 N.E.2d 404 (1980) Defendant was charged with attempt murder. The indictment did not allege that defendant had "intent to kill," and during the guilty plea proceedings the defendant was not admonished that "intent to kill" was an essential element of attempt murder. The Court held that the failure to admonish the defendant concerning intent to kill did not render the plea involuntary. Rule 402(a)(1) requires that the judge inform the defendant of the nature of the charge and determine whether he understands it. Here, the defendant, stated he understood the charge, and he agreed with the factual basis.

People v. Nyberg, 64 Ill.2d 210, 356 N.E.2d 80 (1976) The trial court sufficiently determined that defendant understood the nature of the charge. Defendant was told the name of the offense, defense counsel stated that he discussed the case and the plea with defendant, the judge "carefully" admonished defendant (pausing often to ask if she understood the explanation), and the judge declared "I'm quite sure she understands everything."

People v. Robinson, 63 Ill.2d 141, 345 N.E.2d 465 (1976) Defendant was sufficiently advised of the nature of the charge where the judge said that he was charged with rape, without further explanation. "[W]hen a defendant is represented by counsel and enters a plea of guilty pursuant to an agreement it is appropriate to inform him of the nature of the charge by naming the offense." See also, **People v. McCarty**, 142 Ill.App.3d 229, 491 N.E.2d 874 (4th Dist. 1986).

People v. Krantz, 58 Ill.2d 187, 317 N.E.2d 559 (1974) The Court found that the record showed that defendant was informed of and understood the nature of the charge. Only substantial compliance with Rule 402 is necessary, and the entire record may be considered in determining whether there was an adequate understanding by the accused. Substantial compliance occurs when, reading the remarks and advice of the court in a practical and realistic manner, an "ordinary person" would understand the information required by the rule.

Illinois Appellate Court

People v. Farnsworth, 10 Ill.App.3d 844, 295 N.E.2d 83 (3d Dist. 1973) After being told of the charge, defendant informed the court that he was not guilty of one of the essential elements. The court was put on notice that defendant did not understand the nature of the charge, and without attempting to resolve the conflict should have refused the plea.

§24-6(c)

Rights to Plead Not Guilty, Go to Trial, and Confront Witnesses

Illinois Appellate Court

People v. Rambo, 123 Ill.App.2d 299, 260 N.E.2d 119 (1st Dist. 1970) Guilty plea vacated even though the trial court informed defendant of his right to a jury trial and supplied him with a jury waiver form which he signed. The trial court did not explicitly ask whether defendant wanted to waive his right to trial by jury and did not explain the meaning of the jury waiver form.

People v. Waldorf, 94 Ill.App.3d 976, 419 N.E.2d 428 (1st Dist. 1981) Plea vacated where defendant was not advised of his right to plead not guilty, that if he pleaded guilty there would be no trial of any kind, and that a plea would waive his right of confrontation. The trial court also failed to state the terms of the plea agreement and confirm those terms with the defendant.

People v. Avery, 16 Ill.App.3d 986, 307 N.E.2d 213 (5th Dist. 1974) Trial court failed to determine that defendant understood his right to plead not guilty and his right to a jury trial. Signing written waiver form is not substantial compliance with Rule 402.

People v. Carle, 7 Ill.App.3d 709, 288 N.E.2d 878 (3d Dist. 1972) It was not sufficient merely to advise defendant that he had a right to trial; he also must be advised of the right to confront witnesses. Compare, **People v. Battie**, 19 Ill.App.3d 806, 313 N.E.2d 203 (1st Dist. 1974) (it was unnecessary to admonish defendant that his guilty plea would waive the right to confront witnesses; "[d]efendant is no stranger to the criminal justice system," and "the trial court complied with Rule 402 and determined that the plea was knowingly and voluntarily made."

§24-6(d)

Possible Sentence

United States Supreme Court

U.S. v. Timmereck, 441 U.S. 780, 99 S.Ct. 2085, 60 L.Ed.2d 634 (1979) A failure to inform defendant of the mandatory parole term did not vitiate the guilty plea. Defendant did not allege that he was unaware of the parole term or that he would not have entered a plea if he knew of it.

Illinois Supreme Court

People v. Boykins, 2017 IL 121365 Mandatory supervised release terms are statutorily mandated and are not subject to plea bargaining. The State cannot offer to exclude the MSR term as part of a plea negotiation, and the trial court has no authority to decline to impose an MSR term when imposing sentence.

Supreme Court Rule 402(a)(2) and due process require that a defendant who pleads guilty must be informed by the trial court of the minimum and maximum sentences which apply to the offense for which a guilty plea is entered. Where the parties enter a negotiated plea for a specific sentence, therefore, the trial court must admonish defendant, before accepting the plea, that an MSR term will be added to the sentence. Where defendant bargains for a specific sentence and the trial court fails to state that an MSR term will be added to the sentence, fundamental due process is violated because defendant receives a more onerous sentence than that which was bargained. **People v. Whitfield**, 217 Ill. 2d 177, 840 N.E.2d 658 (2005).

To ensure that defendants understand the consequences of their plea agreements, trial judges are encouraged to explicitly link admonishments about MSR and negotiated sentences. In addition, admonishments concerning MSR should be given when the judge reviews the terms of the plea agreement with defendant and the MSR term should be reiterated both at the sentencing and in the written judgement.

However, there is no precise formula for admonishing a defendant of his MSR obligation. An admonition is sufficient if an ordinary person in the defendant's situation would understand the judge's statements as conveying the required information.

Before it accepted defendant's guilty plea, the trial court informed defendant of the range of possibilities for first degree murder, including that the required prison term was between 20 and 60 years, that based on his prior record defendant could be imprisoned for life, and that upon his release from the penitentiary defendant would be required to serve a three-year-term of mandatory supervised release. The court concluded that although the MSR term was not explicitly linked to the negotiated 22-year-sentence, an ordinary person in defendant's circumstances would have understood that the penalty included three years of MSR following whatever term of imprisonment the trial court imposed. Thus, both due process and Rule 402(a)(2) were satisfied.

People v. Guerrero, 2012 IL 112020 Defendant pleaded guilty to first degree murder in return for a negotiated 50-year prison sentence. The trial court failed to advise defendant that he would be required to serve three years of mandatory supervised release after the imprisonment ended. Furthermore, the written judgment order did not include any reference to mandatory supervised release. Defendant failed to raise the admonishment issue in his first post-conviction petition, but 12 years later filed for leave to file a successive post-conviction petition raising the issue.

Defendant claimed that he first learned that he would have to serve an MSR period in 2005 or 2006, when he spoke to Ronald Whitfield, the defendant in **People v. Whitfield**, 217 Ill.2d 177, 840 N.E.2d 658 (2005). In **Whitfield**, the court found that a reduction of a negotiated prison term was justified where the trial court failed to admonish a guilty plea

defendant of the MSR requirement. In [People v. Morris, 236 Ill.2d 345, 925 N.E.2d 1069 \(2010\)](#), however, the court held that the **Whitfield** rule applies prospectively only to convictions which were not yet finalized on December 20, 2005, the day on which **Whitfield** was announced.

At a hearing on the motion for leave to file a successive petition, defendant testified that he knew that he would have to serve parole after his prison term was finished. Defendant testified that he first learned about parole when he was transferred from juvenile to adult DOC, which he estimated was one or two years after he filed his initial post-conviction petition. The trial court denied leave to file a subsequent post-conviction petition.

A successive post-conviction petition may be filed only with leave of the court and only if the petitioner demonstrates “cause” for failing to bring the claim in the initial post-conviction petition and “prejudice” resulting from that failure. Defendant did not show cause here. According to defendant’s testimony, he knew about parole when he arrived in adult DOC. Although defendant claimed that this was after his first post-conviction proceeding, the record showed that he was an inmate at an adult institution when he filed a motion to extend the time for filing his first post-conviction petition.

Second, although **Whitfield** granted relief on the failure to admonish issue, the claim was not a new one. Instead, similar claims had been raised unsuccessfully for some 30 years before **Whitfield** was decided. A lack of precedent for a particular position does not constitute “cause” for failing to raise the issue; even where the law is unfavorable, an issue must be raised to preserve it for review.

Even had defendant been allowed to file a subsequent petition, a reduction in sentence would have been inappropriate where the defendant claimed that his plea was not entered knowingly and voluntarily. A reduction in sentence was ordered in **Whitfield** because, once the MSR term was added to the imposed sentence, the defendant did not receive the benefit of his bargain. Where a plea was not entered voluntarily, however, the appropriate remedy is to allow the defendant to withdraw his plea rather than to reduce the sentence.

[People v. Snyder, 2011 IL 111382](#) Supreme Court Rule 402 requires that the court admonish defendant regarding the minimum and maximum sentence prescribed by law before accepting defendant’s guilty plea. Where the admonition is defective but has no relevance to any bargain that defendant struck with the State in exchange for his plea, the appropriate remedy is to allow defendant the opportunity to vacate the plea rather than to vacate the portion of the sentence that does not conform to the admonition. Allowing defendant a fresh opportunity to decide whether to plead guilty, with full knowledge of the possible consequences, adequately protects his rights and avoids awarding a windfall due to the trial court’s error. It also provides both the parties and the trial court an incentive to ensure adequate admonishments.

Defendant entered a partially-negotiated plea of guilty, where some of the charges against her were dropped in exchange for her plea to the remaining charges. There was no agreement as to her sentence. The court ordered defendant to pay restitution but had failed to admonish her before accepting her plea that she could be ordered to pay restitution. Defendant nonetheless received the full benefit of her bargain with the State. Therefore the only remedy available to her was withdrawal of the plea, rather vacatur of the restitution order.

[People v. Morris & Holborow, 236 Ill.2d 345, 925 N.E.2d 1069 \(2010\)](#) Under [People v. Whitfield, 217 Ill.2d 177, 840 N.E.2d 658 \(2005\)](#), due process is violated where a defendant

is not advised that a mandatory supervised release term will be added to the sentence negotiated under a plea agreement. The court concluded that **Whitfield** created a “new” rule for purposes of retroactivity analysis.

Because the **Whitfield** holding satisfied neither of the two exceptions to the rule barring application of “new” rules in collateral proceedings, the **Whitfield** court erred by announcing a rule that should not have been applied in that case. Because the new rule was improperly adopted, it will not be applied in post-conviction cases where the conviction became final before the date of the **Whitfield** opinion - December 20, 2005.

The court clarified that when giving guilty plea admonishments concerning mandatory supervised release, the trial court should explicitly link the MSR term to the negotiated sentence to which the defendant is agreeing. Because the purpose of admonishments are to advise defendants of the actual terms of the bargain he has made with the State, an admonishment which uses the term “MSR” without “putting it in some relevant context could not serve to advise the defendant of the consequences of his guilty plea and cannot aid the defendant in making an informed decision about his case.”

Furthermore, such an admonishment should be given both at the plea hearing and at sentencing, and a reference to the MSR requirement should be placed in the written judgment.

People v. Davis, 145 Ill.2d 240, 582 N.E.2d 714 (1991) The defendant entered a guilty plea with no agreement as to sentence except that he could apply for drug treatment (TASC) and the State could seek an extended term. Defendant was also admonished that the possible sentences included probation. However, because of defendant's previous convictions, he was ineligible for either probation or TASC. The defendant's motion to withdraw the plea should have been granted because the trial court never explained that a prison sentence was mandatory. Although the mere fact that an improper admonishment is given does not necessarily require that the plea be vacated, defendant's belief that he was eligible for probation most likely led him to forego the possibility of negotiating a limited prison sentence.

People v. Kidd, 129 Ill.2d 432, 544 N.E.2d 704 (1989) Defendant pleaded guilty to murder and was sentenced to death. The Supreme Court vacated the plea and remanded the cause because defendant was not admonished as to the minimum sentence (mandatory natural life). But see, **People v. Stewart**, 101 Ill.2d 470, 463 N.E.2d 677 (1984), where the Court, in a death penalty case, concluded, "We are not persuaded that the trial judge failed to substantially comply with Rule 402 because he did not ceremoniously inform the defendant of all the lesser sentences which could possibly be imposed."

People v. McCoy, 74 Ill.2d 398, 385 N.E.2d 696 (1979) The failure to admonish the defendant concerning the mandatory parole term did not make the guilty plea involuntary where the sentence actually imposed (one to three years) and the mandatory parole term (three years) were "substantially less than the maximum of 20 years" that defendant knew he could receive. Compare, **People v. Shuman**, 226 Ill.App.3d 1065, 590 N.E.2d 99 (3d Dist. 1992) (though defendant generally need not be correctly admonished as to the maximum sentence so long as he receives a sentence less than the admonishment he received, "[t]here comes a point . . . where the defendant is so poorly admonished that his plea can no longer be said to be knowing and voluntary); **People v. Smith**, 285 Ill.App.3d 666, 676 N.E.2d 224 (1st Dist. 1996) (due process violation occurs where trial court failed to admonish on mandatory supervised release, defendant received a longer sentence than that mentioned during his

admonishments, and defendant asserts he would not have pleaded guilty had the sentence been fully explained).

People v. Wills, 61 Ill.2d 105, 330 N.E.2d 505 (1975) Rule 402(a)(2) requires that a defendant be admonished of the mandatory parole term that is part of the sentence that will be imposed. See also, **People v. O'Toole**, 174 Ill. App.3d 800, 529 N.E.2d (4th Dist. 1988).

People v. Warship, 59 Ill.2d 125, 319 N.E.2d 507 (1974) Rule 402 does not require that defendant be admonished that probation on a prior conviction may be revoked as a result of his plea. Also, the failure of the judge to advise defendant of the minimum sentence does not require reversal; "defendant does not contend that he did not understand the minimum sentence [or] that he was prejudiced by the failure of the court to state the minimum sentence."

People v. Weakley, 45 Ill.2d 549, 259 N.E.2d 802 (1970) Trial court is required to explain to defendant the maximum penalty provided by law, and cannot assume defendant has been adequately advised by counsel. Where the record fails to show that the court advised defendant of the maximum penalty, defendant is entitled to withdraw the plea.

Illinois Appellate Court

People v. Shaw, 2023 IL App (1st) 221358 Defendant made a substantial showing of an involuntary guilty plea, where his post-conviction petition alleged that both the trial court and defense counsel misled him about MSR. Specifically, he was told MSR could not affect his release date from prison, yet he was ultimately "violated at the door" and served over four years in prison beyond the term agreed to in the plea.

Defendant pled to criminal sexual assault in exchange for a five-year prison term. The MSR term was 3 years to life along with registration as a sex offender. At the guilty plea hearing, defendant specifically asked if the MSR term affects his release date. The judge said, "No, it does not," and defendant agreed to plead guilty. On his release date, IDOC informed defendant he would not be released because he could not find an approved host site that complied with the restrictions placed on sex offenders.

Defendant's post-conviction petition alleged that his plea was not voluntary because the trial court, and his attorney, misled him about the nature of MSR. If he had known about the living restrictions, and that an inability to comply would lead to a "violation at the door," he would not have pled guilty. He alleged that he would have gone to trial and presented a defense of consent. The circuit court granted the State's motion to dismiss.

The appellate court reversed. Although the trial court had no obligation to inform defendant of the collateral consequences of the plea, including the need to find an approved host site in order to be released from prison, it did have an obligation to provide accurate information once defendant asked about those details. Here, the court's statement was false – MSR could, and did, affect defendant's release date. Where these false statements induced the plea, defendant made a substantial showing of an involuntary plea.

Defendant also made a substantial showing of plea counsel's ineffectiveness by alleging that counsel assured him the MSR restrictions were not onerous and would not affect his release date. Defense counsel is not obligated to inform a defendant of all collateral consequences of the plea, but courts have recognized exceptions to this rule. "Where consequences are severe, certain to occur, 'enmeshed' in the criminal process, and are of predictable importance to a defendant's calculus, they are not categorically excluded from

Strickland's purview despite being traditionally categorized as collateral." [People v. Hughes, 2012 IL 112817, ¶49](#), citing [Padilla v. Kentucky, 559 U.S. 356 \(2010\)](#). The appellate court agreed with defendant that the risk of being "violated at the door" and held indefinitely is one such consequence, meaning that defendant's allegations, taken as true, made a showing of unreasonable assistance. The petition further made a showing of prejudice by detailing the consent defense he would have presented at trial. The court remanded for a third-stage evidentiary hearing.

[People v. Brown, 2021 IL App \(1st\) 180991](#) In 2003, defendant pled guilty to a murder and hijacking committed at age 15. He received concurrent sentences of 30 and 15 years. In a post-conviction petition, defendant alleged that the trial court's plea admonishments misstated the maximum possible penalty as life in prison or the death penalty. The circuit court dismissed the claim at the second stage.

On appeal, defendant alleged that his plea was involuntary because the trial court advised him that he faced a sentence of 20 to 60 years, without informing him that he could not receive a sentence of more than 40 years unless the court found him permanently incorrigible. Defendant cited [People v. Parker, 2019 IL App \(5th\) 150192](#), for the proposition that misinforming a juvenile defendant as to his eligibility for a *de facto* life sentence renders a plea involuntary.

The Appellate Court found this claim waived because it was not included in defendant's petition. The Supreme Court has repeatedly held that a defendant may not raise a new claim for the first time on appeal from the dismissal of a post-conviction petition. The court rejected the argument that [People v. Nieto, 2020 IL App \(1st\) 121604-B](#) created an exception to this rule for **Miller** claims. **Nieto** involved an as-applied **Miller** challenge to a 78-year sentence imposed on a juvenile, which had not been raised below because **Miller** and **Buffer** were resolved during the pendency of the appeal. The Appellate Court here did not believe the relaxation of forfeiture in **Nieto** should be extended to the instant case, where defendant did not receive a *de facto* life sentence. Nor did it agree with the dissent's position that the claim could be reached where the admonishment claim in the petition sufficiently preserved the claim. Defendant made clear in his briefs that he sought to raise a new claim based on **Miller** and **Parker**, not the straightforward admonishment claim included in the petition.

[People v. Robinson, 2021 IL App \(1st\) 181653](#) Defendant pled guilty to murder and attempt murder, committed at age 17, and received concurrent sentences of 35 and 30 years. The defendant's post-conviction petition stated the gist of a claim that his guilty plea was secured by the threat of a now unconstitutional *de facto* life sentence. As in [People v. Parker, 2019 IL App \(5th\) 150192](#), the Appellate Court held that the defendant's belief that he faced a 60-year maximum, rather than a potential 40-year maximum, rendered his plea involuntary.

The Appellate Court rejected the State's argument that defendant's fully negotiated plea foreclosed his claim. Defendant's rights under the eighth amendment in this context were not known at the time he pled guilty; therefore, he could not have voluntarily relinquished them. The court also rejected the State's argument that defendant lacked a claim because he did not receive a *de facto* life sentence, as the key question is not whether he received a life sentence, but whether his decision to accept the plea was involuntary due to the threat of a potential *de facto* life sentence.

[People v. Williams, 2019 IL App \(3d\) 160412](#) Because the Illinois Supreme Court’s most recent analysis of SORA concluded that it is not punitive, it remains a “collateral consequence” of the plea and its absence from admonishments does not render a guilty plea unknowing or involuntary. While the Appellate Court agreed that current SORA laws are punitive, defendant pled guilty in 2015, prior to the current version of SORA.

[People v. Parker, 2019 IL App \(5th\) 150192](#) The trial court erred in denying defendant leave to file a successive petition alleging a **Miller** violation. Defendant pled guilty to first-degree murder, based on accountability, committed at age 16, after the State agreed to a 50-year sentencing cap. Defendant was admonished that the crime carried a sentence up to natural life. He agreed to the cap, pled guilty and received 35 years. In his successive petition, he alleged he received a *de facto* natural life sentence in violation of **Miller**. The circuit court denied leave to file, finding the sentence was not *de facto* life, and that the sentencing court did consider defendant’s age in mitigation.

On appeal, defendant conceded that in light of **Buffer**, his sentence is not a *de facto* life sentence. But he argued that his plea was not voluntary where he was not adequately informed of his eligibility for a life sentence or the 50-year cap, neither of which were available absent a finding of incorrigibility. The Appellate Court held that defendant established cause, as his initial petition was filed before **Miller**. It also found prejudice, because **Buffer** would have established that the State’s cap represented a *de facto* life sentence, and defendant could not have knowingly agreed to this plea without understanding that neither the maximum nor the sentencing cap would be available absent a finding of incorrigibility.

[People v. Pace, 2015 IL App \(1st\) 110415](#) Under Illinois Supreme Court Rule 402(a)(2), a trial court must admonish a defendant about “the minimum and maximum sentence prescribed by law, including, when applicable...consecutive sentences.” The court must substantially comply with Rule 402, meaning that the court need not recite the rule verbatim, but the record must affirmatively and specifically show that defendant understood the components of the rule. In addition, the defendant must demonstrate prejudice as a result of the improper admonitions to obtain reversal of his guilty plea.

Here the trial court did not admonish defendant (who pled guilty and received consecutive sentences totaling 100 years) that he would be subject to consecutive sentencing. The Appellate Court thus found that the trial court failed to substantially comply with Rule 402. But, the Court also found that defendant could not show that he suffered prejudice as a result of the improper admonitions.

First, defendant did not allege in his motion to vacate guilty plea or his appellate brief that he would not have pled guilty if he had received proper admonitions. Second, the trial court informed defendant that the maximum sentence he faced was life imprisonment. Thus the trial court did not impose a sentence that exceeded the sentence defendant was told he could receive. And third, defendant entered a blind plea with no agreement with the State regarding his sentence. Defendant thus had no reasonable expectations about his possible sentence.

[People v. Williams, 2014 IL App \(3rd\) 120824](#) Defendant was convicted, on a guilty plea, of unlawful delivery of a controlled substance. The trial court advised defendant on several occasions that the maximum sentence for the offense was 60 years. However, the parties agreed to a sentencing cap of 25 years’ imprisonment.

The trial judge's admonishment was in error and prejudiced defendant. Several statutes arguably applied to the maximum sentence. [730 ILCS 5/5-4.5-95](#) authorizes a Class X sentence for a defendant who is convicted of a Class 1 or Class 2 felony after having twice been convicted in any state or federal court of an offense which contains the same elements as a Class 2 or greater felony. [720 ILCS 570/408](#) provides that a person convicted of a second or subsequent offense under the Controlled Substances Act may be sentenced to imprisonment for a term up to twice the maximum term otherwise authorized. The trial court applied the Class X sentencing provision of [730 ILCS 5/5-4.5-95](#) to find that defendant was subject to a Class X sentence of six to 30 years, and then applied the doubling provision of §408 to calculate a maximum sentence of 60 years.

The Appellate Court found that the above statutes conflicted with [730 ILCS 5/5-8-2](#), which authorizes a sentence in excess of the base sentence only if a factor in aggravation under [730 ILCS 5/5-5-3.2](#) is present. The only provision of §5-5-3.2 applicable here was (b)(1), which authorizes an extended term where the defendant is convicted of any felony after having been previously convicted of the same or greater class felony within the past 10 years. [730 ILCS 5/5-5-3.2\(b\)\(1\)](#).

In [People v. Olivo](#), 183 Ill. 2d 339, 701 N.E.2d 511 (1998), the Supreme Court held that a Class X extended term may be imposed under §5-5-3.2(b)(1) only if the defendant has been convicted of a Class X felony. Because defendant had never been convicted of a Class X felony and faced Class X sentencing solely because of his prior convictions, under [Olivo](#) he was not eligible for a Class X extended term.

The court concluded that where statutes conflict, the most recently enacted statute controls. Because §5-8-2 was enacted after the sentencing doubling provision of §408, it controlled. Because defendant was ineligible for a Class X extended term, he could not receive a sentence greater than the 30-year maximum for a Class X conviction.

Although the parties agreed to a sentencing cap that was less than the 30-year maximum sentence which actually applied, defendant was prejudiced by the trial court's erroneous admonishments that the maximum sentence was 60 years. The court noted that defendant alleged that he had relied on the faulty admonishments in deciding to accept the plea bargain. When defendant accepted the sentencing cap of 25 years, he believed that he faced a maximum of 60 years. Had defendant realized that he had negotiated a reduction in the maximum sentence of only five years instead of 35, he might not have been willing to accept the plea agreement. Under these circumstances, prejudice was established.

[People v. Chavez](#), 2013 IL App (4th) 120259 Supreme Court [Rule 402\(a\)](#) requires the court to admonish a defendant of the "minimum and maximum sentence prescribed by law, including, when applicable, the penalty to which the defendant may be subjected because of prior convictions or consecutive sentences." Substantial, not literal, compliance with this rule is required. An imperfect admonition does not require reversal unless real justice has been denied or prejudice results.

Defendant entered an open plea to two Class X felonies. The court informed defendant they were punishable by a minimum term of six years and a maximum penalty of 30 years. When the prosecution informed the court that it would request discretionary consecutive sentences and that it believed defense counsel had "informed his client," the court explained to the defendant that it could sentence him to concurrent or consecutive terms. The court explained by example that if it sentenced defendant to six-year terms, they could run at the same time, in which case it would be a single six-year sentence. Or the court could order that the sentences run consecutively. "So again, if it were six-year terms, it would be six and six or a 12-year total term or any other term that could be imposed." The defendant stated he

understood and had no questions. The court sentenced defendant to consecutive terms of 20 and 30 years, for a total of 50 years.

The admonitions were sufficient to inform the defendant of the maximum penalty to which he could be subjected, even though the court had not explained that any consecutive sentences could add up to an aggregate sentence greater than the maximum penalty of 30 years. The court advised the defendant of the sentencing range for Class X felonies, the difference between concurrent and consecutive sentences and how consecutive sentences work. “While a perfect admonishment might state the maximum aggregate sentence in years,” perfection is not required, only substantial compliance.

People v. Williams, 2012 IL App (2d) 110559 Where the trial court’s **Rule 402** admonishments informed defendant that he was eligible for T.A.S.C. probation, but in fact due to his prior record defendant was ineligible for the T.A.S.C. program, defendant was entitled to withdraw his plea only if he could establish that he was prejudiced by the erroneous admonishment. Defendant did not make an adequate showing of prejudice where he failed to claim that he would not have pleaded guilty had he known he was ineligible for T.A.S.C., and stated only that accurate admonishments would have allowed him to “more accurately [consider] the sentencing paradigm and [determine whether] his potential sentencing range was great enough that it would be more advantageous to elect to stand trial.” The court concluded that without a more specific claim of prejudice, defendant was not entitled to withdraw his plea.

People v. Hunter, 2011 IL App (1st) 093023 Under Supreme Court **Rule 402**, the trial court may not accept a guilty plea without admonishing the defendant concerning several points, including the maximum and minimum sentences which apply to the conviction. In **People v. Whitfield**, 217 Ill.2d 177, 840 N.E.2d 658 (2005), the Supreme Court held that due process and Supreme Court **Rule 402** are violated if the trial court accepts a guilty plea without informing the defendant that he will be subject to a term of mandatory supervised release once his prison term is completed.

The Appellate Court concluded that the trial court substantially complied with **Rule 402**, and satisfied due process requirements, where it advised defendant before his plea that the offense carried a two-year period of mandatory supervised release, even though the judge did not mention the MSR term a few minutes later when imposing the negotiated sentence. Although **People v. Morris**, 236 Ill.2d 345, 925 N.E.2d 1069 (2010), held that the “better practice” would be to incorporate the MSR admonition in the announcement of sentence, the Appellate Court concluded that such express linkage is not required so long as the defendant was advised before he pleaded guilty that he would be required to serve MSR.

People v. Davis, 403 Ill.App.3d 461, 934 N.E.2d 550 (1st Dist. 2010) Noting a conflict in appellate authority, the Appellate Court held that **People v. Whitfield** was not violated where the trial court admonished defendant at the plea hearing that he would be required to serve a term of mandatory supervised release, but failed to mention MSR at sentencing. (Affirming **People v. Marshall**, 381 Ill.App.3d 724, 886 N.E.2d 1106 (1st Dist. 2008)). The court stated that under **Whitfield**, a “constitutional violation occurs only when there is absolutely no mention to a defendant, before he actually pleads guilty, that he must serve an MSR term in addition to the agreed-upon sentence that he will receive in exchange for his plea of guilty.”

Because defendant knew before he entered the guilty plea that he would be sentenced to the penitentiary, and was told during the plea hearing that persons sentenced to the

penitentiary must serve MSR, he was placed on notice that he would have to serve an MSR term in addition to the penitentiary sentence. The court acknowledged, however, that “[t]he better practice would incorporate the mandatory supervised release admonition when the specific sentencing is announced,” and that “the written sentencing judgment should also include the term of mandatory supervised release.”

People v. Dorsey, 404 Ill.App.3d 829, 942 N.E.2d 535 (4th Dist. 2010) Defendants must be advised that a term of mandatory supervised release will be added to the actual sentence or sentencing range agreed upon in return for a plea of guilty. **People v. Morris**, 236 Ill.2d 345, 925 N.E.2d 1069 (2010).

In the context of advising defendant of the maximum penalties he faced independent of the plea agreement, the court stated, “If you’re sent to prison there’s a period of MSR of three years.” Defendant filed a post-conviction petition complaining that the court had failed to advise him that any sentence he received based on his plea agreement included an MSR term.

The Appellate Court noted that post-**Morris**, the districts are split on whether a general admonition that the defendant must serve an MSR term if he is sentenced to a term of imprisonment is sufficient to inform a defendant that his agreed-upon sentence or sentencing range includes an MSR term. The First, Fourth and Fifth (in *dicta*) Districts find such admonition sufficient to put the defendant on notice that he will serve an MSR term, while the Second District rejects that view because the admonition does not convey unconditionally that the MSR term will be added to the negotiated sentence or sentencing range.

The Appellate Court concurred with the Second District that an admonition such as that given to the defendant links the MSR term only to the statutory sentencing range or maximum penalties, and defendant could reasonably believe that the MSR term would apply to him only if he did not plead guilty under the negotiated plea agreement.

The court affirmed the trial court’s order dismissing the petition.

People v. Andrews, 403 Ill.App.3d 654, 936 N.E.2d 648 (4th Dist. 2010) The Appellate Court finds the dispositive holding of **People v. Whitfield**, 217 Ill.2d 177, 840 N.E.2d 658 (2005), to be that the trial court must inform the defendant that the MSR term will be added to his negotiated sentence, not that the MSR term is part of the negotiated sentence. The defendant prevailed in **Whitfield** only because the court made no reference at all to the MSR term, not because the court failed to inform defendant that the MSR term was part of his negotiated sentence. The statutorily-mandated MSR term cannot be part of a plea negotiation because there is nothing to negotiate. The MSR admonition is not required by Supreme Court Rule 402(b), which directs that the terms of the plea agreement be stated in open court, but by 402(a)(2), which directs the court to advise defendant of the minimum and maximum penalties prescribed by law. **People v. Morris**, 236 Ill.2d 345, 925 N.E.2d 1069 (2010), does not change this analysis, even though **Morris** also makes reference to defendant’s plea agreement.

Applying this analysis, the Appellate Court found no due process violation. The prosecutor accurately stated the plea agreement without reference to the MSR term. The court mentioned as part of its 402(a)(2) admonition that if defendant was convicted and sentenced to prison, there would be a one-year MSR term.

People v. Burns, 405 Ill.App.3d 40, 933 N.E.2d 1208 (2d Dist. 2010) In **People v. Morris**, 236 Ill.2d 345, 925 N.E.2d 1069 (2010), the Illinois Supreme Court held that whether an admonition regarding mandatory supervised release (MSR) substantially complies with Rule 402 is a fact-specific inquiry that focuses on whether an ordinary person in defendant's place would reasonably understand that MSR will be added to the actual sentence agreed upon in exchange for the guilty plea.

The court advised defendant at the plea hearing that "a conviction of these offenses could result in you being sentenced to the Illinois Department of Corrections for a period of time from 6 to 30 years; the extended term is 30 to 60 years. There's a potential fine of up to \$25,000, with a period of three years mandatory supervised release." This admonition was insufficient because it did not link MSR to the actual sentences defendant would receive and did not convey unconditionally that MSR would be added to the agreed-upon sentences.

Defendant's plea bargain was for concurrent 21-year sentences to charges of armed robbery and home invasion. This was the minimum term of imprisonment for each offense because the court was required to impose a 15-year add-on to each Class X sentence. 720 ILCS 5/18-2(a)(2) and 5/12-11(a)(3). Because the court was not authorized to reduce those sentences below that minimum, the only remedy available to defendant for the faulty MSR admonition was vacation of his plea.

People v. Snyder, 403 Ill.App.3d 637, 935 N.E.2d 137 (3d Dist. 2010) Defendant entered a plea of guilty where there was no agreement regarding the sentence she would receive. The court did not admonish her about the possibility of restitution, but then ordered defendant to pay restitution when it imposed sentence. Relying on **People v. Whitfield**, 217 Ill.2d 177, 840 N.E.2d 658 (2005), the Appellate Court vacated the restitution order because of the defective admonition.

People v. Thomas, 402 Ill.App.3d 1129, 932 N.E.2d 658 (5th Dist. 2010) In **People v. Morris**, 236 Ill.2d 345, 925 N.E.2d 1069 (2010), the Supreme Court held that **People v. Whitfield**, 217 Ill.2d 177, 840 N.E.2d 658 (2005), does not apply retroactively to convictions which became final before December 20, 2005, the date on which **Whitfield** was announced. Here, the court held that the conviction in defendant's case became final on November 15, 2005, when consecutive sentences were entered on a guilty plea which had been entered a week earlier. Because defendant's conviction was final before December 20, 2005, the **Whitfield** rule did not apply to this case.

People v. Wigod, 406 Ill.App.3d 66, 940 N.E.2d 202 (1st Dist. 2010) Supreme Court Rule 402(a)(2) provides that a court shall not accept a plea of guilty without addressing defendant in open court, informing him of and determining that he understands the minimum and maximum sentences prescribed by law.

The court admonished defendant, who entered a blind plea to a charge of failure to support (750 ILCS 16/15(a)(4)) that the offense was a Class 4 felony, probationable, and punishable by a minimum term of imprisonment of one year and a maximum of three years, with one year of mandatory supervised release. The court did not advise defendant that the court was also required by statute to order restitution in the amount of the total unpaid support obligation at the time of sentencing, or that defendant could be fined. The court sentenced defendant to a term of probation and ordered restitution as required by statute. Because defendant could reasonably conclude based on the court's admonitions that his decision to plead guilty would subject him to a sentence of probation or imprisonment in lieu

of having to pay the arrearage on his support obligation, defendant's plea was not made with knowledge of its consequences.

The court vacated the circuit court's judgment and allowed defendant to withdraw his plea and plead anew.

People v. Johnson, 392 Ill.App.3d 897, 910 N.E.2d 677 (1st Dist. 2009) Defendant's attempt to litigate a **Whitfield** claim in a successive post-conviction petition was rejected because he could not meet the "cause and prejudice test

People v. Serrano, 392 Ill.App.3d 1011, 912 N.E.2d 325 (1st Dist. 2009) Under **People v. Whitfield**, 217 Ill.2d 177, 840 N.E.2d 658 (2005), due process is violated where a defendant pleads guilty in exchange for a specific sentence, but receives a more onerous sentence due to the mandatory supervised release requirement. The trial court's admonitions are insufficient where the defendant is told he will serve a period of mandatory supervised release, but is not informed of the specific length of MSR that will be required. "[I]nforming the defendant that he will have to serve MSR without specifying the length of the term does not fulfill the court's duty under Supreme Court Rule 402(a)(2) to admonish him concerning the sentence to be imposed."

The court rejected the State's argument that although the trial court failed to advise defendant that he would be required to serve a three-year MSR term for attempt first degree murder, the sentence should be reduced by only two years because defendant was properly advised that he would serve a one year period of MSR for an unrelated controlled substance offense. An admonishment concerning the consequences of pleading guilty to one crime cannot serve as an admonishment of the consequences of pleading to a separate crime which carries a different statutory MSR period.

People v. Gregory, 379 Ill.App.3d 414, 883 N.E.2d 762 (4th Dist. 2008) The defendant's plea agreement was void because an essential part of the agreement - a sentencing cap of three years - was less than the minimum sentence that was authorized in light of the defendant's prior record. Although defendant was subject to a mandatory 15-year-sentence, he was admonished that the sentencing range was three to seven years and that he could receive probation. Resentencing defendant to a term of which he had been admonished was not an available remedy when the parties learned, during probation revocation proceedings, that defendant had been ineligible for probation in the first place. Although specific performance is an accepted remedy it is "not a viable option" where the plea agreement is void because an essential condition was unauthorized under Illinois law.

People v. Davison, 378 Ill.App.3d 1010, 883 N.E.2d 648 (4th Dist. 2008) The Appellate Court held that defendant's plea was involuntary where the trial court failed to admonish him at the time of the plea that he was subject to mandatory consecutive sentences. The cause was remanded with instructions that the defendant be given an opportunity to withdraw his guilty plea.

People v. Company, 376 Ill.App.3d 846, 876 N.E.2d 1055 (5th Dist. 2007) Under **People v. Whitfield**, 217 Ill.2d 177, 840 N.E.2d 615 (2005), due process and Supreme Court Rule 402 are violated when a defendant pleads guilty in exchange for a specific sentence, but is not advised before the plea that a mandatory supervised release term will be added to that sentence. The defendant is entitled to relief when, judged by objective standards, the circumstances surrounding the guilty plea justified his mistaken impression that the

sentence did not include a MSR term. Here, the trial court admonished defendant that he would be subject to a MSR term if convicted at trial, but did not mention the possibility of mandatory supervised release in connection with a negotiated sentence. In addition, the written order did not refer to a term of MSR. Under these circumstances, the defendant could have reasonably believed that he was subject to a MSR term only if convicted at a trial. The appropriate remedy was to enforce the "negotiated plea agreement as [the defendant] understood it." Therefore, the cause was remanded with instructions to reduce the defendant's 15-year-sentence to a term of 12 years to be followed by a 3-year-term of MSR.

People v. Welch, 376 Ill.App.3d 705, 877 N.E.2d 134 (2d Dist. 2007) Defendant could raise, in a successive post-conviction petition, the trial court's failure to properly admonish him of the MSR term before he pleaded guilty. Because defendant claimed to have learned of the MSR term for the first time while in prison, and there was no evidence that he knew of the issue during the prior post-conviction proceedings, the issue was not defaulted.

People v. Taylor, 368 Ill.App.3d 703, 859 N.E.2d 20 (2d Dist. 2006) Under 730 ILCS 5/5-8-2(b), an extended term may be imposed on a guilty plea only where the record shows that defendant knew, when the plea was entered, that such a sentence "was a possibility." Where the trial court said only that certain sentences could be imposed "if extended term applies," the admonishments were insufficient to permit an extended term sentence once probation was revoked. By stating that a certain sentence was possible "if" enhanced sentencing applied, the judge failed to inform the defendant whether he was eligible for such sentencing. "This type of conditional, tentative admonishment leaves a defendant to speculate whether an extended-term sentence is possible in his case." The court also noted that neither the trial judge nor the attorneys were certain whether defendant was eligible for an extended term, making it unlikely that defendant knew whether he was eligible. If the defendant does not receive proper admonishments, he cannot be subjected to an extended term unless he is first allowed to withdraw his plea without prejudice. Because the defendant was being sentenced on a revocation of probation, however, he could not challenge the basis of the underlying conviction. Thus, withdrawal of the guilty plea was not an alternative, and the only remedy was to impose a non-extended term.

People v. Mendoza, 342 Ill.App.3d 195, 795 N.E.2d 316 (2d Dist. 2003) The trial court's failure to admonish a guilty plea defendant concerning mandatory Class X sentencing did not constitute plain error, because the 10-year Class X sentence imposed upon revocation of the defendant's probation was within the extended term sentencing range of which defendant had been advised at the time of his plea. The court noted that defendant did not move to withdraw his plea or claim that he would not have entered a guilty plea had the sentencing admonishments been accurate.

People v. Lappin, 335 Ill.App.3d 418, 780 N.E.2d 744 (4th Dist. 2002) Where the probationer pleaded guilty in 1997 to two counts of aggravated criminal sexual abuse with an agreement that consecutive sentences could not be ordered, the trial court was not prohibited, upon revoking probation, from ordering defendant's prison terms to be served consecutively to the offense that was the basis for the revocation. The court concluded that the only restriction in the original plea agreement was that the two counts in that case must be served concurrently. In addition, under **People v. Johns**, 229 Ill.App.3d 740, 593 N.E.2d 594 (4th Dist. 1992), the trial court is not limited to the original plea agreement when imposing a sentence upon revocation of probation. The court also held that defendant's

consecutive sentences on the probation revocation need not be vacated because defendant was not admonished, before he admitted to the probation violation, that consecutive sentences were possible. Under [People v. Hall, 198 Ill.2d 173, 760 N.E.2d 971 \(2001\)](#), guilty plea admonitions under Supreme Court Rule 402 are not required for persons admitting to probation violations. While Hall requires that certain admonitions be given to a probationer who intends to admit to a probation violation, including the "sentencing range for the underlying offense," the possibility of consecutive sentencing is not a required admonishment.

[People v. Vasquez, 332 Ill.App.3d 269, 772 N.E.2d 922 \(1st Dist. 2002\)](#) Before a defendant enters a guilty plea he must be advised of the nature of the charge and the maximum and minimum sentences. The judge indicated that the plea agreement called for concurrent terms of nine years on two counts of aggravated criminal sexual abuse, but failed to state the minimum and maximum authorized sentences, that defendant was eligible for an extended term, or that he would be required to serve a ten-year period of supervision following his release. The trial court's responsibility to give adequate admonitions is not negated by the fact that the defendant has negotiated a plea agreement; the court is required to "spell out" the minimum and maximum authorized sentences whether or not the plea is negotiated.

[People v. Fish, 316 Ill.App.3d 795, 737 N.E.2d 694 \(3d Dist. 2000\)](#) A defendant who receives a substantially higher sentence than was specified in the plea admonishments is entitled to relief even where he does not specifically argue that he would have refused to enter the plea had the admonishments been proper. Although a defendant is not entitled to relief for incomplete admonishments unless he makes a good faith argument of prejudice, the mere failure to allege that one would have acted differently does not preclude a finding of prejudice.

[People v. Cavins, 288 Ill.App.3d 173, 679 N.E.2d 1276 \(5th Dist. 1997\)](#) An extended term of 10 years was not void, although the defendant was not admonished of the possibility of an extended term, where he was told that he could receive a non-extended term of six to 30 years.

[People v. Wills, 251 Ill.App.3d 640, 622 N.E.2d 1271 \(5th Dist. 1993\)](#) The Court held that the plea was involuntary because defendant had not been admonished about the possibility of consecutive sentencing. However, merely allowing defendant to withdraw the plea was an insufficient remedy because defendant had relied on the trial court's admonitions in giving inculpatory statements, paying restitution, and helping the victims in their civil suits against his co-conspirators. Because withdrawing the plea would not restore him to his original position the Court modified the sentences to run concurrently.

[People v. Tripp, 248 Ill.App.3d 706, 618 N.E.2d 1157 \(5th Dist. 1993\)](#) Defendant pled guilty to four counts of murder. At the plea hearing, defendant was admonished that the minimum sentence was 20 years and the maximum was natural life. At sentencing, the trial court said it had recently discovered that a natural life sentence was mandatory, but that counsel had discussed the situation with defendant and agreed that such a sentence could be imposed. Defendant subsequently claimed that the plea had been involuntary because he had been incorrectly advised of the sentencing possibilities, and that counsel had been ineffective for failing to inform him that a natural life sentence was mandatory. At a hearing, defense counsel testified that at the judge's request he had advised defendant of the mandatory sentence. According to counsel, defendant had decided to persist in his pleas. The trial judge

interjected that he had told defense counsel that defendant could either persist in his pleas or withdraw them, and defense counsel agreed and said he had relayed this information to the defendant. However, defendant testified that the conversation with defense counsel had lasted only five minutes, and he had pleaded guilty in the belief he was eligible for a sentence of 20 to 80 years. The Court held that Rule 402 cannot be satisfied where the defendant is given incorrect information about the range of penalties and the defective admonishments were not cured by counsel's consultation with defendant at the sentencing hearing. Guilty plea admonishments are to be given in open court by the trial judge; an off-the-record discussion between the defendant and his attorney fails to insure that proper admonishments have been made.

People v. Johns, 229 Ill.App.3d 740, 593 N.E.2d 594 (4th Dist. 1992) Defendant's plea agreement limited the maximum sentence to five years imprisonment. The trial court's admonishments repeatedly stated that the maximum sentence would be five years, and failed to state that the statutory sentencing range was three to seven years. The judge imposed a sentence of five years probation and told defendant that if he violated probation, he would be exposed to a five-year-sentence. Probation was later revoked and a six-year-sentence was imposed. The Court held that once probation is revoked, sentencing options are not limited by the terms of the initial plea agreement. However, a defendant cannot receive a sentence greater than that of which he was admonished at the time of the plea.

People v. Terneus, 239 Ill.App.3d 669, 607 N.E.2d 568 (4th Dist. 1992) The trial judge is not required to advise a defendant who is pleading guilty that he will be required to pay court costs. Payment of court costs is merely a collateral consequence of a conviction.

People v. Mapps, 198 Ill.App.3d 521, 555 N.E.2d 1275 (5th Dist. 1990) Defendant pleaded guilty and was given an extended term sentence of five years. The record showed defendant was only admonished that he could receive a sentence of one to three years, and was not admonished as to an extended term sentence. The Court held that a defendant who pleads guilty must have knowledge of the possibility of an extended term. Otherwise, he may not be subjected to such a sentence unless he is first given an opportunity to withdraw his plea. Here, the defendant did not learn of the possibility of an extended term until he was sentenced, and was not given an opportunity to withdraw his plea. Therefore, the excess portion of the extended term sentence was stricken and the sentence was reduced to three years.

People v. Stoneking, 193 Ill.App.3d 98, 549 N.E.2d 931 (3d Dist. 1990) Defendant's plea was vacated because the trial court failed to admonish him that a natural life sentence for first degree murder precludes the possibility of parole.

People v. Butler, 186 Ill.App.3d 510, 541 N.E.2d 171 (2d Dist. 1989) Defendant pleaded guilty to burglary and theft, but was not admonished as to the possibility of consecutive sentences. Defendant was sentenced to probation for both offenses but probation was later revoked and consecutive sentences were imposed. The Court held that the imposition of consecutive sentences without the appropriate admonishment was error.

People v. Nolte, 167 Ill.App.3d 915, 522 N.E.2d 283 (3d Dist. 1988) Defendant pleaded guilty, and received a sentence which ran consecutively to a previously imposed sentence. The plea was vacated because defendant had not been admonished of the possibility of a

consecutive sentence. See also, [People v. Akers](#), 137 Ill.App.3d 922, 484 N.E.2d 1160 (4th Dist. 1985).

[People v. Jenkins](#), 141 Ill.App.3d 602, 490 N.E.2d 953 (4th Dist. 1986) Defendant pleaded guilty and was sentenced to imprisonment and ordered to pay restitution. The Court vacated the order of restitution because this sanction was never mentioned during the plea admonishments. See also, [People v. Culp](#), 127 Ill.App.3d 916, 468 N.E.2d 1328 (4th Dist. 1984).

[People v. Kane](#), 140 Ill.App.3d 928, 489 N.E.2d 500 (1st Dist. 1986) Not informing defendant of the factors in aggravation that could justify an extended term sentence does not invalidate the plea. See also, [People v. Roesler](#), 195 Ill.App.3d 1007, 552 N.E.2d 1242 (5th Dist. 1990).

[People v. Scheidt](#), 144 Ill.App.3d 12, 494 N.E.2d 159 (3d Dist. 1986) A change in the good-time credit policy did not render defendant's previous guilty plea involuntary.

§24-6(e) Right to Appeal

Illinois Supreme Court

[People v. Dominguez](#), 2012 IL 111336 Supreme Court Rule 605(c) provides admonitions to be given by the trial judge to a defendant who has been sentenced on a guilty plea. The rule specifically states that the trial court “shall advise the defendant” of six specific admonitions. Here, the trial court misstated two of the six admonitions and omitted any reference to a third.

The court concluded that under the circumstances, the admonishments “substantially complied” with Rule 605(c). The failure to give the admonitions verbatim is not reversible error so long as the trial court “substantially complies” with Rule 605(c) by imparting the essence of the matters involved in the rule. “Substantial compliance” occurs if the court adequately informs the defendant what he must do to preserve the right to appeal his guilty plea or sentence.

As a matter of first impression, the court held that written admonishments are not adequate substitutes for oral admonishments. However, where the written admonishments are acknowledged in open court and it is ascertained that the defendant is aware of and understands them, the written admonishments may supplement the oral admonishments required under the rule. Thus, when there is a question whether oral admonishments substantially complied with Rule 605(c), written admonishments which the court and the defendant discussed in open court may be relevant to determining whether the defendant was substantially advised in accordance with Rule 605(c).

Rule 605(c)(2) requires that the trial court inform the defendant that to take an appeal, he must within 30 days file a written motion asking to have the judgment vacated and the guilty plea withdrawn. Although it was “unfortunate” that the trial court misstated the admonishment by telling defendant that he had “to return to the courtroom” within 30 days to file post-plea motions, the court found that the oral admonishment, when combined with written admonishments that given to the defendant, substantially informed defendant of the requirement that he file a motion to withdraw his plea before seeking to appeal.

Rule 605(c)(5) requires that the defendant be informed that if he or she is indigent, a transcript will be provided and counsel appointed to assist with the preparation of the post-plea motions. Although the trial judge's oral admonishments erroneously gave the impression that defendant could receive a transcript and the assistance of counsel only after a motion to withdraw the plea had been denied, the court concluded that the admonitions "reflect[ed] that a court-appointed attorney would be available for the defendant." Thus, the admonitions substantially complied with the rule. The court also noted the written admonitions clearly indicated that counsel could be appointed to help defendant prepare the post-plea motions.

The court acknowledged that the trial court completely failed to mention the admonishment required under Rule 605(c)(4) - that if the plea was vacated the State could reinstate all charges dismissed under the negotiated plea agreement. Despite the complete absence of any oral admonition, the court found substantial compliance with the rule because defendant acknowledged receiving written admonitions which complied with the rule.

People ex rel. Alvarez v. Skryd, 241 Ill.2d 34, 944 N.E.2d 347 (2011) No appeal may be taken from a judgment entered on a plea of guilty unless the defendant files in the circuit court within 30 days of sentencing an appropriate post-plea motion. Supreme Court Rule 604(d). As a general rule, where defendant fails to file such a motion, the Appellate Court must dismiss the appeal. The 30-day requirement of Rule 604(d) incorporates the general limitation that a circuit court loses jurisdiction to vacate or modify its judgment 30 days after entry of judgment.

An admonition exception to this rule exists where the circuit court fails to admonish defendant regarding his right to appeal as required by Supreme Court Rule 605. Dismissal of an appeal based on defendant's failure to file the motion required by Rule 604(d) violates due process where the court fails to comply with Rule 605 because defendant has not been informed that the filing of the motion was necessary. In such circumstances, the appeal is not dismissed. Rather, the reviewing court must remand the cause to the circuit court for proper admonishments and strict compliance with Rule 604(d).

This admonition exception is for the Appellate Court to apply after the defendant files a notice of appeal from a guilty plea without first complying with Rule 604(d). The admonition exception does not restore jurisdiction to the circuit court after 30 days from entry of judgment. While the absence of admonitions is erroneous, the error does not render the judgment of the circuit court void, as to allow the defendant to raise the issue at any time.

Defendant pled guilty to misdemeanor possession of cannabis. The court did not admonish defendant regarding his appeal rights. Twelve years later, defendant moved to vacate his plea. The admonition exception did not allow defendant to file an untimely motion where he had not filed a timely notice of appeal. The circuit court's jurisdiction over defendant's plea of guilty and conviction lapsed after 30 days and the court had no authority to address the merits of defendant's motion.

The Supreme Court awarded the State a writ of *mandamus*, and ordered the circuit court to rescind its order granting the defendant's motion and enter an order dismissing defendant's motion for lack of jurisdiction.

Illinois Appellate Court

People v. Holcomb, 2022 IL App (3d) 210038 Defendant entered into a negotiated guilty plea in exchange for 12-year sentence that would be imposed only if defendant could not successfully complete drug court. The State ultimately filed a petition to terminate defendant's participation in drug court, and asking for the sentence to be imposed. The

defendant admitted to the allegations in the petition, received a 12-year sentence, and was then, for the first time, admonished about his appellate rights. In relevant part, the court informed defendant that if he wished to withdraw his admission to the State's petition, he had 30 days to do so via written motion.

On appeal, defendant alleged that the court erred when it failed to provide 605(c) admonishments when he entered into the guilty plea. The appellate court disagreed, finding the admonishments were required at the time of sentencing, and here, the sentence was not imposed upon entry of the plea. The circuit court did err, however, when its admonishments only referenced defendant's admission to the violations of the drug court program, rather than the guilty plea itself. The appellate court remanded for proper Rule 605(c) admonishments to give defendant the opportunity to comply with the requirements of Rule 604(d) to file a motion to withdraw guilty plea.

People v. Brown, 2018 IL App (2d) 160775 The appellate court remanded defendant's case for new post-plea proceedings because the trial court gave improper 605(c) admonishments. Defendant was found guilty of armed habitual criminal after a bench trial. Before sentencing, he entered into a negotiated guilty plea that covered both the AHC case and a separate drug case. The plea required defendant to waive his appeal rights in the AHC case.

While the court properly advised defendant in accordance with Rule 605(c) in the drug case, it added admonishments relating to the AHC case detailing what his appellate rights "would have been," suggesting a different procedure would be required to appeal that judgment. Defendant then filed a motion to restore his right to appeal, rather than a Rule 604(d) motion, which the court denied. The Appellate Court reversed for new post-plea proceedings, as the additional admonishments suggested defendant could move to withdraw the appeal waiver only, when in reality a 604(d) motion was required to take any action on either case.

People v. Braden, 2018 IL App (1st) 152295 Where defendant pled guilty in exchange for the State's recommendation of a specific sentence, the trial court erred in giving appeal admonishments which informed defendant only of the steps required to appeal his sentence and sentencing hearing. While defendant did file a timely motion to vacate his guilty plea, the admonishments error was not moot where the motion to vacate was withdrawn by defense counsel before it could be ruled upon. Remand for proper appeal admonishments was ordered.

People v. Perry, 2014 IL App (1st) 112584 Supreme Court Rule 605(c) requires the trial court to admonish a defendant who has entered a negotiated guilty plea that: (1) he has the right to appeal, (2) before taking an appeal he must file a written motion within 30 days asking to have the judgment vacated and for leave to withdraw the plea, (3) if the motion is allowed the plea and sentence will be vacated and a trial date set, (4) any charges that were dismissed as part of the plea agreement may be reinstated, (5) if defendant is indigent a copy of the transcript will be provided and counsel will be appointed to assist the defendant in preparing the motions, and (6) any issue not raised in the motion to withdraw the plea will be waived. The trial court need not use the exact language of Rule 605(c) so long as it conveys the substance of the rule.

Here, the trial court's admonishments were inadequate. First, the admonishments did not deal at all with two of the requirements of Rule 605(c) - informing defendant that if his plea was withdrawn dismissed charges could be reinstated and that issues not raised in the motion to withdraw the plea would be waived. Second, some of the remaining admonishments

were unclear. For example, the trial court told defendant that he had 30 days to file an appeal rather than that he was required to file a motion to withdraw the plea, but also referred to what would happen if it granted or denied “the motion.” Because the admonishments lacked the specificity necessary to resolve any ambiguity, they were insufficient to impart the information required under Rule 605(c).

Once a guilty plea defendant expresses an interest in challenging his plea, the trial court has an affirmative duty to ascertain whether the defendant desires counsel to assist in preparing and presenting the postplea motions. Rule 604(d); **People v. Griffin**, 305 Ill. App. 3d 326, 713 N.E.2d 662 (2nd Dist. 1999). Where a guilty plea defendant who had not been properly admonished under Rule 605(c) filed several “notification of motions,” and when asked by the trial court if he wanted to withdraw his plea responded that he did because he had “ineffective assistance of counsel,” there was a sufficient indication of defendant’s desire to challenge his plea to trigger the court’s affirmative duty to offer the appointment of counsel.

People v. Jones, 2013 IL App (4th) 120300 Supreme Court Rule 605(c) requires that upon entry of a negotiated guilty plea, the trial court must admonish the defendant concerning several points, including that: (1) the defendant has a right to appeal, (2) before appealing the defendant must file a motion to withdraw the guilty plea, (3) if the guilty plea is withdrawn the judgment will be vacated, a trial date set, and any dismissed charges reinstated, (4) if the defendant is indigent a copy of the transcript will be provided and counsel appointed, and (5) claims not raised in the motion to withdraw the plea will be waived.

The record did not contain a transcript of the trial court’s admonishments after defendant entered a guilty plea to domestic battery. However, a bystanders’ report indicated that the trial court informed defendant that she could appeal by filing a notice of appeal within 30 days, without stating that she was required to file a motion to withdraw the plea. Although the bystanders’ report indicated that the trial court was in the habit of admonishing guilty plea defendants of the requirement to file a motion to withdraw the plea, the court noted that at best the trial court gave inconsistent admonishments concerning the right to appeal.

Because it would be a violation of due process to dismiss the appeal due to the failure to file a motion to withdraw the plea where the trial court failed to admonish defendant of that requirement, the cause was remanded for the trial court to give proper admonishments and to allow defendant an opportunity to file a motion to withdraw the plea.

Although the written negotiated guilty plea specified that defendant was required to file a motion to withdraw the plea, written admonishments may not substitute for the oral admonishments required by Rule 605(c). Written admonishments may supplement oral admonitions only if the written admonishments are acknowledged in open court and the trial court ascertains that the defendant was aware of the admonishments and understood them. Because the certified bystanders’ report indicated that the trial court did not address the contents of the plea agreement in open court or ascertain that defendant understood the written agreement, that agreement cannot be used to determine whether defendant was sufficiently admonished under Rule 605(c).

People v. Wright, 311 Ill.App.3d 1042, 725 N.E.2d 811 (5th Dist. 2000) Where a defendant enters a negotiated plea in return for a sentencing cap, and is admonished under Supreme Court Rule 605(b) that he may appeal his sentence by filing either a motion to withdraw the plea or a motion to reconsider the sentence, the cause should be remanded for

admonishments which accurately state that the defendant must file a motion to withdraw the plea. "We refuse to accept a position that endorses dismissal without recourse for those defendants who do not invoke our jurisdiction because they relied upon and followed inaccurate judicial instruction" that they could perfect an appeal by filing a motion to reconsider the sentence. See also, [People v. Diaz](#), 192 Ill.2d 211, 735 N.E.2d 605 (2000) (where the trial court erroneously admonished defendant that he could challenge his sentence by filing either a motion to withdraw the plea or a motion to reconsider the sentence, fundamental fairness required that the cause be remanded with instructions to vacate the order denying the motion to reconsider, properly admonish the defendant, and allow him to move to withdraw his plea). (Note: Effective October 1, 2001 the Illinois Supreme Court amended Rule 605 to conform to Illinois case law.)

[People v. Stevens](#), 297 Ill.App.3d 408, 696 N.E.2d 828 (1st Dist. 1998) Where the trial court admonished defendant that he was required to file a motion to withdraw his plea, but failed to advise him that issues not included in the motion would be waived for purposes of appeal, issues omitted from the written motion were not waived. The Appellate Court remanded the cause for proper admonishments and an opportunity to raise any additional issues.

[People v. Horton](#), 250 Ill.App.3d 944, 620 N.E.2d 437 (4th Dist. 1993) Supreme Court Rule 402, which governs the admonitions to be given to a defendant who seeks to plead guilty, and Supreme Court Rule 605, which defines the admonitions to be given after sentence is imposed, apply to indirect criminal contempt cases.

§24-7

Factual Basis

Illinois Supreme Court

[People v. Barker](#), 83 Ill.2d 319, 415 N.E.2d 404 (1980) To establish a factual basis, less evidence is necessary than would be required to sustain a conviction after trial. All that is required is a basis from which the trial judge could reasonably reach the conclusion that the defendant committed the acts with the intent required to constitute the offense.

[People v. Petrovich](#), 77 Ill.App.3d 737, 396 N.E.2d 629 (2d Dist. 1979) A guilty plea to aggravated kidnapping was vacated because the factual basis showed defendant "has, at the very least, a defense worthy of consideration by a finder of fact."

[People v. Warship](#), 59 Ill.2d 125, 319 N.E.2d 507 (1974) The factual basis for a plea may be established at the sentencing hearing. Here, a factual basis was established despite defendant's testimony that "his mind went blank and . . . he does not remember entering the building." Other facts related at the sentencing hearing were "sufficient to support a determination that the defendant possessed the requisite intent to commit the offense."

Illinois Appellate Court

[People v. Moore](#), 2021 IL App (2d) 200407 After the first day of his jury trial, where the State presented evidence that defendant was armed with a firearm at the time of the robbery in question, defendant and the State entered into a fully negotiated agreement whereby defendant pled guilty to a charge of armed robbery with a dangerous weapon other than a firearm in exchange for a 15-year sentence. In accepting the plea, the Court said it had heard

adequate evidence during the first day of trial to find a factual basis for the plea. Defendant subsequently sought leave to withdraw the plea arguing, in part, that there was no factual basis for the dangerous weapon element since the evidence on the first day of trial established that defendant was armed with a firearm. That motion was denied, and the Appellate Court affirmed.

[Illinois Supreme Court Rule 402\(c\)](#) provides that the court shall not enter a final judgment on a plea without first determining that there is a factual basis for the plea. There is a sufficient factual basis if there is a basis anywhere in the record from which the court can reasonably conclude that defendant committed the elements of the offense to which he is pleading guilty. Armed robbery with a firearm under Section 18-2(a)(2) and armed robbery with a dangerous weapon other than a firearm under Section 18-2(a)(1) are mutually exclusive; a charge under one subsection cannot be satisfied with proof that defendant committed the offense under the other subsection.

Here, the Appellate Court agreed with defendant that the record showed that defendant was armed with a firearm and not that he was armed with a dangerous weapon other than a firearm. But, the court concluded that defendant was precluded from challenging his guilty plea under the invited-error doctrine. Defendant sought out the plea agreement after the first day of trial and was fully aware of its terms. He was properly admonished and expressly agreed to plead guilty to armed robbery with a dangerous weapon to ensure a sentence below the mandatory minimum of 21 years for armed robbery with a firearm.

It would be manifestly unfair to allow defendant to withdraw his plea where he had agreed to, and benefitted from, a more lenient sentence and where it could result in a hardship to the State in prosecuting the offense given the passage of time. While the invalid factual basis may have rendered the plea voidable, it was not void and therefore the invited-error doctrine could be applied. Thus, the trial court did not abuse its discretion in denying defendant's motion to withdraw his plea.

[People v. Armstrong, 2016 IL App \(2d\) 140358](#) Defendant entered a negotiated guilty plea to the offense of failing to register as a sex offender and was sentenced to three years in prison. On appeal, he argued that his counsel was ineffective for advising him to plead guilty where the prior 1997 offense on which his status as a sex offender depended was not actually a sex offense. The Appellate Court agreed.

Defendant's prior conviction for unlawful restraint would have been (at the time he pled guilty in 1997) a sex offense requiring registration only if the victim had been under 18 years old. Neither the complaint nor the information charging defendant with the offense made any reference to the victim's age. The State's factual basis did not mention the victim's age. And the written judgment order did not mention the victim's age or order defendant to register as a sex offender.

Under these circumstances, defendant's 1997 conviction for unlawful restraint did not make him subject to sex offender registration. The State's factual basis established the nature of the offense and thus defined the range of available consequences. Since the factual basis did not establish that the victim was under 18, the offense was not a sex offense and defendant was not subject to registration.

Counsel was ineffective for advising defendant to plead guilty to the offense of failing to register. If counsel had reviewed the record of defendant's 1997 conviction, counsel would have discovered that defendant had not been convicted of a sex offense. It was then reasonably probable that defendant would not have pled guilty since he could not have been properly convicted of failing to register.

People v. Williams, 299 Ill.App.3d 791, 701 N.E.2d 1186 (4th Dist. 1998) A trial court should not accept a guilty plea where the factual basis consists solely of a stipulation between the attorneys. Instead, the trial court should: (1) ask the prosecutor to briefly describe the State's evidence, and (2) ask defense counsel whether the witnesses would testify as the prosecutor has indicated. Defendant waived any error in the acceptance of a stipulated factual basis, however, because he failed to include that issue in his motion to withdraw the plea. Under Rule 604(d), an issue not raised in the motion to withdraw is deemed waived for purposes of appeal. But see, **People v. Cooper**, 182 Ill. App.3d 243, 537 N.E.2d 1963 (1st Dist.1989).

People v. Vinson, 287 Ill.App.3d 819, 683 N.E.2d 1262 (5th Dist. 1997) A motion to withdraw guilty plea should have been granted where the record contained no facts to support a factual basis.

People v. Dilger, 125 Ill.App.3d 277, 465 N.E.2d 937 (2d Dist. 1984) The judge was informed of a plea agreement under which defendant would plead guilty to a reduced charge. Following the prosecutor's presentation of the factual basis, the judge held that the "statement of facts does not show any willful violation of any criminal statute. . . if those are the facts he is not guilty of anything." The judge then found the defendant not guilty. The Appellate Court held that if a judge finds a factual basis insufficient, he "has no alternative other than to submit the case to trial." Rule 402 does not permit a finding of not guilty in these circumstances.

§24-8

Motion to Vacate Plea or Reconsider Sentence; Appeal

§24-8(a)

Generally

Illinois Supreme Court

People v. Walls, 2022 IL 127965 The supreme court held that in the guilty plea context, the 30-day deadline for filing a notice of appeal begins to run upon sentencing, or after denial of a defendant's Rule 604(d) post-sentencing motion. A successive motion in the trial court, asking for rehearing of the denial of the post-sentencing motion, does not toll the 30-day deadline.

Defendant pled guilty, then timely filed a motion to reconsider his sentences. The trial court denied the motion, and defendant filed a "motion for rehearing," arguing his attorney failed to comply with Rule 604(d) and that his sentences should be reduced. The trial court did not rule on the motion for several years, when, after defendant filed various collateral attacks, the trial court noticed the motion was still pending. The court struck all of defendant's collateral filings and allowed defendant to file an amended motion for rehearing, which it ultimately denied. Within 30 days of the denial (and nearly 15 years after the denial of the original 604(d) motion), defendant filed a notice of appeal. The appellate court found the notice of appeal untimely, holding that Rule 606(b)'s 30-day deadline applied to the denial of the original 604(d) motion.

The supreme court affirmed. Rule 604(d) states, in part, that upon denial of a post-plea motion, "a notice of appeal from the judgment and sentence shall be filed within the time allowed in Rule 606, measured from the date of entry of the order denying the motion." Rule 606(b) states: "Except as provided in Rule 604(d), the notice of appeal must be filed with the

clerk of the circuit court within 30 days after the entry of the final judgment appealed from or if a motion directed against the judgment is timely filed, within 30 days after the entry of the order disposing of the motion.” Thus, the rules require a notice of appeal to be filed within 30 days of the denial of a motion attacking the final judgment, which in a criminal case is the sentence. In this case, the denial of the motion attacking the final judgment occurred when the trial court denied defendant’s 604(d) motion.

The motion for rehearing did not toll the time to file the notice of appeal. Defendant cited **People v. Feldman**, 409 Ill. App. 3d 1124 (2011), where the appellate court held that a notice of appeal is timely if filed within 30 days after the denial of a motion to reconsider the denial of a post-plea motion. The supreme court found that **Feldman** incorrectly determined the motion reconsider the denial of a post-plea motion was a motion “directed against the final judgment.” Only the original post-plea motion was directed against the final judgment, and therefore only the denial of that motion could trigger the 30-day deadline for a notice of appeal.

The court vacated the appeal, and remanded to the circuit court for the reinstatement of defendant’s collateral filings, admonishing the lower court against any further unnecessary delays.

People v. Johnson, 2019 IL 122956 As a general matter, if a plea contains any sort of negotiation as to the sentence to be imposed, an individual is required to seek withdrawal of that plea in order to challenge the sentence imposed. The Supreme Court declined to find an exception to that general rule where a defendant argues that the sentencing judge considered an improper factor in imposing sentence. An argument that the court considered an improper statutory aggravating factor is, in essence, an excessive sentence challenge.

Here, where defendant pled guilty in exchange for a cap on the sentencing range, the appellate court erred in considering the merits of defendant’s motion to reconsider sentence. The Supreme Court vacated the appellate court’s order remanding for resentencing.

People ex rel. Alvarez v. Skryd, 241 Ill.2d 34, 944 N.E.2d 347 (2011) No appeal may be taken from a judgment entered on a plea of guilty unless the defendant files in the circuit court within 30 days of sentencing an appropriate post-plea motion. Supreme Court Rule 604(d). As a general rule, where defendant fails to file such a motion, the Appellate Court must dismiss the appeal. The 30-day requirement of Rule 604(d) incorporates the general limitation that a circuit court loses jurisdiction to vacate or modify its judgment 30 days after entry of judgment.

An admonition exception to this rule exists where the circuit court fails to admonish defendant regarding his right to appeal as required by Supreme Court Rule 605. Dismissal of an appeal based on defendant’s failure to file the motion required by Rule 604(d) violates due process where the court fails to comply with Rule 605 because defendant has not been informed that the filing of the motion was necessary. In such circumstances, the appeal is not dismissed. Rather, the reviewing court must remand the cause to the circuit court for proper admonishments and strict compliance with Rule 604(d).

This admonition exception is for the Appellate Court to apply after the defendant files a notice of appeal from a guilty plea without first complying with Rule 604(d). The admonition exception does not restore jurisdiction to the circuit court after 30 days from entry of judgment. While the absence of admonitions is erroneous, the error does not render the judgment of the circuit court void, as to allow the defendant to raise the issue at any time.

Defendant pled guilty to misdemeanor possession of cannabis. The court did not admonish defendant regarding his appeal rights. Twelve years later, defendant moved to vacate his plea. The admonition exception did not allow defendant to file an untimely motion where he had not filed a timely notice of appeal. The circuit court's jurisdiction over defendant's plea of guilty and conviction lapsed after 30 days and the court had no authority to address the merits of defendant's motion.

The Supreme Court awarded the State a writ of *mandamus*, and ordered the circuit court to rescind its order granting the defendant's motion and enter an order dismissing defendant's motion for lack of jurisdiction.

People v. Edwards, 197 Ill.2d 239, 757 N.E.2d 442 (2001) The court rejected the argument that a guilty plea defendant who alleges that trial counsel was ineffective for failing to file a motion to withdraw the plea must allege that there was a basis for such a motion. Under **Roe v. Flores-Ortega**, 528 U.S. 470 (2000), a *pro se* defendant who pleads guilty cannot be required to demonstrate that an appeal would have been successful in order to establish that he was prejudiced by his attorney's failure to pursue a request for an appeal. Where the post-conviction petition alleged that trial counsel ignored defendant's requests to file an appeal, and there was nothing of record to indicate that defense counsel reviewed the plea proceedings or consulted with the defendant before deciding not to file a motion to withdraw the plea, the petition made a sufficient allegation of ineffective assistance to survive summary dismissal.

People v. Rogers, 197 Ill.2d 216, 756 N.E.2d 831 (2001) The Supreme Court rejected the argument that the judge who heard defendant's motion to reduce the sentence erred by deferring to the sentencing court's judgment and finding that the original court had not abused its discretion. The court stated, "We have found no authority indicating [that the second judge] was required to exercise plenary review over the defendant's sentence."

People v. Pullen, 192 Ill.2d 36, 733 N.E.2d 1235 (2000) Whether a defendant should be allowed to withdraw a guilty plea is left to the discretion of the trial court, which should consider whether: (1) the plea was entered under a misapprehension of fact or law, or (2) whether there is a doubt of the defendant's guilt and the ends of justice would be better served by submitting the case to trial. A negotiated plea to serve an unauthorized sentence is the result of a serious misapprehension of law, and justifies withdrawal of the plea.

People v. Lumzy, 191 Ill.2d 182, 730 N.E.2d 20 (2000) The Supreme Court established the following rules for determining whether a motion to vacate a guilty plea is necessary to challenge a sentence: (1) Where the defendant enters a "blind" plea and the trial court exercises its discretion to determine the sentence from the authorized range provided by the statute, the defendant may challenge his sentence by moving to either withdraw the plea or reconsider the sentence. (2) Where the defendant enters a fully negotiated plea in which he agrees to a specific sentencing recommendation by the State, he must move to withdraw the plea in order to challenge the length of the sentence. (3) Where the plea agreement provides a sentencing cap, the defendant must move to withdraw the plea in order to argue that the sentence is excessive. By agreeing to plead guilty in exchange for a sentencing limit, the defendant agrees not to challenge any sentence below the cap on the ground it is excessive. (4) Where the defendant pleads guilty in return for the dismissal of some charges, and the plea agreement is silent as to sentencing, the defendant may challenge the sentence by moving to withdraw the plea or reconsider the sentence. See also, **People v. Linder & Rice**,

186 Ill.2d 67, 708 N.E.2d 1169 (1999) (defendant who pleads guilty in exchange for cap on the length of the sentence may not challenge that sentence as excessive by filing a motion to reconsider the sentence, but must move to withdraw the entire guilty plea.

People v. Diaz, 192 Ill.2d 211, 735 N.E.2d 605 (2000) A plea bargain by which the State agrees not to object to concurrent sentencing or seek extended terms "entails significant sentencing concessions." Thus, defendant was required to move to withdraw his plea. However, even where the plea agreement included sentencing provisions, a motion to withdraw the plea is not required where the defendant argues that the trial court lacked statutory authority to impose the sentence in question. See also, **People v. Wilson**, 181 Ill.2d 409, 692 N.E.2d 1107 (1998) (even where a negotiated plea is involved, "a challenge to a trial court's statutory authority to impose a particular sentence is not waived" because the defendant filed a motion to reconsider the sentence rather than a motion to withdraw the guilty plea).

People v. Foster, 171 Ill.2d 469, 665 N.E.2d 823 (1996) Though Supreme Court Rule 604(d) requires that a defendant convicted on a guilty plea must move to withdraw the plea or reconsider the sentence before appealing, the failure to file an appropriate motion is excused where the trial court fails to admonish the defendant in accordance with Rule 605(b). Where a defendant who fails to file an appropriate motion was not properly admonished of the requirement to do so, the cause must be remanded for strict compliance with Rule 604(d).

People v. Evans & Meeks, 174 Ill.2d 320, 673 N.E.2d 244 (1996) A defendant who pleads guilty pursuant to a negotiated plea may challenge the sentence only by filing a motion to withdraw the plea, and not merely by filing a motion to reconsider the sentence. See also, **People v. Williams**, 179 Ill.2d 331, 688 N.E.2d 1153 (1997).

People v. Wallace, 143 Ill.2d 59, 570 N.E.2d 334 (1991) A defendant who pleads guilty and seeks to appeal only the sentence must first file, in the trial court, a written motion to reconsider the sentence. It is not necessary to ask to withdraw the guilty plea, but "the filing of a motion to reconsider a sentence is a prerequisite to an appeal from that sentence."

People v. Davis, 145 Ill.2d 240, 582 N.E.2d 714 (1991) A motion to withdraw a guilty plea should be granted where: (1) it appears to have been entered due to a misapprehension of the facts or law due to misrepresentations by the prosecutor, defense counsel or someone else in authority, (2) there is doubt of the defendant's guilt, (3) the defendant has a defense worthy of consideration, or (4) the ends of justice would be served by holding a trial. See also, **People v. Halawa**, 291 Ill.App.3d 373, 683 N.E.2d 926 (1st Dist. 1997).

People v. Wilk, 124 Ill.2d 93, 529 N.E.2d 218 (1988) Under Supreme Court Rule 604(d), the filing of a motion to withdraw the guilty plea is a condition precedent for an appeal from a guilty plea. See also, **People v. Frey**, 67 Ill.2d 77, 364 N.E.2d 46 (1977).

People v. Adkisson, 83 Ill.2d 1, 413 N.E.2d 1238 (1980) Defendant argued that his guilty plea to attempt murder must be vacated because he was not admonished that "intent to kill" was an essential element. The Court held that the issue was waived because it was not included in defendant's motion to withdraw his guilty plea. Rule 604(d) "could scarcely have been more definite" in providing that issues not raised in a motion to withdraw shall be deemed waived. See also, **People v. Favelli**, 176 Ill.App.3d 618, 531 N.E.2d 386 (2d Dist.

1988) (an issue not raised in the defendant's motion to reconsider sentence is waived for appeal); [People v. Handy, 278 Ill.App.3d 829, 664 N.E.2d 1042 \(4th Dist. 1996\)](#) (a defendant must include in the motion to withdraw plea or reconsider sentence "any issue he might wish to raise on appeal.")

Illinois Appellate Court

[People v. Jones, 2024 IL App \(1st\) 221506](#) Following defendant's negotiated guilty plea, plea counsel filed a motion to withdraw but failed to file a Rule 604(d) certificate. The parties agreed that failure required remand for new post-plea proceedings.

Additionally, at the hearing on defendant's motion to withdraw plea, defendant had been permitted to present his own argument in support of withdrawal of his plea. Defendant stated that nobody, including plea counsel, had advised him that he would have to serve his four-year term of mandatory supervised release on electronic monitoring, which he likened to "house arrest." On appeal, the parties argued that the court failed to conduct a preliminary **Krankel** inquiry based on this allegation. The appellate court held that remand under **Krankel** was not required, however, because the circuit court had gone ahead and construed defendant's claim as an argument for withdrawing his plea. Instead, remand for a new hearing was the proper remedy because the record was insufficiently developed to decide that claim in the instant appeal. In reaching this conclusion, the court rejected the State's argument that the claim was forfeited because it was not in the written post-plea motion filed by counsel. The trial court expressly incorporated this issue into the motion to withdraw plea when it told defendant at the hearing, "it's your motion, go ahead and say what you want to say."

Reversed and remanded for the appointment of new post-plea counsel and new post-plea proceedings, including a hearing on whether plea counsel provided ineffective assistance by failing to advise defendant about the requirement of serving his mandatory supervised release on electronic monitoring.

[People v. Erby, 2023 IL App \(3d\) 220400](#) Defendant pled guilty to a charge of theft in exchange for a sentence of two years of conditional discharge, court costs, and a hearing to determine restitution. Subsequently, restitution was ordered, and defendant filed a motion to reconsider sentence arguing that the State failed to present sufficient evidence to support the amount ordered. That motion was denied, and defendant appealed.

On appeal, defendant persisted in his argument that the restitution amount was not supported by the evidence. Rather than considering the issue on the merits, however, the appellate court dismissed the appeal because defendant had entered a negotiated guilty plea but had not moved to withdraw the plea before appealing. Defendant's challenge to the evidentiary basis for the restitution order was, at its core, still an excessive sentence argument. He did not argue that the court lacked the authority to impose restitution, but rather simply challenged the amount of restitution that was ordered. Because defendant did not file a motion to withdraw plea, he failed to comply with [Illinois Supreme Court Rule 604\(d\)](#), and thus his appeal was dismissed.

The special concurrence agreed that this result was dictated by current law, but acknowledged that it was "absurd and unjust" because the amount of restitution imposed was greater than the charge to which defendant pled guilty and because the supporting evidence was insufficient.

People v. Stewart, 2023 IL App (4th) 220432 Defendant entered a fully negotiated guilty plea and then, within 30 days, filed a *pro se* notice of appeal. The notice of appeal was accompanied by an attachment stating the reasons defendant wished to appeal. Defendant argued that the circuit clerk should have treated the attachment as a post-plea motion, should have stricken the notice of appeal, and should have appointed counsel and conducted further proceedings on the post-plea motion. The appellate court disagreed.

Defendant was properly admonished at the conclusion of his guilty plea hearing as to the steps necessary for perfecting his right to appeal, including the need to first file a motion to withdraw his plea. What defendant filed was plainly labeled as a notice of appeal. It referenced the appellate court and included reasons for his appeal. It did not, however, state a desire to withdraw his plea or set forth any grounds for doing so. Thus, the appellate court found defendant failed to comply with Rule 604(d) and dismissed his appeal.

In a partial dissent, one justice explained that he would have found defendant's *pro se* filing, liberally construed, to be both a notice of appeal and motion to reconsider sentence. Accordingly, he would have stricken the notice of appeal, dismissed the appeal, and remanded the matter for proceedings on defendant's motion. While a motion to reconsider sentence would not have been sufficient to perfect defendant's right to appeal from his negotiated guilty plea, that is a determination which should be made by the circuit court in the first instance.

People v. Arriaga, 2023 IL App (5th) 220076 Defendant pled guilty and subsequently sent a request to withdraw his guilty plea to the circuit court. That request came in the form of two letters sent on two separate dates. The letters were each received more than 30 days after the plea, and the request was therefore untimely. And, defendant failed to follow the requirements of the mailbox rule, thus his request to withdraw his plea could not be considered timely under Supreme Court Rule 373. More specifically, defendant failed to include a section 1-109 certification with his letters, stating the time and date the letters were deposited in the prison mail, the name of the person who deposited them, and the address to which they were to be delivered, as required by Supreme Court Rule 12.

The court rejected defendant's request to remand the matter to the circuit court for the filing of a section 1-109 certification pursuant to **People v. Cooper, 2021 IL App (1st) 190022**. The appellate court concluded that the **Cooper** court exceeded its authority when it remanded the matter. Additionally, the court distinguished **Cooper** where the post-plea motion was received and filed just one day after the deadline, making it very likely that the defendant had placed it in the mail within 30 days. Here, on the other hand, defendant's first letter was not received until 14 days after the expiration of the deadline. Accordingly, the appellate court vacated the trial court's order denying defendant's post-plea motion and remanded with orders for the circuit court to dismiss defendant's motion for lack of jurisdiction.

People v. Anderson, 2023 IL App (4th) 220357 Defendant entered a fully negotiated guilty plea and was sentenced to 30 months of probation. More than two years later, defendant's probation was revoked, and she was sentenced to four years of imprisonment. Following imposition of that prison sentence, defendant filed a *pro se* motion alleging ineffective assistance of plea counsel. The trial court initially appointed substitute counsel pursuant to **Krankel**, but subsequently struck defendant's *pro se* motion as untimely. The appellate court affirmed, concluding that the circuit court lacked jurisdiction to hold **Krankel** proceedings because defendant failed to file a motion within 30 days of the plea. Further, because the

court lacked jurisdiction, its order appointing substitute counsel pursuant to **Krankel** was void, so the appellate court vacated that order.

People v. Hayes, 2022 IL App (2d) 210014 Defendant entered a negotiated guilty plea to a charge of domestic battery, and at the same time admitted to a violation of probation in a prior aggravated domestic battery case. As part of the plea agreement, defendant agreed to participate in a mental health court program. Sentencing was deferred, with the understanding that defendant would be sentenced to conditional discharge if he successfully completed the program, and to concurrent prison terms if he did not. Ultimately, defendant was unsuccessfully discharged from the mental health court program and was sentenced to prison. At the conclusion of the hearing where the prison sentence was announced, the court told defendant that he could perfect an appeal by filing, within 30 days, either a notice of appeal or a motion to reconsider the sentence if he wished to challenge the sentence. Defendant filed a motion to reconsider sentence, which was denied, and defendant appealed.

On appeal, defendant argued that because he entered a negotiated plea, counsel should have filed a Rule 604(d) certificate, and the failure to do so meant that the matter had to be remanded for compliance with Rule 604(d). The State argued that defendant's appeal was from a probation revocation proceeding, governed instead by Rule 604(b), and thus remand was not required. Ultimately, the court concluded that defendant's appeal was governed by 604(d). The mental health court program was a post-plea, pre-sentencing program. And, notably, when defendant was discharged from the program, the State asked the court to impose sentence and the matter proceeded to a sentencing hearing.

The court went on to note, though, that defendant was required to file a motion to withdraw plea, not a motion to reconsider sentence, in order to perfect his appeal under Rule 604(d) because he had entered a negotiated plea. But, the trial court had not admonished defendant of that requirement. Thus, there was a lack of substantial compliance with Rule 605(c) requiring remand for proper admonishments, the filing of an appropriate post-plea motion and Rule 604(d) certificate, and a new post-plea motion hearing. While this matter also involved defendant's admission to a probation violation, which would not normally be subject to Rule 604(d) compliance, the probation violation matter had been consolidated for both the plea and sentencing and thus it was remanded, as well.

People v. Millsap, 2022 IL App (4th) 210192 Defendant agreed to plead guilty to various weapons offenses, including armed habitual criminal, in exchange for the State's promise to recommend a sentencing cap of 25 years in prison. The court imposed a 30-year term, and defendant moved to withdraw the plea. The circuit court denied the motion.

On appeal, defendant argued that he should have been allowed to withdraw his negotiated guilty plea because he was denied his right to a fair sentencing hearing, where the State allegedly requested a longer sentence by implication and the trial court relied on improper factors before sentencing defendant.

The Appellate Court held that these attacks on the sentence are not appropriate in an appeal from a negotiated plea. Rule 604(d) requires a motion to withdraw the plea prior to appeal from a negotiated plea, but a defendant may not couch excessive sentencing arguments as ground for withdrawal of a plea. **People v. Johnson, 2019 IL 122956**. Rather, the basis for withdrawal must lie in the claim that the plea was entered through a misapprehension of the facts or of the law or where there is doubt as to the guilt of the accused and justice would be better served through a trial.

People v. Moore, 2021 IL App (2d) 200407 After the first day of his jury trial, where the State presented evidence that defendant was armed with a firearm at the time of the robbery in question, defendant and the State entered into a fully negotiated agreement whereby defendant pled guilty to a charge of armed robbery with a dangerous weapon other than a firearm in exchange for a 15-year sentence. In accepting the plea, the Court said it had heard adequate evidence during the first day of trial to find a factual basis for the plea. Defendant subsequently sought leave to withdraw the plea arguing, in part, that there was no factual basis for the dangerous weapon element since the evidence on the first day of trial established that defendant was armed with a firearm. That motion was denied, and the Appellate Court affirmed.

Illinois Supreme Court Rule 402(c) provides that the court shall not enter a final judgment on a plea without first determining that there is a factual basis for the plea. There is a sufficient factual basis if there is a basis anywhere in the record from which the court can reasonably conclude that defendant committed the elements of the offense to which he is pleading guilty. Armed robbery with a firearm under Section 18-2(a)(2) and armed robbery with a dangerous weapon other than a firearm under Section 18-2(a)(1) are mutually exclusive; a charge under one subsection cannot be satisfied with proof that defendant committed the offense under the other subsection.

Here, the Appellate Court agreed with defendant that the record showed that defendant was armed with a firearm and not that he was armed with a dangerous weapon other than a firearm. But, the court concluded that defendant was precluded from challenging his guilty plea under the invited-error doctrine. Defendant sought out the plea agreement after the first day of trial and was fully aware of its terms. He was properly admonished and expressly agreed to plead guilty to armed robbery with a dangerous weapon to ensure a sentence below the mandatory minimum of 21 years for armed robbery with a firearm.

It would be manifestly unfair to allow defendant to withdraw his plea where he had agreed to, and benefitted from, a more lenient sentence and where it could result in a hardship to the State in prosecuting the offense given the passage of time. While the invalid factual basis may have rendered the plea voidable, it was not void and therefore the invited-error doctrine could be applied. Thus, the trial court did not abuse its discretion in denying defendant's motion to withdraw his plea.

People v. Talavera, 2021 IL App (4th) 190200 Defendant pled guilty to two counts of aggravated battery in exchange for the dismissal of two counts of domestic battery and the State's agreement to recommend a sentence of no more than 9 years in prison. At sentencing, however, the State recommended a 10-year sentence, defendant did not object, and the court sentenced defendant to 10 years in prison. Defendant filed a motion to reconsider sentence, which was denied, and defendant appealed.

The Appellate Court first held that it could consider defendant's appeal from his negotiated guilty plea. Rule 604(d), which normally requires the filing of a motion to withdraw plea prior to taking an appeal from a negotiated plea, does not apply where the State did not fully abide by the terms of the agreement. Because the State recommended 10 years, despite its agreement to recommend no more than 9, the State breached the agreement. Accordingly, the court remanded the matter to the trial court with directions to conduct a new sentencing hearing at which the State must honor its agreement.

Defendant also argued on appeal that the State had not established his eligibility for extended-term sentencing. The Appellate Court did not reach the merits of that claim, but

did note that the State must establish a qualifying conviction to impose extended-term sentences on remand. The court also ordered the appointment of new counsel for defendant and that proper appeal admonishments be provided at the conclusion of the new sentencing hearing.

People v. Robinson, 2021 IL App (4th) 200515 The State’s promise to recommend a specific sentence created a “negotiated plea” for purposes of Rule 604(d), despite the fact that the sentencing court rejected the cap and imposed a longer sentence.

Defendant pled guilty in exchange for the State’s agreement to recommend an 18-year sentence. The sentencing court entered a 20-year term. Defendant filed a motion to withdraw the plea and a motion to reconsider the sentence, which were denied.

On appeal, defendant raised only an excessive sentence claim. The State argued that defendant’s claim was barred, and that he could challenge only the denial of the motion to withdraw, in accordance with **People v. Johnson, 2019 IL 122956**, because he had entered into a negotiated plea.

The Appellate Court reluctantly agreed. Rule 604(d) defines a negotiated plea as “one in which the prosecution has bound itself to recommend a specific sentence, or a specific range of sentence, or where the prosecution has made concessions relating to the sentence to be imposed and not merely to the charge or charges then pending.” The court held that under the plain language, the recommendation of a cap, even if it is non-binding and ultimately ignored, renders the plea negotiated. Although the court traced this language to cases involving actual concessions, as where the State promised to forego Class X sentencing, it also accurately describes the instant case. The court dismissed the appeal.

People v. Owens, 2021 IL App (2d) 190153 Defendant’s *pro se* “notice of motion and petition,” filed within 30 days of his guilty plea and sentencing, tolled the time for defendant to file a notice of appeal under Rule 604(d), even though it was not accompanied by an actual motion. In that filing, defendant expressly stated an intent to present a motion to withdraw plea, which he later did with the assistance of counsel. The Appellate Court held that any written submission in which the defendant expresses an interest in withdrawing his or her guilty plea qualifies as a motion to withdraw plea under Rule 604(d).

The court went on to grant OSAD’s motion to withdraw as counsel, however, because the appeal presented no issue of arguable merit. The dissenting justice would have found that defendant’s notice of motion was insufficient to comply with Rule 604(d) and would have dismissed the appeal for lack of jurisdiction.

People v. Dorado, 2020 IL App (2d) 190818 Defendant sought to withdraw his guilty plea on the grounds that his trial attorney was ineffective for failing to advise him of the effects his plea would have on his immigration status and that he did not receive the benefit of his bargain where he was potentially subject to deportation despite being sentenced to first-offender probation in exchange for his plea. The trial court denied the motion to withdraw, and the Appellate Court affirmed.

Plea counsel consulted with immigration counsel and informed defendant that his plea could subject him to deportation and future inadmissibility prior to defendant’s entering the plea. Defendant also consulted with immigration counsel himself and decided to accept the plea knowing that it carried a risk of deportation. Further, in **Najera-Rodriguez v. Barr, 926 F. 3d 343 (7th Cir. 2019)**, the Seventh Circuit recently held that convictions under the first-offender statute do not render a defendant subject to mandatory deportation.

Accordingly, defendant was adequately advised of the potential immigration consequences of his plea prior to pleading guilty.

The Appellate Court also held that defendant received the benefit of his bargain with the State. The only thing defendant was promised in exchange for his plea was a sentence to first-offender probation, and he received that sentence. The potential immigration consequences resulting from his plea are controlled by federal law, and the State has no power to change or negotiate those consequences.

People v. Assmar, 2020 IL App (2d) 180253 Defendant was convicted after a bench trial of felony and misdemeanor public indecency in connection with one act, and entered into a negotiated plea of guilty to public indecency related to a second act. As part of the guilty plea, defendant received an agreed sentence on the first case. Defendant appealed the first case, challenging the sufficiency of the evidence. The State argued that because the sentencing of the first case had been included in the plea agreement, 604(d), contract principles required he move to withdraw the plea before appeal. The Appellate Court disagreed. Rule 604(d) does apply when defendant is convicted after a bench trial. Contract principles do not apply because nothing in the plea agreement limited defendant's right to appeal the first case.

People v. Cady, 2020 IL App (3d) 190199 Defendant's conviction for armed violence predicated on the underlying offense of possession of a stolen firearm could not stand, and defendant should have been allowed to withdraw his guilty plea to that offense. The indictment alleged, and the factual basis confirmed, that defendant, while armed with one firearm, was engaged in the sale of a separate, stolen firearm to an undercover police officer. The armed violence statute specifically excludes any offense that makes possession or use of a dangerous weapon an element. Under a plain reading of the armed violence statute, possession of a stolen firearm is not a proper predicate offense. Defendant's guilty plea was due to a misapprehension of the law, and therefore the trial court abused its discretion in denying his motion to withdraw guilty plea. The matter was reversed and remanded for further proceedings.

People v. Harris, 2020 IL App (5th) 170158 After entering a fully negotiated plea, defendant filed a motion to withdraw alleging that the plea was coerced and the result of ineffective assistance of counsel. The trial court allowed that motion, and the State filed a motion to reconsider arguing that the hearing on defendant's motion to withdraw had been only a **Krankel** hearing such that allowing withdrawal of the plea was premature. The trial court agreed and granted the State's motion to reconsider. Subsequently, new counsel filed a new motion to withdraw plea, including the ineffective assistance of counsel claim, which was ultimately heard and denied.

On appeal, defendant challenged the court's ability to reinstate his plea on the State's motion to reconsider. The court held that the trial court has the inherent authority to reconsider its granting of a motion to withdraw plea. Because defendant did not challenge the denial of his motion to withdraw plea on the merits, the Appellate Court affirmed.

People v. Rivera, 2020 IL App (2d) 171002 The trial court erred when it refused to consider defendant's motion to revoke fines, filed under **730 ILCS 5/5-9-2**. The trial court had cited the fact that the fines were imposed pursuant to a negotiated plea, and defendant had not moved to withdraw his plea as required by Rule 604(d). The Appellate Court held that a motion to withdraw plea is not a prerequisite to filing a motion to revoke fines. A 5-9-2 motion is particularly appropriate when aimed at mandatory fines which the trial court had no

discretion to impose. Mandatory fines aren't affected by the negotiated plea, and therefore a successful motion to revoke fines would not change the terms of the agreement. Accordingly the trial court abused its discretion when it refused to rule on the merits of the motion, and the case was remanded for a ruling on the merits.

People v. Rainey, 2019 IL App 1st 160187 Prior to trial, defendant's disagreements with his public defender caused him to waive counsel and proceed *pro se*. Shortly thereafter he requested re-appointment of the public defender before waiving counsel and going *pro se* a second time, then finally accepting the appointment of counsel. On the eve of trial, defendant again requested to represent himself. The trial court denied the request. Defendant pled guilty and received a 40-year sentence. He moved to withdraw the plea, arguing the court's refusal to allow him to proceed *pro se* rendered his guilty plea involuntary. The trial court denied the motion to withdraw the plea.

The Appellate Court affirmed. Assuming denial of the right to self-representation could render a plea involuntary (an unsettled principle of law that the court declined to decide), there was no improper denial here. Waiver of counsel must be "clear and unequivocal." While defendant's waiver here was clear, it was not unequivocal. Defendant repeatedly equivocated, and in doing so sought to delay the proceedings. The fact that defendant's decisions were impulsive and his behavior dilatory and disrespectful supported the trial court's decision.

Although the trial court did mention that it found defendant "incapable" of self-representation, which would not be a proper ground for denial of the right to proceed *pro se* if it referred to the legal ability to conduct a defense, the court's comments here clearly referred to defendant's inability to comport himself in a dignified manner in the courtroom, as exhibited by his outbursts, incessant profanity (spanning 80 pages of record), and flight from the courtroom. Under these circumstances, a defendant forfeits his right to self-representation. Thus, the trial court did not abuse its discretion in refusing a third request for self-representation, or in denying the motion to withdraw his guilty plea.

People v. Nieto-Roman, 2019 IL App (4th) 180807 The trial court did not abuse its discretion when it denied defendant's motion to withdraw his guilty plea. Defendant pled guilty to first degree murder in connection with the death of his girlfriend Ember's infant. The motion to withdraw the plea alleged actual innocence and ineffective assistance of counsel. At an evidentiary hearing, defendant testified that Ember was responsible for the death, and defendant's brother provided hearsay evidence of Ember's admission of guilt. Ember testified that defendant committed the offense consistent with the State's factual basis.

Although older precedent held that a motion to withdraw a guilty plea should be granted if defendant can demonstrate the existence of a "defense worthy of consideration," more recent cases hold that defendant must show manifest injustice, either through a misapprehension of facts or law, or through doubt as to guilt. Applying a deferential standard of review, the Appellate Court could not say that the trial court abused its discretion in crediting Ember's account over defendant's, particularly in light of strong circumstantial evidence of guilt.

People v. Orahim, 2019 IL App (2d) 170257 A timely post-plea motion extends both the trial court's jurisdiction over the case, as well as the time for filing a notice of appeal. However, a successive post-plea motion filed more than 30 days after sentencing does not

extend the trial court's jurisdiction or the time to file notice of appeal, even if the successive motion is filed within 30 days of the court's ruling on the initial, timely-filed, post-plea motion.

Here, where defendant filed a motion to withdraw plea the day after his motion to reconsider sentence was denied, but more than 30 days after sentencing, the trial court lacked jurisdiction to rule on the motion to withdraw plea. Because defendant did not file a notice of appeal within 30 days of the denial of his motion to reconsider sentence, the Appellate Court lacked jurisdiction to review the merits of his appeal. Instead, the court vacated the trial court's denial of the motion to withdraw plea and dismissed that motion.

People v. Willoughby, 2019 IL App (2d) 160729 Defense counsel's failure to file a 604(d) certificate, upon timely filing a motion to reconsider sentence, did not require remand under **People v. Janes, 158 Ill. 2d 27 (1994)**, where defendant had been sentenced *in absentia* and it was his absence that made it impossible for counsel to comply with the consultation requirement of Rule 604(d). Although the Court found it "arguable" that counsel should have certified partial compliance with 604(d) to the extent possible, defendant did not argue for partial application of *Janes*, so the Court declined to reach that question. Defendant's appeal was dismissed.

People v. Young, 2019 IL App (3d) 160528 An amendment to **725 ILCS 5/113-4**, which became effective while defendant's case was on appeal, did not apply retroactively in accordance with **People v. Hunter, 2017 IL 121306**. While the amendment was procedural, requiring certain additional admonishments be given to a defendant before accepting his or her guilty plea, no proceedings remained to which the amendment could be applied on appeal. The court's failure to give the new admonishments was not error. Defendant was not otherwise entitled to withdraw her plea where the record showed only that defendant had changed her mind shortly after entering the plea, which is not a valid basis on which to withdraw a knowing and voluntary plea.

People v. Boyd, 2018 IL App (5th) 140556 Defendant should have been permitted to withdraw his guilty plea to armed robbery because he established ineffective assistance of plea counsel. At the hearing on the motion to withdraw, plea counsel confirmed that he informed defendant he would receive 50% credit, which constituted deficient performance because defendant must serve 85% of his sentence. As for prejudice, counsel and defendant both testified that they discussed the amount of credit defendant would receive in the lead-up to the plea. The Appellate Court interpreted this testimony as establishing more than a bare allegation that defendant would not have pled guilty absent the misinformation, as it showed the amount of credit to be a factor in his decision. Thus, defendant established both prongs of **Strickland** and should have been allowed to withdraw his plea.

People v. Braden, 2018 IL App (1st) 152295 Where defendant pled guilty in exchange for the State's recommendation of a specific sentence, the trial court erred in giving appeal admonishments which informed defendant only of the steps required to appeal his sentence and sentencing hearing. While defendant did file a timely motion to vacate his guilty plea, the admonishments error was not moot where the motion to vacate was withdrawn by defense counsel before it could be ruled upon. Remand for proper appeal admonishments was ordered.

People v. Cuevas, 2018 IL App (2d) 151100 Defendant made a substantial showing of plea counsel's ineffectiveness for not filing a motion to reconsider sentence following an open guilty plea, and for not investigating mitigation witnesses. Under **Roe v. Ortega-Flores**, 528 U.S. 470 (2000), an attorney's ineffectiveness is established when defendant specifically instructs the attorney to perfect his post-plea appeal and counsel fails to do so. However, to establish a substantial showing of such a claim at the second stage, the defendant must corroborate his bare allegation that he asked counsel to move to reconsider and appeal, by explaining the basis for the motion and showing a reasonable probability of its success.

Defendant here met that burden by including affidavits from mitigation witnesses who would rebut the aggravation presented by the State at his sentencing hearing. And given defendant's allegation that counsel knew of but did not contact these witnesses, the petition also made a substantial showing of ineffectiveness based on the failure to investigate the witnesses.

People v. McClendon, 2015 IL App (3d) 130401 Defendant filed a timely motion to withdraw his guilty plea. At the hearing on the motion, the complainant testified that there had been no crime. After the complainant's testimony, the State advised the court that it did not object to allowing the motion to withdraw. The trial court denied the motion.

The Appellate Court held that under the unique facts of this case, the trial court abused its discretion by denying the motion. The State has the exclusive duty and discretion to prosecute all criminal actions. It is well within the State discretion to oppose or not to oppose defendant's motion to withdraw. The court specifically noted that the State waited until after the complainant's testimony before it advised the trial court that it would not oppose the motion. Judicial discretion should not be used to override prosecutorial discretion unless there are compelling reasons to do so. The Appellate Court found no compelling reasons in this case and thus reversed the denial of defendant's motion to withdraw.

People v. Perry, 2014 IL App (1st) 122584 Once a guilty plea defendant expresses an interest in challenging his plea, the trial court has an affirmative duty to ascertain whether the defendant desires counsel to assist in preparing and presenting the postplea motions. Rule 604(d); **People v. Griffin**, 305 Ill. App. 3d 326, 713 N.E.2d 662 (2nd Dist. 1999). Where a guilty plea defendant who had not been properly admonished under Rule 605(c) filed several "notification of motions," and when asked by the trial court if he wanted to withdraw his plea responded that he did because he had "ineffective assistance of counsel," there was a sufficient indication of defendant's desire to challenge his plea to trigger the court's affirmative duty to offer the appointment of counsel.

People v. Gooch, 2014 IL App (5th) 120161 A defendant who is convicted pursuant to a negotiated guilty plea may not challenge his sentence by filing a motion to reconsider, and must instead file a motion to withdraw the plea. Supreme Court Rule 604(d). The court concluded that a "negotiated" plea is one in which the parties reach an agreement concerning sentencing. In other words, where there is no agreement as to sentence but the parties agree that some charges will be dismissed in exchange for the plea, the plea is not "negotiated" for purposes of Rule 604(d).

The court rejected the argument that sentencing considerations are involved in a plea whenever the State loses the ability to obtain sentences on dismissed charges. The court distinguished **People v. Diaz**, 192 Ill.2d 211, 735 N.E.2d 605 (2000), in which the plea agreement specified that the State agreed not to seek consecutive or extended term

sentencing, and held that a “plea bargain that is silent as to sentencing is equivalent to an open plea.”

Because defendant agreed to plead guilty to one count of criminal sexual assault in exchange for the dismissal of two counts of predatory criminal sexual assault, and there was no agreement concerning sentencing, the plea was not negotiated. Therefore, defendant could challenge the sentence by filing a motion to reconsider the sentence and was not required to move to withdraw the plea.

People v. Holm, 2014 IL App (3rd) 130583 A defendant does not have a right to withdraw a guilty plea. Instead, leave to withdraw a plea is permitted as required to correct a manifest injustice under the facts of the particular case. Whether to grant leave to withdraw is left to the discretion of the trial court, whose decision will not be disturbed on appeal unless it appears that the plea was entered through a misapprehension of the facts or the law or there is doubt of the defendant’s guilt and the ends of justice would be served by holding a trial. Before accepting a guilty plea, the trial court must ensure that the defendant’s conduct supports the charge to which he or she is pleading guilty.

Defendant’s motion to withdraw his plea should have been granted. Defendant and his father were charged with the offense of hunter interference for creating noise in an attempt to interfere with hunters on adjacent property. Defendant represented himself and reached a plea agreement by which he would avoid jail time and be able to continue to support his grandmother and disabled brother.

The father represented himself at a jury trial and was convicted. However, in the father’s appeal the Appellate Court found that the statute creating the offense of hunter interference did not apply to the conduct of defendant and his father because they were at all times engaged in the lawful use of their property.

The court concluded that because defendant’s conduct did not constitute the offense to which he pleaded guilty, the interests of justice required that he be allowed to withdraw his plea.

People v. Tapia, 2014 IL App (2d) 111314 Defendant entered a negotiated guilty plea in exchange for the State’s recommendation of a sentencing cap. At the sentencing hearing, the trial court relied upon incorrect information in the pre-sentence investigation report (PSI) which listed a prior conviction from Georgia as a felony rather than a misdemeanor. Defendant did not object to the court’s actions, and filed no post-judgment motions or direct appeal.

Defendant filed a post-conviction petition alleging that trial counsel was ineffective for failing to correct the misinformation about the Georgia conviction. At a third-stage evidentiary hearing, the State introduced trial counsel’s affidavit which stated that he reviewed the PSI with defendant and defendant never indicated that the description of the Georgia conviction as a felony was inaccurate. Defendant filed an affidavit stating that he did not receive a copy of the PSI until the day of sentencing when trial counsel asked him to quickly look it over. Defendant looked it over but did not notice any errors because he did not understand all the legalese. The circuit court denied the petition and defendant appealed.

The Appellate Court held that defendant forfeited his claim of ineffective assistance by failing to file any post-judgment motions or raise the claim on direct appeal. Ordinarily, forfeiture bars a post-conviction claim that could have been, but was not, raised on direct appeal. Here, support for the claim existed and it could have been raised in a post-judgment motion or on direct appeal. The record shows that defendant reviewed the PSI. Defendant also knew that his Georgia conviction was a misdemeanor. A defendant has the obligation to

notify the sentencing court of any inaccuracies in the PSI. By failing to object to the misinformation in the PSI or the court's reliance upon that misinformation, defendant failed to preserve the issue.

People v. Albers, 2013 IL App (2d) 111103 Under Supreme Court Rule 604(d), a defendant who enters a negotiated plea which includes a sentencing cap implicitly agrees not to challenge any sentence which is less than the cap. Thus, the defendant is not allowed to challenge just his sentence, but must file a motion to withdraw the guilty plea and vacate the judgment.

Where defendant pleaded guilty pursuant to a negotiated plea involving the dismissal of other charges and a ten-year-sentencing cap, and then moved to reconsider the sentence, it would have been improper to remand the cause due to defense counsel's failure to comply with the Rule 604(d) requirement that he certify that he consulted with defendant, examined court documents, and amended the *pro se* motion. The court rejected the reasoning of **People v. Neal, 403 Ill. App.3d 757, 936 N.E.2d 726 (4th Dist. 2010)**, which held that a remand is required where counsel's certification was inadequate even where the defendant entered a negotiated plea and filed only a motion to reconsider the sentence. Here, the court found that because defendant failed to file a motion to withdraw his plea, it had no option but to dismiss the appeal.

People v. Buckner, 2013 IL App (2d) 130083 Defendant agreed to plead guilty to three counts in exchange for the State's agreement to nolle three other counts. There was no agreement with respect to the sentence. Defendant filed no motion to withdraw her plea, but filed a motion to reconsider her sentence contending that two of the counts to which she pleaded guilty should merge under the one-act, one-crime doctrine.

Generally, a defendant who pleads guilty must file a motion to withdraw his guilty plea if he seeks to challenge his conviction. Where a defendant agrees to plead guilty to certain charges and the State agrees to drop the remaining charges, the defendant forfeits any consideration of a claim that two of the counts to which he pleaded guilty should merge under the one-act, one-crime rule, where he fails to file a motion to withdraw his guilty plea raising this issue. There is no plain error review. To do so would allow the defendant to receive the full benefit of his bargain under the plea agreement, while later avoiding his own obligation by unilaterally reducing the convictions to which he had agreed.

People v. Merriweather, 2013 IL App (1st) 113789 Defendant argued that because the 30-day period following a guilty plea is a "critical stage" of the criminal process during which the defendant has a constitutional right to counsel, the trial court must appoint counsel when a defendant who pleaded guilty files any *pro se* document requesting the appointment of counsel. Defendant entered a negotiated guilty plea, and subsequently filed a *pro se* notice of appeal without filing a motion to withdraw the plea. Supreme Court Rule 604(d) requires that a defendant who wishes to appeal from a negotiated guilty plea must first file a motion to withdraw the plea. Under Rule 604(d), if the defendant is indigent counsel is to be appointed upon the filing of the motion to withdraw the plea.

The court rejected the argument, noting that defendant was represented by counsel at both his guilty plea and sentencing and properly admonished by the trial court concerning the requirement that he move to withdraw his plea. The court stated that under Rule 604(d), filing a motion to withdraw a negotiated plea is a "condition precedent" to taking an appeal and triggers the right to counsel on appeal.

2. The court also rejected the argument that constitutional questions would be raised concerning Supreme Court Rule 606(a), which governs the perfection of appeals, unless counsel is appointed whenever a *pro se* guilty plea defendant files a notice of appeal. The court acknowledged that Rule 606(a) permits a defendant to file a *pro se* notice of appeal. However, without fully explaining its holding, the court found that a guilty plea defendant who defaults on the Rule 604(d) requirement to file a motion to withdraw the plea is not constitutionally entitled to the appointment of counsel for appeal. The court also noted that although defendant's direct appeal must be dismissed due to the failure to comply with Rule 604(d), defendant is not barred from raising constitutional claims in post-conviction proceedings.

People v. Jordan, 2013 IL App (2d) 120106 When a guilty plea defendant moves to reconsider the sentence or withdraw the plea, defense counsel must file a certificate stating that he or she has consulted with the defendant "to ascertain defendant's contentions of error in the sentence *or* the entry of the plea of guilty," examined the trial court file and report of proceedings of the guilty plea, and made any amendments to the *pro se* motion that are necessary for adequate presentation of any defects in "those proceedings." (S.Ct. Rule 604(d)). The purpose of strictly complying with Rule 604(d) is to safeguard a defendant's right to a direct appeal.

Where defendant entered a non-negotiated plea and could therefore file a motion to reconsider the sentence, a motion to withdraw the plea, or both, defense counsel's certificate was inadequate where it stated only that counsel had consulted with defendant to ascertain any contentions of error "in the imposition of a sentence." The trial court's order denying defendant's motion to reconsider his sentence was vacated, and the cause was remanded so counsel could file a valid Rule 604(d) certificate, defendant could file new post-plea motions if he wished, and the trial court could conduct a new post-plea hearing.

People v. Marquez, 2012 IL App (2d) 110475 A motion to withdraw a guilty plea is untimely under Supreme Court Rule 604(d) if it is filed before sentencing. The court concluded that a Rule 604(d) certificate which was filed in connection with a premature motion does not satisfy the certificate requirement of the rule. (Overruling **People v. Sawyer**, 258 Ill. App. 3d 174, 630 N.E.2d 1294 (2d Dist. 1994)).

The court noted that even with a negotiated plea, where the issues which can be raised are limited and the defendant is not allowed to challenge only his sentence, issues relevant to the motion to withdraw might not occur until sentencing. Under Rule 604(d), counsel is required to certify that he or she has made any amendments to the motion that are necessary to present defendant's contentions. The court found that if counsel filed the certificate before sentencing, it would be impossible to make a truthful certification concerning issues which arise at sentencing.

People v. Monson, 2012 IL App (3d) 100868 Generally, a defendant who pleads guilty in exchange for a cap on the length of her sentence may not challenge a sentence imposed within that cap without first filing a motion to withdraw the plea. However, a defendant does not have to move to withdraw her plea if she challenges her sentence on the ground that it was imposed without statutory authority. A sentence that does not conform to the statutory authority is void.

Defendant pled guilty in exchange for a sentencing cap. She received probation and was ordered to serve a jail term of 180 days without good-conduct credit. Because the court

had no authority to deny that credit to defendant as provided by [730 ILCS 130/3](#), defendant properly filed a motion to reconsider sentence and was not required to file a motion to withdraw her plea. The absence of a 604(d) certificate was of no consequence because a court can correct a void sentence at any time.

The Appellate Court directed the clerk to amend the mittimus to reflect that defendant was entitled to good-conduct credit.

[People v. Villafuerte-Medrano, 2012 IL App \(2d\) 110773](#) Where the court has subject matter and personal jurisdiction, it is not divested of jurisdiction because it accepts a guilty plea which violates double jeopardy. Thus, a conviction based on such a plea is voidable rather than void. To raise a double jeopardy challenge to such a plea, the defendant is required to file a timely motion to withdraw the plea. Otherwise, the entry of the guilty plea waives the double jeopardy challenge.

The court acknowledged that under federal constitutional law, a guilty plea does not waive a double jeopardy challenge where the double jeopardy violation can be established on the face of the charge. The court concluded that even in that case, however, the defendant must preserve the issue on appeal. In other words, a court may not review a double jeopardy claim that has not been preserved for appeal.

Here, the conviction based on defendant's guilty plea was voidable rather than void. Because defendant failed to file a timely motion to withdraw the plea, the court could not consider the claim that the conviction violated double jeopardy.

[People v. Hampton, 2011 IL App \(4th\) 100219](#) Supreme Court Rule 606(b) contemplates that a defendant may file only one post-judgment motion directed against the final judgment. Successive motions raising issues that were previously raised are not permitted and unnecessarily extend the time for appeal. A *pro se* motion for sentence modification is not properly before the trial court if it is filed while the defendant is represented by counsel.

Here, the trial court did not err by failing to consider the merits of defendant's *pro se* motion arguing that error had occurred at the sentencing hearing. Defendant's *pro se* motion was improper because it was filed after the court denied his counsel's motion to reconsider sentence, defendant filed a notice of appeal, and counsel was appointed on appeal. The court acknowledged, however, that a different result might have been required had defendant's motion raised an ineffective assistance of counsel claim.

[People v. Feldman, 409 Ill.App.3d 1124, 948 N.E.2d 1094 \(5th Dist. 2011\)](#) A plea of guilty is an admission of every fact alleged in the indictment as long as each fact admitted is an ingredient of the offense charged. A judicial admission is binding upon the party making it and may not be controverted by other evidence. If the fact admitted to is a concrete fact within the peculiar knowledge of the individual who admits it, an opposing party is entitled to hold the individual to the fact, and the individual may not have the benefit of other evidence that might tend to falsify the admission unless the court finds that the individual has provided a reasonable explanation of it due to mistake.

Defendant pled guilty to a charge of possession of a controlled substance. As part of the factual basis, the State recited that defendant did not have a prescription for any of the substances recovered by the police. The court asked both defense counsel and defendant if they objected to the factual basis and both responded they did not. Defendant later moved to withdraw his plea, asserting that he had a prescription for the pills found in his possession and he only pled guilty to obtain his release from jail.

The court refused to allow defendant to “deliberately mislead the court by stipulating to facts that he now claims are not true and that he now wishes to attempt to controvert,” finding defendant was stopped from contesting that he had no valid prescription by his judicial admission, which operated as a waiver of proof of that fact.

Even if defendant was not bound by “the facts to which he had knowingly and willfully stipulated,” the court concluded that defendant produced insufficient evidence to support the withdrawal of his plea. Defendant had not produced a copy of a valid prescription or any verified information from a physician showing he had a valid prescription. The documents defendant did offer—a workers’ compensation report purportedly written by a physician alluding to his being given a prescription, and a purported expense report from a pharmacy showing defendant had prescriptions for the drugs filled—did not provide substantial evidence that defendant had a valid prescription.

People v. Wigod, 406 Ill.App.3d 66, 940 N.E.2d 202 (1st Dist. 2010) Supreme Court Rule 402(a)(2) provides that a court shall not accept a plea of guilty without addressing defendant in open court, informing him of and determining that he understands the minimum and maximum sentences prescribed by law.

The court admonished defendant, who entered a blind plea to a charge of failure to support (750 ILCS 16/15(a)(4)) that the offense was a Class 4 felony, probationable, and punishable by a minimum term of imprisonment of one year and a maximum of three years, with one year of mandatory supervised release. The court did not advise defendant that the court was also required by statute to order restitution in the amount of the total unpaid support obligation at the time of sentencing, or that defendant could be fined. The court sentenced defendant to a term of probation and ordered restitution as required by statute. Because defendant could reasonably conclude based on the court’s admonitions that his decision to plead guilty would subject him to a sentence of probation or imprisonment in lieu of having to pay the arrearage on his support obligation, defendant’s plea was not made with knowledge of its consequences.

A claim of error not contained in a post-plea motion is not forfeited if the error is clear and obvious and so serious that the defendant was denied a substantial right. A defendant who is denied his due process right to be properly and fully admonished prior to entry of a guilty plea has been denied a substantial right. Also, defendant’s failure to object to the erroneous admonishment can be excused because Supreme Court Rule 402 places the obligation on the court to admonish the defendant regarding the consequences of his plea. Therefore, the court’s neglect to advise defendant that restitution would be a consequence of his plea was not forfeited even though not preserved by defendant’s post-plea motion.

The circuit court also erred in denying defendant’s *pro se* post-plea motion without defendant being present or represented by counsel. Supreme Court Rule 604(d) requires the court to determine whether a defendant who files a post-plea motion is represented by counsel, and if indigent, desires that counsel be appointed. Because the court acted without defendant being present, it could not ascertain if defendant was indigent or desired counsel.

The court vacated the circuit court’s judgment and allowed defendant to withdraw his plea and plead anew.

People v. Brexton, 405 Ill.App.3d 989, 939 N.E.2d 1076 (2d Dist. 2010) Under **Blackledge v. Perry**, 417 U.S. 21 (1974), due process is not violated by the mere fact that the sentence is increased upon retrial after a successful appeal. Instead, due process prohibits only an increased sentence that appears to have been motivated by a realistic likelihood of vindictiveness. Under **People v. Walker**, 84 Ill.2d 512, 419 N.E.2d 1167 (1981), there is a

presumption of vindictiveness where, in the absence of new evidence or changed circumstances, the prosecutor brings additional, more serious charges after a defendant invokes a right to which the law entitles him. The State must rebut the presumption by presenting objective facts showing that the decision to bring the more serious charges was not motivated by vindictiveness.

The prosecution failed to rebut the presumption that it acted vindictively by adding a new burglary charge after defendant successfully sought to withdraw his plea to one count of retail theft. The burglary charge was based on the same act of shoplifting as the retail theft count, and that the State was aware of the facts supporting both charges when it elected to charge only retail theft. The court also rejected several arguments by the State to show that the decision to add the burglary charge was not vindictive. The State did not claim that new evidence or changed circumstances justified the more serious charge. Instead, the only change was that defendant had withdrawn his plea. Defendant's burglary conviction was vacated and the cause remanded for sentencing on retail theft.

People v. Trussel, 397 Ill.App.3d 913, 931 N.E.2d 266 (4th Dist. 2010) Under Supreme Court Rule 604(d), a conviction entered by a guilty plea may be appealed only if the defendant, within 30 days of the date on which the sentence was imposed, files a motion to reconsider the sentence or to vacate the plea. Once the motion is filed, the trial court must determine whether the defendant is represented by counsel or wants to have counsel appointed.

Where the defendant mailed a letter to the circuit clerk's office stating that he wanted to appeal because he felt trial counsel had been ineffective, the clerk erred by treating the document as a notice of appeal rather than a motion to reconsider the sentence or withdraw the plea. Because of the strict waiver requirements of Rule 604(d), which provides that issues not raised in the motion to reconsider the sentence or withdraw the plea are forfeited for appeal, fundamental fairness requires that the defendant be afforded a full opportunity to explain his allegations and to have the assistance of counsel in preparing a formal motion.

The cause was summarily remanded with directions to strike the notice of appeal, treat the defendant's letter as a *pro se* post-conviction motion, and appoint counsel.

People v. Prather, 379 Ill.App.3d 763, 887 N.E.2d 44 (4th Dist. 2008) An attorney representing a defendant on a motion to reconsider the sentence or to withdraw a guilty plea must file a certificate indicating that he or she has consulted with the defendant to ascertain the contentions of error in the sentence or guilty plea, examined the trial court file and report of proceedings of the guilty plea, and made any amendments to the motion necessary to adequately present the issues. Although the certificate need not recite Rule 604(d) word for word, a reviewing court cannot assume or infer compliance with the rule. Defense counsel failed to strictly comply with Rule 604(d) where the wording of the certificate made it unclear whether counsel had made a typographical error in the certificate after performing the duties required by the rule, or had failed to fulfill those duties. The court also noted that according to the certificate, counsel reviewed some transcripts from the file but may not have reviewed the entire file.

People v. Strawder, 374 Ill.App.3d 338, 871 N.E.2d 233 (2^d Dist. 2007) Where defendant filed separate motions to withdraw his guilty plea and to reconsider the sentence, the trial attorney's failure to comply with Supreme Court Rule 604(d) required a remand for a new hearing on the motion to withdraw the guilty plea. However, counsel's error did not nullify a favorable ruling on the motion to reconsider sentence. Thus, "[i]f defendant is satisfied with [the sentencing] relief obtained [on the motion to reconsider sentence] the order on that

motion may stand despite the absence of a proper Rule 604(d) certificate." However, if the defendant wishes to file a new motion to reconsider the sentence, the trial court must vacate the order reducing the sentence and hold a hearing on the new motion.

People v. Green, 375 Ill.App.3d 1049, 874 N.E.2d 935 (2d Dist. 2007) Supreme Court Rule 604(d) provides that an appeal may be taken from a negotiated guilty plea only if the defendant files a motion to withdraw the plea. Although defendant filed a motion to reconsider the sentence imposed on a partially negotiated plea, and thus sought relief that was unavailable as a matter of law, the Court found that it had jurisdiction. The requirements of Rule 604(d) are not jurisdictional and Rule 606(b), which defines the Appellate Court's jurisdiction over criminal appeals, does not state that an improper Rule 604(d) motion affects appellate jurisdiction.

People v. Lofton, 379 Ill.App.3d 331, 883 N.E.2d 506 (4th Dist. 2007) Defendant pleaded guilty and at sentencing indicated that he wanted to appeal. The judge did not respond to the statement, but gave accurate appeal admonishments, including that defendant was required to file a motion to withdraw his negotiated plea and that he was entitled to the assistance of counsel. Although Rule 604(d) states that a defendant who pleads guilty has the right to counsel once a post-plea motion is filed, it is well settled that a guilty plea defendant is entitled to the assistance of an attorney to prepare and present the post-plea motion. In addition, the trial court has an obligation to appoint counsel for a guilty plea defendant who indicates a desire to appeal, or at the minimum to investigate whether a defendant who manifests an interest in appealing wants to have counsel appointed. The trial court erred by failing to respond to defendant's statement that he wanted to appeal by inquiring whether defendant wanted an attorney.

People v. Carroll, 375 Ill.App.3d 162, 872 N.E.2d 1088 (2d Dist. 2007) An attorney's failure to file a Rule 604(d) certificate does not deprive the trial court of jurisdiction to proceed on a motion to withdraw a guilty plea, and does not render the court's judgment void. Instead, the judgment is merely voidable.

People v. Bryant, 369 Ill.App.3d 54, 860 N.E.2d 511 (1st Dist. 2006) A trial judge has authority to reconsider a ruling granting a defendant's motion to withdraw his guilty plea. Where the State failed to object in the trial court, the trial judge had authority to grant an oral motion to withdraw a guilty plea. Although Supreme Court Rule 604(d) requires a written motion before a defendant can appeal from a judgment entered on a guilty plea, the trial court's authority to grant leave to withdraw a plea is not dependent on the existence of a written motion.

People v. Crowder, 351 Ill.App.3d 1096, 815 N.E.2d 1244 (4th Dist. 2004) Trial courts must strictly comply with the requirements of Supreme Court Rule 605, which defines the admonitions required to be given after a defendant pleads guilty. Where the trial court fails to strictly comply with Rule 605, the appropriate remedy is to remand the cause with instructions to give proper admonishments and allow the defendant an opportunity to file appropriate post-judgment motions.

People v. Jones, 349 Ill.App.3d 255, 812 N.E.2d 32 (3d Dist. 2004) Although an appellate court must generally dismiss an appeal when the defendant has failed to follow Rule 604(d) by filing a timely motion to reconsider the sentence or to withdraw the guilty plea, the court

found that the "admonition exception," under which appellate courts may entertain appeals in which the trial court failed to issue proper Rule 605 admonitions, should be applied where there was a *bona fide* doubt of the defendant's fitness at the time he received the admonitions. "It seems but a small step from an exception for no admonitions at all to an exception for admonishments given to an unfit defendant who cannot understand or comply with them."

People v. Little, 337 Ill.App.3d 619, 786 N.E.2d 636 (4th Dist. 2003) Defense counsel did not comply with Rule 604(d) where he filed a certificate stating that he had satisfied the requirements of the rule, but the record showed that the transcript of the plea of guilty was not prepared until after the certificate was filed. Here, defense counsel's motion to reconsider the sentence was merely pro forma; counsel stated he was filing the motion only because he was required to do so before defendant could appeal, and the motion failed to state any grounds to reduce the sentence and therefore waived all issues for appeal.

People v. Lloyd, 338 Ill.App.3d 379, 788 N.E.2d 1169 (1st Dist. 2003) The "admonition exception," which permits a guilty plea defendant to appeal despite his failure to challenge his plea or sentence within 30 days if the trial court failed to properly admonish him under the Supreme Court Rules, applies to both negotiated and non-negotiated pleas. The Court had jurisdiction where the trial court advised defendant that he was required to act within 30 days, but failed to inform him that if he was indigent, counsel would be appointed to assist in preparing the post-plea motions. A trial judge can not consider such an admonition superfluous where the defendant is represented by private counsel at the guilty plea proceedings; "[h]owever reasonable the omission may have seemed under the circumstances, it is axiomatic that a criminal defendant's right to assistance of counsel is fundamental."

People v. Wade, 326 Ill.App.3d 940, 761 N.E.2d 1196 (1st Dist. 2001) Under Supreme Court Rule 604(d), once a motion to withdraw the plea or reconsider sentence is denied, notice of appeal must be filed within 30 days. Whether an order is a final judgment is determined by its substantive effect rather than its form. Despite the trial court's statement that defendant's motion was struck "for the time being," the substantive effect of the order was to dismiss the motion as untimely.

People v. Bonds, 317 Ill.App.3d 411, 740 N.E.2d 519 (4th Dist. 2000) Under **People v. Tuft**, 165 Ill.2d 66, 649 N.E.2d 374 (1995) and **In re J.E.M.Y.**, 289 Ill.App.3d 389, 682 N.E.2d 451 (4th Dist. 1997), a defendant who admits to a probation revocation petition is not required to comply with Rule 604(d) in order to appeal his sentences. Thus, a revoked probationer may appeal without filing a motion to reconsider the sentence.

People v. Haley, 315 Ill.App.3d 717, 734 N.E.2d 473 (3d Dist. 2000) **People v. Evans**, 174 Ill.2d 320, 673 N.E.2d 244 (1996) and **People v. Linder**, 186 Ill.2d 67, 708 N.E.2d 1169 (1999) preclude a defendant from challenging the severity of a negotiated sentence after a motion to withdraw the plea has been denied. The court held that permitting appeals in such cases "would do nothing to encourage plea bargaining and is steeped in potential for abuse." Thus, where a motion to withdraw a guilty plea is unsuccessful the defendant "may appeal from the court's denial of the motion; however, he may not challenge the severity of his sentence."

People v. Foster, 308 Ill.App.3d 286, 719 N.E.2d 1163 (3d Dist. 1999) A defendant who enters a negotiated guilty plea is not required to file a motion to withdraw his plea in order

to challenge a sentence which violated the plea agreement. See also, [People v. Renner](#), 321 Ill.App.3d 1022, 748 N.E.2d 1272 (5th Dist. 2001) (a defendant need not move to withdraw a guilty plea where the sentence is outside the range to which the parties agreed).

[People v. Stevens](#), 297 Ill.App.3d 408, 696 N.E.2d 828 (1st Dist. 1998) Where the trial court admonished defendant that he was required to file a motion to withdraw his plea, but failed to advise him that issues not included in the motion would be waived for purposes of appeal, issues omitted from the written motion were not waived. The Appellate Court remanded the cause for proper admonishments and an opportunity to raise any additional issues.

[People v. Butcher](#), 288 Ill.App.3d 120, 679 N.E.2d 1260 (4th Dist. 1997) The trial court erroneously advised the defendant that to appeal a probation revocation based on an admission, he was required to file a motion to vacate the admission. "We are unaware of any case requiring a defendant who has admitted violating his probation to file a motion to vacate or withdraw his admission before he can appeal the order revoking the probation."

[People v. Barnes](#), 291 Ill.App.3d 545, 684 N.E.2d 416 (3d Dist. 1997) Although [People v. Evans](#), 174 Ill.2d 326, 73 N.E.2d 244 (1996) holds that a defendant sentenced pursuant to a negotiated guilty plea cannot appeal by filing a motion to reconsider the sentence, the trial court is required to appoint counsel where a pro se defendant erroneously files a motion to reconsider the sentence instead of seeking to withdraw the plea.

[People v. McKay](#), 282 Ill.App.3d 108, 668 N.E.2d 580 (2d Dist. 1996) In this case the defendant's failure to file a motion to withdraw the plea did not deprive the Appellate Court of jurisdiction. The court declined to apply the waiver doctrine to an arguably unfit defendant.

[People v. Riegle](#), 246 Ill.App.3d 270, 615 N.E.2d 1232 (4th Dist. 1993) Before sentencing, the defendant moved to withdraw his guilty pleas. The trial court denied the motion, and defendant thereafter failed to renew this motion or to file a motion to reconsider the sentence after his sentence was imposed. Under Supreme Court Rule 604(d), which mandates that a motion to withdraw the plea or to reconsider the sentence be filed within 30 days after the sentencing hearing, defendant failed to perfect his appeal.

[People v. Mapps](#), 198 Ill.App.3d 521, 555 N.E.2d 1275 (5th Dist. 1990) Defendant filed a timely motion to withdraw his guilty plea, but did not challenge the extended term sentence. The Court held that the extended term was void because defendant had not been admonished as to the possibility of such a sentence. See also, [People v. McCracken](#), 237 Ill.App.3d 519, 604 N.E.2d 1104 (3d Dist. 1992) (incorrect admonishments about sentencing possibilities may be reached as plain error; a trial court's failure to admonish defendant about the possibility of consecutive sentences was not waived though it was omitted from the motion to withdraw the plea).

[People v. Pagel](#), 197 Ill.App.3d 305, 553 N.E.2d 1110 (4th Dist. 1990) A motion to withdraw a guilty plea was timely filed where it was deposited into a prison mailbox on the 30th day after sentencing, though it was not sent out of the prison or postmarked until a later date. See also, [People v. Easley](#), 199 Ill.App.3d 179, 556 N.E.2d 802 (4th Dist. 1990). But see, [People v. Tlatenchi](#), 391 Ill.App.3d 705, 909 N.E.2d 198 (1st Dist. 2009).

People v. Johnson, 174 Ill.App.3d 812, 528 N.E.2d 1360 (4th Dist. 1988) Defendant pleaded guilty and the trial judge placed him on supervision. The defendant appealed, challenging a condition of the supervision, without filing a motion to withdraw the guilty plea. The Court held that defendant could properly appeal without filing a motion to withdraw the guilty plea. Rule 604(d) requires the filing of a motion to withdraw before an appeal may be taken from a "judgement" entered upon a guilty plea but an order of supervision is not a "judgement," because it permits a defendant to be discharged without judgment being entered.

People v. Jenkins, 141 Ill.App.3d 602, 490 N.E.2d 953 (4th Dist. 1986) An issue which is not raised in defendant's motion to withdraw his guilty plea may not be raised on appeal. However, a "reviewing court may, at its discretion, consider the merits of a defendant's claim."

People v. Culp, 127 Ill.App.3d 916, 468 N.E.2d 1328 (4th Dist. 1984) The failure to file a motion to vacate a guilty plea, pursuant to Rule 604(d), forecloses a direct appeal from the conviction, but does not preclude a defendant from filing a Post- Conviction petition. See also, **People v. Umfleet**, 190 Ill.App.3d 804, 546 N.E.2d 1013 (5th Dist. 1989).

§24-8(b)

Procedure on Motion

§24-8(b)(1)

Generally

Illinois Supreme Court

People v. Edwards, 197 Ill.2d 239, 757 N.E.2d 442 (2001) Once a pro se defendant notifies the circuit court that he wishes to withdraw his guilty plea and appeal, the protections of Rule 604(d), including the appointment of counsel, are triggered. See also, **People v. Griffin**, 305 Ill.App.3d 326, 713 N.E.2d 662 (2d Dist. 1999) (although Supreme Court Rule 604(d) requires the trial court to appoint counsel for an indigent defendant only after a post-plea motion is filed, once a defendant who has pleaded guilty expresses an interest in appealing, the trial court must ascertain whether counsel is desired for purposes of preparing a written motion).

People v. Fitzgibbon & Merritt, 184 Ill.2d 320, 704 N.E.2d 366 (1998) Although Supreme Court Rule 604(d) requires an attorney who represents a defendant on a motion to withdraw a guilty plea or reconsider a sentence to file a certificate stating that he or she has examined the "report of proceedings of the plea of guilty," an attorney who files a motion to reconsider the sentence need not certify that he or she has examined the transcript of the sentencing hearing. Although the court was not "unmindful of the concerns" which led the Fourth District Appellate Court to require counsel to certify that he or she had read the sentencing hearing transcript (see **People v. Munetsi**, 283 Ill.App.3d 326, 669 N.E.2d 1258 (4th Dist. 1996)), it refused "at this time" to "add an additional certification requirement to Rule 604(d)."

Illinois Appellate Court

People v. Salamie, 2023 IL App (2d) 220312 Defendant was charged with two felonies and one misdemeanor in connection with a domestic violence incident. She entered into a negotiated plea to one felony. In exchange, the other charges were dismissed, and she received a two-year sentence that would be deferred while she was diverted to mental health court. If she completed the program successfully, the sentence would be vacated and she would receive a short term of home confinement.

After several appearances before the mental health court, it became evident that, because defendant was hearing-impaired, she would have to wait years for the appropriate treatment. The parties and the court agreed to grant her a “neutral discharge” from mental health court, and to modify the plea sentence to a six-month term of conditional discharge.

Defendant moved to withdraw the plea, arguing that she was never informed that the parties and court had discussed other options aside from re-negotiating the sentence, including allowing her to withdraw. She was instead told that she had to either accept the modified sentence or enter into an open plea. Counsel provided an affidavit stating that he informed defendant one of the possibilities of the neutral discharge was an open plea. He admitted, however, that an open plea could not be forced upon defendant, as she was entitled to the benefit of the bargain, and therefore he was ineffective in communicating the option of withdrawal. The court denied the motion to withdraw.

On appeal, defendant first argued that the mental health court failed to provide Rule 402 admonishments upon discharge and imposition of the modified sentence. The appellate court disagreed. The plain language of the rule requires admonishments at plea hearings. Defendant did not plead guilty upon her discharge or upon her agreement to the modification of the sentence. Thus, Rule 402 did not apply.

The appellate court did agree with defendant’s argument that her attorney labored under an actual conflict of interest when representing her on the motion to withdraw. Counsel is allowed to argue his or her own ineffectiveness only if there is no adverse affect on performance. Attorneys in this situation must zealously argue their own ineffectiveness. Here, counsel’s conflict affected his performance. Counsel was reluctant to cast blame on himself or anyone else for the erroneous advice, deemphasizing his role and using passive language such as, “In addition to being misinformed about what her options were,” instead of directly asserting that he provided her with the deficient advice. He also argued at the hearing on the motion to withdraw that, “I think she made that decision based on—I don’t want to say bad advice, but on some faulty potential, I guess I would say.” Finally, counsel failed to produce relevant evidence, such as his emails to defendant, which defendant had averred would show the deficient advice. As such, counsel did not provide zealous advocacy, and defendant established an actual conflict. The case was remanded for a new hearing on the motion to withdraw the plea, and for appointment of new counsel.

People v. Grigalanz, 2022 IL App (4th) 210468 In a prior appeal, defendant’s case was remanded for further post-plea proceedings because counsel had failed to strictly comply with Rule 604(d). On remand, new appointed counsel filed an amended motion to withdraw guilty plea, arguing that the trial court failed to substantially comply with Rule 402(a)(2) when it incorrectly admonished defendant that he only faced a 3-year MSR term, when in fact the appropriate MSR term was 3-years-to-life. Defendant argued that his plea was not knowing and voluntary in light of the incorrect admonishment. The court denied defendant’s amended motion to withdraw plea on the basis that it was forfeited because defendant had not raised it in his original motion to withdraw.

In this appeal, defendant argued that the court erred in denying his motion where his Rule 402 claim had merit. The State argued, on the other hand, that the issue was whether

the court properly found the claim forfeited. The Appellate Court agreed with the State as to the nature of the issue before it. And, the court concluded that the trial court had erred in finding defendant's claim forfeited. As part of the original 604(d) remand, the court specifically ordered that the trial court give defendant the opportunity to file a new post-plea hearing and conduct a new motion hearing. Defendant was not limited to asserting only those claims raised in his original motion. Such a limitation would be fundamentally unfair where counsel failed to comply with Rule 604(d) in the original post-plea proceedings. The denial of defendant's motion was vacated, and the matter remanded for a new hearing on defendant's amended motion to withdraw plea.

People v. Sidney, 2021 IL App (3d) 190048 At a hearing on defendant's motion to withdraw guilty plea the judge *sua sponte* called defendant's plea counsel as a witness. One of the grounds on which defendant sought to withdraw his plea was that he received ineffective assistance of plea counsel, specifically that counsel misinformed him about how much time he would have to serve in custody. Defendant testified at the motion hearing, but neither post-plea counsel nor the prosecutor presented testimony from plea counsel, who was present in the courthouse and available to testify.

The trial judge did not abuse his discretion in calling plea counsel as a witness. The judge asked neutral questions to clarify what advice plea counsel had given defendant as to sentencing and to determine the truth of defendant's allegations. The judge noted that he would have denied defendant's motion even without plea counsel's testimony. On these facts, the court did not step into the role of advocate by calling plea counsel as a witness.

People v. Baker, 2020 IL App (3d) 180348 Appellate Court had jurisdiction over defendant's guilty plea appeal even though the trial court twice struck defendant's post-plea motion. In doing so, the court impliedly extended the time for defendant to properly file his motion, and ultimately ruled on its merits. The trial court is presumed to know and follow the law, and nothing in the record showed it did not do so when it ruled on the post-plea motion here. The Appellate Court went on to reverse and remand for further proceedings because the trial court failed to comply with Rule 604(d) where it did not determine whether defendant desired legal representation until after it denied defendant's post-plea motion.

People v. Harris, 2020 IL App (5th) 170158 After entering a fully negotiated plea, defendant filed a motion to withdraw alleging that the plea was coerced and the result of ineffective assistance of counsel. The trial court allowed that motion, and the State filed a motion to reconsider arguing that the hearing on defendant's motion to withdraw had been only a **Krankel** hearing such that allowing withdrawal of the plea was premature. The trial court agreed and granted the State's motion to reconsider. Subsequently, new counsel filed a new motion to withdraw plea, including the ineffective assistance of counsel claim, which was ultimately heard and denied.

On appeal, defendant challenged the court's ability to reinstate his plea on the State's motion to reconsider. The court held that the trial court has the inherent authority to reconsider its granting of a motion to withdraw plea. Because defendant did not challenge the denial of his motion to withdraw plea on the merits, the Appellate Court affirmed.

People v. Williams, 2019 IL App (3d) 160412 A trial court does not abuse its discretion when, as justification for denying a motion to withdraw a guilty plea, it considers the purported weaknesses in a defendant's proffered defense. Here, defendant alleged that his

attorney failed to obtain exculpatory evidence prior to the guilty plea, but the trial court disbelieved the defendant's description of this evidence. The Appellate Court affirmed, finding the court's rationale appropriate under Illinois Supreme Court precedent, which requires a defendant to propose a "meritorious defense" when weighing a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel prior to a guilty plea. The circuit court therefore acted appropriately in analyzing whether defendant's proposed defense had merit.

People v. Jackson, 2018 IL App (3d) 170125 Defendant entered a fully negotiated guilty plea, and subsequently filed a motion to withdraw his plea. Post-plea counsel's Rule 604(d) certificate failed to state that she reviewed the report of proceedings of the sentencing hearing. Nevertheless, the Court held that under "the unique facts of this case," the certificate was strictly compliant with the requirements of the rule because counsel certified she reviewed the guilty plea transcript which included discussion of defendant's sentence.

People v. Bridges, 2017 IL App (2d) 150718 When a defendant moves to withdraw his guilty plea, Rule 604(d) requires counsel to certify that she has made any amendments to the motion that are necessary to adequately present any errors relating to defendant's plea. Where counsel has filed a facially valid certificate of compliance, the reviewing court may consult the record to determine whether she actually fulfilled her 604(d) obligations.

Counsel filed an amended motion to withdraw defendant's guilty plea and a certificate of compliance with Rule 604(d). At a status hearing where defendant was not present, the court asked if the case should be continued for argument. Defense counsel stated that the written motion laid out the necessary arguments. She added that she could have defendant testify but doubted whether there were "any issues about any of the factual issues." The parties stated that there was no evidence to present.

At the next court date, the parties declined to present additional argument. The trial court denied defendant's motion, stating that there was nothing in the record to support defendant's claim.

The Appellate Court held that the record refuted counsel's certificate of compliance. Counsel presented detailed factual allegations in defendant's amended motion to withdraw, but none of those allegations were supported by the record. Under 604(d), facts that do not appear in the record must be supported by an affidavit. Thus to fulfill her duties, counsel was obligated to attach an affidavit substantiating her allegations. By failing to do so, counsel did not comply with Rule 604(d).

The court also held that the hearing on defendant's motion was inadequate under Rule 604(d). Counsel prepared a detailed motion to withdraw but failed to offer any argument or evidence to support it. This failure "functioned as a concession that the motion was without merit." The hearing thus served no purpose.

The Court remanded the case for filing a valid 604(d) certificate, the opportunity to file a new motion to withdraw and/or reconsider sentence, and a new motion hearing.

People v. Bernard, 2014 IL App (2d) 130924 When defense counsel fails to file a Rule 604(d) certificate, the appropriate remedy is to remand for the filing of the certificate, the opportunity to file a new motion to withdraw if one is necessary, and a new motion hearing. Once the reviewing court remands a case for the potential filing of a new motion, the previous order denying the motion to withdraw has been vacated and is nullified, canceled, and void.

People v. Buchanan, 2013 IL App (2d) 120447 Defendant made a post-plea claim that counsel who represented him at his guilty plea was ineffective, after counsel had filed a written motion to withdraw the plea. The court properly allowed defendant to proceed *pro se* on his ineffectiveness allegations, but did not treat his request to proceed *pro se* as a complete waiver of his right to counsel on the post-plea motion. After conducting a **Krankel** hearing on defendant's allegations of ineffectiveness and determining that the claims were without merit, the trial court denied the post-plea motion.

Upon determining that the *pro se* claims had no merit, the trial court should have clearly informed defendant that he was not entitled to conflict counsel and, rather than denying the post-plea motion, should have allowed counsel to argue the remaining claims or obtained a waiver of counsel from the defendant before ruling on the post-plea motion.

The cause was remanded for further proceedings on the post-plea motion. Because the court appointed new counsel for defendant on another matter after denying the post-plea motion, that counsel or other new counsel may represent the defendant on remand. That counsel must file a new Rule 604(d) certificate, and counsel is free to file an amended motion to withdraw plea.

People v. Gabrys, 2013 IL App (3d) 110912 The court is not required to automatically appoint new counsel when defendant makes a post-trial claim of ineffective assistance of counsel. The court is only required to examine the factual basis of defendant's claim. If the court determines that the claim lacks merit or pertains only to matters of trial strategy, the court need not appoint new counsel and may deny the post-trial motion. If the allegations show possible neglect of the case, new counsel should be appointed. This rule applies in the post-plea context as well.

The court made an adequate inquiry into defendant's post-plea allegations of ineffective assistance of counsel. Defendant alleged that he had a defense. Defense counsel explained that the name and phone number defendant gave him turned up no one. Defendant alleged that defense counsel did not meet with him prior to the plea. Defense counsel explained that she had met with the defendant a number of times. The court did not abuse its discretion in finding that the allegations lacked merit and denying the motion to withdraw the guilty plea.

People v. Maxwell, 2013 IL App (4th) 111042 Supreme Court Rule 604(d) provides that a post-plea motion "shall be heard promptly." This rule provides an opportunity for fact finding when the witnesses are available and memories are fresh and to allow a court to immediately correct any errors that may have produced a guilty plea. But unlike a post-conviction proceeding, there is no threshold pleading requirement that a defendant must meet to obtain a hearing. The hearing must be meaningful and defendant must be given an opportunity to argue the merits of the motion.

The trial court denied defendant's second motion to withdraw her guilty plea without a hearing. Neither party contested defendant's ability to bring a second motion. Because the trial court denied the defendant her right to a hearing, the Appellate Court reversed and remanded for further proceedings in strict compliance with Rule 604(d).

People v. Dean, 2012 IL App (2d) 110505 Defense counsel filed a motion to vacate defendant's guilty plea that included an allegation that the plea was induced by his attorney's unwillingness to try to the case and that he was never informed that a jury could return a verdict finding him guilty only of second-degree murder. Before denying the motion, the court questioned defense counsel about these allegations, had a discussion with the defendant,

relied on its own recollection of the proceedings, and reviewed the transcript of the plea proceedings.

The Appellate Court concluded that a *per se* conflict of interest did not exist merely because the motion to vacate plea raised a question about the defense attorney's competence. Because the trial court sufficiently inquired into the factual basis for the allegations in the motion before denying the motion, no error occurred.

People v. Hampton, 2011 IL App (4th) 100219 Supreme Court Rule 606(b) contemplates that a defendant may file only one post-judgment motion directed against the final judgment. Successive motions raising issues that were previously raised are not permitted and unnecessarily extend the time for appeal. A *pro se* motion for sentence modification is not properly before the trial court if it is filed while the defendant is represented by counsel.

Here, the trial court did not err by failing to consider the merits of defendant's *pro se* motion arguing that error had occurred at the sentencing hearing. Defendant's *pro se* motion was improper because it was filed after the court denied his counsel's motion to reconsider sentence, defendant filed a notice of appeal, and counsel was appointed on appeal. The court acknowledged, however, that a different result might have been required had defendant's motion raised an ineffective assistance of counsel claim.

People v. Wigod, 406 Ill.App.3d 66, 940 N.E.2d 202 (1st Dist. 2010) A claim of error not contained in a post-plea motion is not forfeited if the error is clear and obvious and so serious that the defendant was denied a substantial right. A defendant who is denied his due process right to be properly and fully admonished prior to entry of a guilty plea has been denied a substantial right. Also, defendant's failure to object to the erroneous admonishment can be excused because Supreme Court Rule 402 places the obligation on the court to admonish the defendant regarding the consequences of his plea. Therefore, the court's neglect to advise defendant that restitution would be a consequence of his plea was not forfeited even though not preserved by defendant's post-plea motion.

The circuit court also erred in denying defendant's *pro se* post-plea motion without defendant being present or represented by counsel. Supreme Court Rule 604(d) requires the court to determine whether a defendant who files a post-plea motion is represented by counsel, and if indigent, desires that counsel be appointed. Because the court acted without defendant being present, it could not ascertain if defendant was indigent or desired counsel.

People v. Dismuke, 355 Ill.App.3d 606, 823 N.E.2d 1131 (2d Dist. 2005) Defense counsel failed to strictly comply with Supreme Court Rule 604(d). The certificate failed to state that: (1) counsel had made any necessary amendments to defendant's motion to withdraw his guilty plea, (2) that counsel had consulted with defendant related to defendant's contentions of error, and (3) that the report of proceedings had been reviewed by counsel. The court rejected the State's argument that strict compliance was unnecessary where the record as a whole demonstrates that the purpose of Rule 604(d) was satisfied. Instead, the court held that it would be a waste of judicial resources to require the appellate court to "scour through" the record to determine whether an attorney who files a facially deficient certificate nonetheless complied with Rule 604(d).

People v. Pegues, 277 Ill.App.3d 884, 661 N.E.2d 405 (1st Dist. 1996) The trial court erred by denying defendant's motion to reconsider sentence without appointing counsel. Though the trial court believed the motion to be untimely, Supreme Rule 604(d) provides that where a motion to withdraw the plea or reconsider the sentence is filed the trial court must

determine whether the defendant is represented by counsel. If the defendant is indigent and desires counsel, counsel must be appointed. Thus, "[b]y its plain terms, Rule 604(d) mandates that trial judges appoint an attorney to represent any indigent defendant desiring counsel."

People v. Brasseaux, 254 Ill.App.3d 283, 660 N.E.2d 1321 (2d Dist. 1996) The hearing on a motion to reduce sentence is a "critical stage" of the prosecution at which the defendant is entitled to the effective assistance of counsel. In addition, the defendant is entitled to attend the hearing on a motion to reconsider sentence where the motion alleges facts outside the record or raises issues that require presentation of evidence.

People v. Horton, 250 Ill.App.3d 944, 620 N.E.2d 437 (4th Dist. 1993) The Court criticized the trial court for failing to give "serious consideration" to the merits of defendant's motion to reconsider sentence. The trial court may not "offhandedly dismiss such a request" or merely presume that the sentence was "unquestionably accurate."

People v. Denson, 243 Ill.App.3d 55, 611 N.E.2d 1230 (1st Dist. 1993) A new hearing was ordered on defendant's pro se motion to withdraw his guilty plea where defendant was not given a transcript of the guilty plea proceeding before his motion was heard.

People v. Jackson, 239 Ill.App.3d 165, 606 N.E.2d 809 (4th Dist. 1992) After pleading guilty, defendant failed to appear at his sentencing hearing. The Court sentenced defendant in absentia. Within 30 days, defendant filed a motion to reconsider the sentence. The trial court found that it had no jurisdiction to hear the motion because the clerk had already filed the notice of appeal. The trial court also stated, "even though you have a right to file a motion to reconsider that would be a useless act on your part, because based upon the evidence before me, I would reimpose the same sentence." The Appellate Court criticized the trial judge for prejudging the merits of the motion to reconsider the sentence pointing out that the "useless act" the trial court referred to is one which the Illinois Supreme Court, in its wisdom, has deemed mandatory. . . . [I]t is error for a trial court to prejudge the matter, as attempted here, in an effort to short-circuit the requirements of Supreme Court Rules. Motions to reconsider remain conditions precedent."

People v. Keele, 210 Ill.App.3d 898, 569 N.E.2d 301 (5th Dist. 1991) Supreme Court Rule 604(d) "contemplates more than the mere pro forma filing of a motion" to withdraw the plea as a vehicle to permit an appeal. The cause was remanded for defendant to file a proper motion to withdraw the plea and the trial court to hold an appropriate hearing.

People v. Chesnut, 47 Ill.App.3d 324, 361 N.E.2d 1185 (3d Dist. 1977) The trial court did not err by appointing the same public defender who represented defendant at his guilty plea to also represent him for the motion to vacate the plea. Defendant did not raise a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel at his plea and did not express any dissatisfaction with counsel.

§24-8(b)(2)

Rule 604(d) Certificates

Illinois Supreme Court

People v. Gorss, 2022 IL 126464 When a defendant files a post-plea motion, Rule 604(d) requires defense counsel to certify, *inter alia*, that he or she has consulted with the client, to ascertain the client’s “contentions of error in the sentence and the entry of the guilty plea.” The rule requires strict compliance.

Here, defendant filed a post-plea motion attacking only his sentence. Defense counsel’s 604(d) certificate stated that he consulted with defendant about errors in the sentence, and that defendant did not desire to withdraw this plea. Defendant argued the certificate failed to comply with Rule 604(d) because it did not state that counsel consulted defendant about his contentions of error in the entry of the plea. The State argued that the certificate complied with 604(d) because it could be inferred from the statement that defendant did not wish to withdraw the plea that counsel consulted defendant about errors in the entry of the plea. The Supreme Court disagreed. The fact that defendant desired to persist in the plea did not reveal whether counsel consulted with defendant as to contentions of error with respect to the guilty plea.

People v. Easton, 2018 IL 122187 Recent amendments to Supreme Court Rule 604(d) do not apply retroactively to cases pending on direct appeal. Looking to **People v. Hunter, 2017 IL 121306**, the Court held that because the post-plea proceedings in the trial court had concluded more than a year prior to the rule’s amendment, there were no “ongoing proceedings” to which the amended rule could apply.

Regardless, counsel’s certificate was deficient because it was not strictly compliant with the version of the rule in existence at the time it was filed. While counsel’s certificate mirrored the language of that prior version of the rule, stating that counsel had consulted with defendant about his claims of error “in the imposition of the sentence or the entry of plea,” under **People v. Tousignant, 2014 IL 115329**, strict compliance required counsel to certify that he consulted with defendant about any claims of error in both the plea *and* sentencing.

In reaching this conclusion, the Court rejected the State’s argument that because “or” means “and” in the Rule, “or” should also mean “and” in an attorney certificate. The Court distinguished the two uses, noting that the language of the Rule was construed to effect the intent of the drafters to ensure protection of defendant’s interests by means of adequate consultation. But, when construing the language of a certificate, the Court is looking to see if counsel’s past conduct (as described in the certificate) strictly complied with the duties of consultation imposed by the Rule. Further, the Court was clear in **Tousignant** that “counsel is required to certify” consultation with defendant concerning both the plea and sentencing.

In re H.L., 2015 IL 118529 Under Supreme Court Rule 604(d), an attorney who represents a defendant on a motion challenging a judgement that was entered on a guilty plea must file, “with the trial court,” a certificate stating that he or she has consulted with the defendant to ascertain any contentions of error in the sentence or entry of the guilty plea, examined the trial court file and report of proceedings of the guilty plea, and made any amendments to the motion necessary for adequate presentation of any defects in those proceedings. Strict compliance with the certification requirement is required.

Acknowledging conflicting language in Illinois precedent, the court concluded that Rule 604(d) does not require defense counsel to file the certificate at or before the hearing on the postplea motion. Instead, strict compliance occurs where the certificate is filed in the trial court rather than on appeal. Thus, the certificate must be filed before the notice of appeal is filed.

People v. Tousignant, 2014 IL 115329 Supreme Court Rule 604(d) requires the attorney for a defendant who has filed a post-judgment motion in the trial court challenging his guilty plea and/or sentence to file a certificate stating that he has consulted with the defendant “to ascertain defendant’s contentions of error in the sentence or the entry of the plea of guilty.” Ill. S. Ct. R. 604(d).

Although the consultation requirement is stated in the disjunctive, a literal reading of the word “or” would frustrate the purposes of the rule. Instead, the rule should be read to require that counsel certify that he has consulted with the defendant to ascertain his contentions of error in both the sentence and the guilty plea.

Counsel’s certificate in this case stated that he consulted with defendant only about his contentions of error in the sentence imposed. Counsel’s certificate thus did not strictly comply with the rule. The cause was remanded for filing of a new postplea motion (if defendant wishes), a new hearing on the motion, and strict compliance with Rule 604(d).

People v. Lindsay, 239 Ill.2d 522, 942 N.E.2d 1268 (2011) Under Supreme Court Rule 604(d), an attorney who represents an indigent defendant on a motion to withdraw a guilty plea and/or reconsider the sentence must file a certificate stating that he or she has consulted with the defendant to ascertain contentions of error, examined the trial court file and report of proceedings of the plea, and made any amendments to the motion that are necessary to adequately present defendant’s contentions of error.

Resolving a conflict in appellate authority, the Supreme Court held that where the cause is remanded due to defense counsel’s failure to file a Rule 604(d) certificate, a new motion to withdraw the guilty plea or reconsider the sentence is required only if counsel concludes that the original motion is insufficient to adequately present the defendant’s contentions.

People v. Shirley, 181 Ill.2d 359, 692 N.E.2d 1189 (1998) Although a Rule 604(d) certificate must be filed before a hearing is held on a motion to withdraw a guilty plea or reconsider the sentence, and strict compliance with the certificate requirement is required, where the cause has been remanded once because trial counsel failed to file a Rule 604(d) certificate "there is no further requirement that successive remands and rehearings will be ordered" because counsel again failed to file a certificate on remand: "In general, strict compliance with the attorney certification component of Rule 604(d) means the certificate must be filed in the trial court, rather than on appeal. If this standard of strict compliance is not met, the remedy is a remand to afford defendant another opportunity to be heard on his Rule 604(d) motion. However, once this remedy is granted, there is no further requirement under Rule 604(d) that successive remands and rehearings will be ordered." See also, **People v. McCaskill**, 298 Ill.App.3d, 698 N.E.2d 690 (4th Dist. 1998).

People v. Janes, 158 Ill.2d 27, 630 N.E.2d 790 (1994) Supreme Court Rule 604(d) provides that where motions to withdraw a guilty plea or reconsider the sentence are filed, defense counsel "shall" file a certificate stating that he or she has consulted with the defendant to ascertain his contentions of error, examined the trial court file and transcript of the guilty plea, and made any necessary amendments to the motions. In denying defendant's motions, the judge found that enough time had passed for both counsel to review the guilty plea hearing and that "both sides have had [the] opportunity to obtain a stenographic record of that proceeding from the court reporter. . . ." However, defense counsel did not file a Rule 604(d) certificate, and the transcript was not certified and filed in the circuit court until more

than a month after the motions were denied. The Court concluded that under [People v. Wilk](#), 124 Ill.2d 93, 529 N.E.2d 218 (1988), strict compliance with [Rule 604\(d\)](#) is necessary. Because defense counsel failed to file a 604(d) certificate, the cause must be remanded for defendant to file new motions challenging his plea and sentence. Defense counsel's failure to file a certificate does not result in a waiver of the defendant's right to an appeal, because the filing of a motion to withdraw the plea or reconsider the sentence is the condition precedent to the reviewing court hearing the appeal. The Court also rejected the State's argument that the harmless error rule may be applied to counsel's failure to file a certificate where the record shows substantial compliance with the purposes of the rule. The Court found that application of the harmless error rule would lead to disputes concerning whether substantial compliance occurred in a particular case.

Illinois Appellate Court

[People v. Jones](#), 2024 IL App (1st) 221506 Following defendant's negotiated guilty plea, plea counsel filed a motion to withdraw but failed to file a Rule 604(d) certificate. The parties agreed that failure required remand for new post-plea proceedings.

Additionally, at the hearing on defendant's motion to withdraw plea, defendant had been permitted to present his own argument in support of withdrawal of his plea. Defendant stated that nobody, including plea counsel, had advised him that he would have to serve his four-year term of mandatory supervised release on electronic monitoring, which he likened to "house arrest." On appeal, the parties argued that the court failed to conduct a preliminary **Krankel** inquiry based on this allegation. The appellate court held that remand under **Krankel** was not required, however, because the circuit court had gone ahead and construed defendant's claim as an argument for withdrawing his plea. Instead, remand for a new hearing was the proper remedy because the record was insufficiently developed to decide that claim in the instant appeal. In reaching this conclusion, the court rejected the State's argument that the claim was forfeited because it was not in the written post-plea motion filed by counsel. The trial court expressly incorporated this issue into the motion to withdraw plea when it told defendant at the hearing, "it's your motion, go ahead and say what you want to say."

Reversed and remanded for the appointment of new post-plea counsel and new post-plea proceedings, including a hearing on whether plea counsel provided ineffective assistance by failing to advise defendant about the requirement of serving his mandatory supervised release on electronic monitoring.

[People v. Gray](#), 2023 IL App (4th) 230076 The record in this case showed that defense counsel failed to strictly comply with Supreme Court Rule 604(d) despite counsel's filing of a facially valid attorney certificate. Specifically, while counsel certified that she consulted with defendant to ascertain his contentions of error, defendant repeatedly stated at the post-plea motion hearing that "no one has talked to me." The hearing transcript corroborated defendant's complaint about a lack of communication where counsel noted defendant's *pro se* allegation that he had not understood the plea and stated, "I'm sure [defendant] can enumerate in more detail if the Court wishes [to know] what he means by that statement." The appellate court concluded that counsel did not appear to know the reasoning behind defendant's lack of understanding, indicating that she had not consulted with defendant as required by Rule 604(d).

The appellate court also found lack of consultation evidenced by counsel's failure to cite a helpful portion of the guilty plea transcript in support of defendant's claim. Instead,

counsel pointed to an exchange between defendant and the court which actually seemed to contradict defendant's claim. Counsel also failed to include an affidavit in support of the portion of defendant's motion which depended on off-record facts, as required by Rule 604(d). When asked about those facts at the hearing, counsel was unable to explain and instead had to turn to defendant to argue that point. Accordingly, the court concluded that although counsel filed a facially compliant certificate, the record strongly indicated that she did not meaningfully consult with defendant to ascertain his contentions of error and thus failed to comply with Rule 604(d).

The matter was remanded for new post-plea proceedings, including the opportunity to file a new motion, a new hearing, and the filing of a new attorney certificate in compliance with Rule 604(d).

People v. Higgins, 2023 IL App (4th) 220837 Defendant pled guilty to three counts of aggravated battery to a child (two Class X and one Class 3) and was sentenced to concurrent terms of imprisonment of 20 years, 20 years, and 5 years. On appeal, defendant argued that the trial court failed to admonish him in accordance with Rule 402 prior to accepting his plea. Specifically, defendant argued that the court erred in referring to his plea as an "open" plea where the parties agreed that the sentences would be served concurrently and where an unrelated felony charge was dismissed as part of the plea agreement here. The appellate court observed, however, that whether the court called the plea "open" or "partially negotiated" did not matter because the court thoroughly admonished defendant that the sentences would run concurrently, that he could be sentenced to a term anywhere between 6 and 30 years of imprisonment, and that the separately charged felony was being dismissed. Thus, Rule 402 was satisfied, and defendant's plea was affirmed.

The court also rejected defendant's argument that counsel's facially valid Rule 604(d) certificate was refuted by the record. Defendant argued that the transcript of the sentencing hearing was not certified until after the date that counsel filed his certificate and thus counsel could not have reviewed the transcript of the sentencing hearing as he had certified. Citing **People v. Little, 2011 IL App (4th) 090787**, the court noted that "the date the court reporter certified the transcripts in preparation of the record on appeal is not evidence of the first date a defense attorney could have reviewed the transcripts."

In an "epilogue" to the opinion, the court criticized the use of Rule 402 conferences generally, quoting a special concurrence from its prior decision in **People v. Anderson, 2016 IL App (4th) 140402-U**. And, the court discussed the misleading nature of the 402 conference here where the judge indicated that he believed a fair sentence would be somewhere in the 7-or-8-year range but ultimately sentenced defendant to 20 years. The appellate court noted that while Rule 402(d) specifically provides for such pre-plea conferences, they "need not and should not ever be conducted," or at a minimum, they should be conducted on the record.

People v. Suaste-Gonzalez, 2023 IL App (2d) 220323 Remand was required for compliance with Rule 604(d), because post-plea counsel filed her certificate before having access to the transcripts from the guilty plea hearing. After receiving the transcripts, counsel filed a motion to withdraw the plea. But she never filed a new 604(d) certificate to confirm that she reviewed the transcripts and consulted with defendant about his contentions of error. Because a certificate is not prospective, and is designed to inform the reviewing court that counsel actually read the record and consulted with defendant, remand was required.

People v. Brown, 2023 IL App (4th) 220573 Where post-plea counsel files a proper 604(d) certificate, and where defendant's post-plea claims are given a full and fair evidentiary hearing and rejected on their merits, there is no need to remand the matter for further post-plea proceedings. While post-plea counsel here should have amended defendant's *pro se* motion to withdraw plea to put defendant's claims in proper legal form, any defects in the pleading here were harmless. It would be "an exercise in futility and a waste of judicial resources" to remand for counsel to replead a claim that the court already heard and rejected as meritless.

People v. Taylor, 2023 IL App (1st) 171631 Rule 604(d) certificate was deficient where counsel did not certify that he consulted with defendant about alleged errors in his sentence or that he examined the report of proceedings of the sentencing hearing. While defendant entered a negotiated plea and later filed only a motion to withdraw plea, thus restricting his options with regard to challenging his sentence, Rule 604(d) is concerned with counsel's duty to consult with his client. Such consultation has value, even if it does not ultimately affect the content of the motion. The matter was remanded to the circuit court for new post-plea proceedings.

People v. Hayes, 2022 IL App (2d) 210014 Defendant entered a negotiated guilty plea to a charge of domestic battery, and at the same time admitted to a violation of probation in a prior aggravated domestic battery case. As part of the plea agreement, defendant agreed to participate in a mental health court program. Sentencing was deferred, with the understanding that defendant would be sentenced to conditional discharge if he successfully completed the program, and to concurrent prison terms if he did not. Ultimately, defendant was unsuccessfully discharged from the mental health court program and was sentenced to prison. At the conclusion of the hearing where the prison sentence was announced, the court told defendant that he could perfect an appeal by filing, within 30 days, either a notice of appeal or a motion to reconsider the sentence if he wished to challenge the sentence. Defendant filed a motion to reconsider sentence, which was denied, and defendant appealed.

On appeal, defendant argued that because he entered a negotiated plea, counsel should have filed a Rule 604(d) certificate, and the failure to do so meant that the matter had to be remanded for compliance with Rule 604(d). The State argued that defendant's appeal was from a probation revocation proceeding, governed instead by Rule 604(b), and thus remand was not required. Ultimately, the court concluded that defendant's appeal was governed by 604(d). The mental health court program was a post-plea, pre-sentencing program. And, notably, when defendant was discharged from the program, the State asked the court to impose sentence and the matter proceeded to a sentencing hearing.

The court went on to note, though, that defendant was required to file a motion to withdraw plea, not a motion to reconsider sentence, in order to perfect his appeal under Rule 604(d) because he had entered a negotiated plea. But, the trial court had not admonished defendant of that requirement. Thus, there was a lack of substantial compliance with Rule 605(c) requiring remand for proper admonishments, the filing of an appropriate post-plea motion and Rule 604(d) certificate, and a new post-plea motion hearing. While this matter also involved defendant's admission to a probation violation, which would not normally be subject to Rule 604(d) compliance, the probation violation matter had been consolidated for both the plea and sentencing and thus it was remanded, as well.

People v. Alarcon-Trujillo, 2021 IL App (2d) 191046 In a prior appeal, this matter was remanded due to counsel's failure to file a Rule 604(d) certificate. On remand, counsel

represented to the court that he had consulted with defendant by mail and would stand on the original motion to reconsider sentence. Counsel argued additional points in favor of reducing defendant's sentence, but the court denied defendant's motion. Counsel filed a Rule 604(d) certificate two days after the hearing on the motion to reconsider. In that certificate, counsel stated that he had consulted with defendant to ascertain his contentions of error in the denial of his motion for further sentence reduction, had reviewed the court file and reports of proceedings of the plea and sentencing proceedings, and had made any amendments necessary for adequate presentation of any defects.

Defendant sought a second remand for compliance with Rule 604(d) based on counsel's failure to certify that he had consulted with defendant about his contentions of error in the plea proceedings. The Appellate Court rejected this argument, noting that this case did not present a "good reason" for a second remand under [People v. Shirley, 181 Ill. 2d 359 \(1998\)](#). Here, counsel assured the court at the hearing on the motion to reconsider that he had consulted with defendant to ascertain whether there were "any matters he wished me to advance." While the certificate did not specifically state that defendant did not wish to withdraw his plea, no motion to withdraw plea was filed after counsel consulted with defendant. And, defendant never raised any concerns about his plea at any of the post-plea proceedings. The Appellate Court concluded that defendant had received a "full and fair" hearing on his motion to reconsider, and thus a remand was not required.

[People v. Merriweather, 2021 IL App \(2d\) 200379](#) Defendant entered an open plea to the Class 2 offense of unlawful possession of controlled substance with intent to deliver (1-15 grams heroin), was found eligible for Class X sentencing based on his prior federal convictions, and was sentenced to 8½ years of imprisonment. Defense counsel filed a timely motion to reconsider sentence, but no Rule 604(d) certificate. The circuit court granted defendant's motion, in part, reducing his sentence to 8 years of imprisonment, and defendant appealed. On appeal, defendant argued, and the State agreed, that remand was required for compliance with Rule 604(d).

Defendant also asked the Appellate Court to reach the merits of his claim that he was not subject to Class X sentencing and instruct the trial court accordingly. Additionally, defendant argued that the Appellate Court should remand without vacating his 8-year sentence. The Appellate Court declined to reach the Class X sentencing issue, concluding that a ruling would be premature given counsel's failure to comply with Rule 604(d). To hold otherwise would assume that the sentencing issue was properly developed in the trial court, contrary to the lack of certification by counsel.

The court agreed, however, that it need not vacate the sentence reduction as part of the remand for compliance with Rule 604(d), consistent with [People v. Strawder, 374 Ill. App. 3d 338 \(2007\)](#). To hold otherwise would penalize defendant for counsel's failure to file a Rule 604(d) certificate. On remand, defendant may file a new post-plea motion if he chooses, in which case the trial court should vacate its original ruling on the motion to reconsider and hold a new hearing. The Appellate Court went on to remind the circuit court of [730 ILCS 5/5-5-4\(a\)](#), which prevents the trial court from imposing a longer sentence for the same offense where the defendant's conviction or sentence has been set aside on appeal. While not directly applicable, the appellate court instructed the trial court to "follow the principles" of section 5-5-4(a) should defendant seek further reconsideration of his sentence.

[People v. Diaz, 2021 IL App \(2d\) 191040](#) Rule 604(d) requires a post-plea attorney to make any amendments to a defendant's motion that are necessary for the adequate presentation of any defects in the guilty plea proceedings. The Appellate Court held that this rule does not

require counsel to amend a defendant's *pro se* motion to withdraw guilty plea to add claims that are completely rebutted by the record.

Here, after defendant's original motion to withdraw his plea was denied, the case was remanded on appeal. On remand, defendant filed a *pro se* motion to withdraw, arguing that his plea attorney was ineffective for misleading him about the length of his sentence. This claim was not included in his original post-plea motion. Counsel on remand filed a motion to withdraw the plea that adopted the original motion, not the motion on remand. Counsel also filed a facially sufficient 604(d) certificate. The motion was denied.

On appeal, defendant alleged a 604(d) violation where counsel failed to add the ineffectiveness claim to the motion. The Appellate Court found 604(d) compliance where the claim was rebutted by both the transcript from the guilty plea hearing, which showed a knowing and voluntary plea, and the initial *pro se* motion, in which defendant acknowledged he was aware of his sentence. Because it would have been futile to add a frivolous claim to the petition, counsel complied with 604(d).

People v. Winston, 2020 IL App (2d) 180289 Defendant's case was remanded for new post-plea proceedings, for the third time, because the record rebutted counsel's Rule 604(d) certificate. While the attorney certificate was facially compliant with the rule, the record showed that counsel did not make a necessary amendment to the motion to withdraw plea. At the hearing on the motion, counsel argued that the evidence was insufficient to establish defendant's guilt. Counsel should have amended the written motion to include that claim and should have attached affidavits from witnesses whose testimony would have supported it. The court rejected the State's argument that it should affirm because defendant's insufficiency-of-the-evidence claim lacked merit, noting that the claim's merit "has no bearing on whether counsel complied with Rule 604(d)."

People v. Peltz, 2019 IL App (2d) 170465 After entering an open plea, defendant moved to reconsider sentence. Counsel filed a 604(d) certificate stating that she consulted with defendant to ascertain his contentions of error in the sentence. The certificate did not say she consulted with the client about errors involved in the entry of the plea. At the end of the motion, however, counsel added that defendant did not wish to withdraw his plea. Under these circumstances, a majority of the Appellate Court found strict compliance with Rule 604(d)'s consultation requirement. The dissent noted that counsel's bare assertion that defendant did not desire to withdraw his plea does not establish that she consulted him about that decision.

People v. McPherson, 2017 IL App (2d) 150538 The court rejected the State's argument that direct criminal contempt proceedings are "*sui generis*" and not subject to Supreme Court Rule 604(d). Although procedural protections applicable to criminal prosecutions do not generally apply to direct criminal contempt convictions, the court noted that in this case the State employed a formal process in which defendant was charged by a petition for adjudication of direct criminal contempt, was arraigned, and entered a guilty plea at a formal proceeding at which he was admonished under Rule 402(a) and at which the State presented a factual basis. In addition, a sentencing hearing was held at which the trial court considered the pre-sentence report and various sentencing factors. Under these circumstances, the rules normally applicable to criminal prosecutions, including the certificate requirements of Rule 604(d), should apply.

People v. Gillespie, 2017 IL App (1st) 152351 Under the version of Supreme Court [Rule 604\(d\)](#) in effect at the time defendant moved to withdraw his guilty plea, counsel was required to certify that he had consulted with defendant to ascertain his “contentions of error in the sentence or the entry of the guilty plea.” In **Tousignant**, 2014 IL 115329, the Illinois Supreme Court held that the word “or” should be read as “and,” and the rule thus required attorneys to certify that they consulted with their clients about both the guilty plea and the sentence. (The rule has since been amended to replace “or” with “and.”)

Here, after defendant moved to withdraw his guilty plea, counsel filed a 604(d) certificate stating that he had consulted with defendant about his guilty plea, but said nothing about his sentence. The Appellate Court held that counsel’s certificate was inadequate under **Tousignant**.

The court rejected the State’s argument that **Tousignant** was distinguishable because that case involved an open plea without any promise regarding the potential sentence, whereas the present case involved a fully negotiated plea. The court noted that **Tousignant** was not limited to open pleas. Moreover, consultation about the sentence would have value even if it did not “ultimately affect the content of the motion.” And it was always possible that a fully negotiated plea might include an improper sentence, and thus there would be a basis to challenge a negotiated sentence.

People v. Hagerstrom, 2016 IL App (3d) 140559 Following a remand for compliance with [Illinois Supreme Court Rule 604\(d\)](#), defense counsel again failed to comply with the rule. Instead of stating that he had consulted with defendant to ascertain his contentions of error in the sentence and entry of the guilty plea, as required by [Rule 604\(d\)\(1\)](#), counsel merely stated that he had consulted with defendant about his contentions of error in the entry of the sentence. And instead of stating that he had examined the trial court file and both the report of proceedings of the guilty plea and the sentencing hearing, as required by [Rule 604\(d\)\(2\)](#), counsel merely stated that he had examined the trial court file.

The State agreed that counsel failed to comply with [Rule 604\(d\)](#), but argued that a second remand was not necessary under **People v. Shirley**, 181 Ill.2d 359 (1998). The court rejected this argument. It noted that although the **Shirley** court stated that it saw “limited value” in requiring multiple remands, it explicitly premised its decision on its finding that defendant had a full and fair hearing following the initial remand. **Shirley** thus did not create a bar on successive remands when they were appropriate. In the present case, by contrast with **Shirley**, counsel had not come close to complying with [Rule 604\(d\)](#). The court remanded for further post-plea proceedings.

People v. Hobbs, 2015 IL App (4th) 130990 Under Supreme Court [Rule 604\(d\)](#), counsel must file a certificate stating, among other things, that he has consulted with defendant to ascertain his “contentions of error in the sentence or the entry of the plea of guilty.” In **People v. Tousignant**, 2014 IL 115329, the Illinois Supreme Court held that in order to effect the purpose of the rule, the word “or” should be considered to mean “and,” and thus counsel must certify that he has consulted with defendant about the errors in his sentence and the guilty plea.

Defendant entered an open plea to possession of a controlled substance with intent to deliver and was sentenced to 15 years imprisonment. The trial court denied defendant’s motion to reconsider sentence. Counsel filed a 604(d) certificate stating in relevant part that he consulted with defendant to ascertain his “contentions of error in the sentence or the entry of the plea of guilty.”

The Appellate Court held that counsel failed to comply with [Rule 604\(d\)](#) since he failed to state that he consulted with defendant about both the sentence and the guilty plea. The court rejected the State’s argument that after **Tousignant** “or” means “and” and thus when counsel used the word “or” in his certificate it should be read to mean “and.” **Tousignant** made it clear that regardless of how the word “or” is to be read in the rule, counsel must certify that he has consulted with defendant about both the sentence and the guilty plea.

The court also disagreed with the decision in [People v. Mineau, 2014 IL App \(2nd\) 110666-B](#), that upheld a certificate that used the word “or” since **Tousignant** did not intend to change “what a certificate must state.” Instead, the court concluded that **Tousignant** did intend to change the certificate’s language to precisely indicate that counsel has consulted with defendant about both the sentence and the plea.

[People v. Mason, 2015 IL App \(4th\) 130946](#) Supreme Court [Rule 604\(d\)](#) requires that an attorney who represents a criminal defendant on a motion to withdraw a guilty plea or reconsider the sentence must file a certificate stating that he or she has consulted with the defendant either by mail or in person concerning any contentions of error “in the sentence or the entry of the plea of guilty,” examined the trial court file and report of proceedings of the plea of guilty, and made any amendments to the motion necessary for adequate presentation of any issues. In [People v. Tousignant, 2014 IL 115329](#), the Supreme Court held that in the context of [Rule 604\(d\)](#), the term “or” is considered to mean “and,” even if the defendant files only a motion to withdraw the plea or a motion to reconsider the sentence.

Since **Tousignant**, there has been a conflict in Appellate Court precedent concerning whether a certificate which recites the verbatim language of [Rule 604\(d\)](#) satisfies the requirements of the rule. The court concluded that because **Tousignant** declared that the term “or” is to be read as “and” and [Rule 604\(d\)](#) has not been amended to specifically substitute “and” for “or,” a certificate which merely recites the language of the rule does not accurately indicate the actions taken by counsel. Thus, a [Rule 604\(d\)](#) certificate which uses the verbatim language of [Rule 604](#) (with “or”) does not show compliance with the rule as interpreted by **Tousignant**.

The order denying defendant’s motion to withdraw his guilty plea was reversed and the cause remanded for further proceedings.

[People v. Martell, 2015 IL App \(2d\) 141202](#) In [People v. Tousignant, 2014 IL 115329](#), which involved an open guilty plea, the Supreme Court held that [Rule 604\(d\)](#) requires the attorney to certify that he or she has consulted with the defendant to ascertain any contentions of error “in the sentence *and* the entry of the plea of guilty.” Here, the court concluded that the **Tousignant** rule applies even where a plea was fully negotiated, because sentencing issues may arise even in a negotiated plea. For example, the plea agreement might call for a sentence which the trial court lacks authority to impose, or one which misstates the appropriate term of mandatory supervised release. For these reasons, defendant’s attorney “ought not forgo all concern about infirmities in the sentence” even where an agreed sentence is imposed.

Because defense counsel’s certificate indicated that he consulted with defendant only on the entry of the plea and not concerning any contentions of error about sentencing, the order denying the post-judgment motion was vacated and the cause remanded for the filing of a valid [Rule 604\(d\)](#) certificate, an opportunity to file a new post-plea motion, and a new hearing.

People v. Scarbrough, 2015 IL App (3d) 130426 Under Supreme Court [Rule 604\(d\)](#), defendant’s counsel must file a certificate stating that he has consulted with defendant to ascertain his contentions of error in the sentence *or* the entry of the guilty plea. In **People v. Tousignant**, 2014 IL 115329, however, the Supreme Court held that in interpreting counsel’s duties under [Rule 604\(d\)](#), “or” means “and,” and thus counsel has a duty to consult with his client about both the sentence and the entry of the guilty plea.

Defendant entered a blind plea and after sentencing filed a motion to reduce sentence. At the hearing on the motion, counsel filed a 604(d) certificate stating that she had consulted with defendant to ascertain his “contentions of error in the sentence or the entry of a plea of guilty in this matter.”

On appeal, defendant argued that his case should be remanded for further post-plea proceedings since counsel failed to comply with [Rule 604\(d\)](#) by failing to certify that she consulted with him about the contentions of error in both the sentence *and* the entry of the guilty plea. The Appellate Court agreed that the certificate failed to comply with [Rule 604\(d\)](#) but found that no remand was needed.

The Court first noted that **Tousignant** did not control the outcome of this case. Although **Tousignant** addressed counsel’s actual duties, and required counsel to consult with defendant about the sentence and the guilty plea, it did directly address the issue presented here about what needs to be stated in the certificate. And since the Supreme Court did not make any change to the rule itself after **Tousignant**, the rule itself continues to use the “or” language.

Nevertheless, the Court did not believe it was enough to simply recite verbatim the language of the rule, as counsel did here. Instead, **Tousignant** demonstrated a need for counsel to specify what she had actually done to comply with the rule. Counsel’s certificate, which merely tracked the language of the statute and stated that she had consulted with defendant about the sentence *or* the guilty plea, was insufficiently precise and technically non-compliant. But since defendant had no objections to the entry of his guilty plea and only raised an issue about a “technical semantic defect” in the certificate, the Court rejected his request for remand.

People v. Willis, 2015 IL App (5th) 130020 Defendant’s counsel filed a 604(d) certificate stating that he had met with defendant (a man) regarding “her” contentions of error and “made amendments to the pleadings necessary for adequate presentation of any defects in the proceedings.” During the hearing on the motion to withdraw guilty plea, counsel admitted that he had made no amendments to defendant’s *pro se* motion, but asserted that the failure of the trial judge to recuse himself was an additional ground to allow withdrawal of the plea, but had not been presented in defendant’s *pro se* motion.

The court held that the certificate filed by defendant’s counsel was defective on its face and impeached by the record. First, the certificate inaccurately referred to defendant as “her.” While the court observed that this error by itself might not have been sufficient to warrant remand, its combination with other error caused the court to seriously question whether counsel properly performed his duties.

Second, counsel asserted in the certificate that he had made all necessary amendments to the *pro se* petition. But he later admitted on the record that he had made no amendments at all, and then stated that there were additional grounds to allow the motion to withdraw the guilty plea.

Finally, the certificate stated that counsel examined the “report of proceedings,” but did not specify that he examined the report of proceedings of *the guilty plea*, as required by Rule 604(d).

People v. Mineau, 2014 IL App (2d) 110666-B Nothing in the plain language of Rule 604(d) requires each attorney to file a certificate when a defendant is simultaneously represented by multiple attorneys from the same office. At the time an amended post-plea motion and a 604(d) certificate were filed, defendant’s public defender said that the case was being reassigned to a new public defender. However, the original attorney appeared with the new attorney at the hearing on the motion and filed the notice of appeal. Although the new public defender questioned defendant at the hearing and argued on his behalf, it could be assumed that the first attorney discussed the case with new counsel. Under these circumstances, the new attorney was not required to file a second 604(d) certificate.

Furthermore, no error occurred where the certificate stated that counsel consulted with defendant “by mail and/or in person.” There is no requirement that counsel state precisely how he or she consulted with the defendant, and the certificate complied with the literal language of Rule 604(d).

Similarly, no error occurred where the certificate adopted the text of the rule by stating that counsel consulted with defendant “to ascertain defendant’s contentions of error in the sentence *or* the entry of the plea of guilty.” The court refused to read the certificate to mean that counsel limited her consultation to one type of error or the other, noting that counsel’s motion sought both to withdraw the plea and in the alternative challenge the sentence.

People v. Jordan, 2013 IL App (2d) 120106 When a guilty plea defendant moves to reconsider the sentence or withdraw the plea, defense counsel must file a certificate stating that he or she has consulted with the defendant “to ascertain defendant’s contentions of error in the sentence *or* the entry of the plea of guilty,” examined the trial court file and report of proceedings of the guilty plea, and made any amendments to the *pro se* motion that are necessary for adequate presentation of any defects in “those proceedings.” (S.Ct. Rule 604(d)). The purpose of strictly complying with Rule 604(d) is to safeguard a defendant’s right to a direct appeal.

The court concluded that where the defendant entered a non-negotiated plea and therefore could file a motion to withdraw the plea, a motion to reconsider the sentence, or both, the purpose of the rule could not be accomplished if counsel was required to inquire only about defendant’s contentions of error concerning either “the sentence *or* the entry of the plea of guilty.” Instead, the disjunctive “or” must be read as requiring counsel to ascertain defendant’s contentions of error concerning both the sentence and the plea. Reading “or” to mean that counsel need inquire only about either the guilty plea or the sentence creates an unacceptable risk that viable contentions will be forfeited without the defendant’s knowledge or intent.

Defense counsel’s certificate was inadequate where it stated only that counsel had consulted with defendant to ascertain any contentions of error “in the imposition of a sentence.” The trial court’s order denying defendant’s motion to reconsider his sentence was vacated, and the cause was remanded so counsel could file a valid Rule 604(d) certificate, defendant could file new post-plea motions if he wished, and the trial court could conduct a new post-plea hearing.

People v. Albers, 2013 IL App (2d) 111103 Under Supreme Court Rule 604(d), a defendant who enters a negotiated plea which includes a sentencing cap implicitly agrees not to challenge any sentence which is less than the cap. Thus, the defendant is not allowed to challenge just his sentence, but must file a motion to withdraw the guilty plea and vacate the judgment.

Where defendant pleaded guilty pursuant to a negotiated plea involving the dismissal of other charges and a ten-year-sentencing cap, and then moved to reconsider the sentence, it would have been improper to remand the cause due to defense counsel's failure to comply with the Rule 604(d) requirement that he certify that he consulted with defendant, examined court documents, and amended the *pro se* motion. The court rejected the reasoning of **People v. Neal, 403 Ill. App.3d 757, 936 N.E.2d 726 (4th Dist. 2010)**, which held that a remand is required where counsel's certification was inadequate even where the defendant entered a negotiated plea and filed only a motion to reconsider the sentence. Here, the court found that because defendant failed to file a motion to withdraw his plea, it had no option but to dismiss the appeal.

People v. Dryden, 2012 IL App (2d) 110646 Supreme Court Rule 604(d) requires that, when a defendant moves to withdraw a guilty plea or to reconsider a sentence following a guilty plea, "[t]he defendant's attorney shall file with the trial court a certificate stating that the attorney has consulted with the defendant either by mail or in person to ascertain defendant's contentions of error in the sentence or in the entry of the plea of guilty, has examined the trial court file and report of proceedings of the plea of guilty, and has made any amendment to the motion necessary for adequate presentation of any defects in those proceedings." Strict compliance with the rule is required.

Defense counsel filed a combined motion to withdraw the guilty plea and reconsider the sentence, but filed a 604(d) certificate that stated only that counsel consulted with defendant to ascertain his claim of error in the entry of the guilty plea, and was silent with respect to consultation regarding the sentence. Because the certificate did not explicitly state that counsel ascertained defendant's contentions of error in the sentence, counsel did not strictly comply with the rule.

Although the rule's consultation requirement is phrased in the disjunctive ("ascertain defendant's contentions of error in the sentence *or* the entry of the plea of guilty"), in context, it is clear that "or" means "and." It would be absurd to suggest that counsel could choose to consult with defendant about one type of error where counsel moves to both withdraw the plea and reconsider the sentence.

People v. Richard, 2012 IL App (5th) 100302 Counsel must strictly comply with Rule 604(d). While the language of the rule need not be recited verbatim in the certificate, some indication must be presented that counsel performed the duties required under the rule. A reviewing court cannot simply assume or infer compliance because any issue not raised in the post-plea motion is waived.

Defense counsel's certification that he ascertained defendant's "contentions of deprivation of constitutional rights" did not satisfy the rule's requirement that he ascertain "defendant's contentions of error in the sentence or the entry of the plea of guilty." The rule does not limit defendant's contentions of error to those that impact his constitutional rights. While all of the claims of error raised by defendant have a constitutional basis, it is not clear that counsel first ascertained defendant's claims of error, and then determined that all of those claims had constitutional bases.

People v. Herrera, 2012 IL App (2d) 110009 Rule 604(d) requires strict compliance. The remedy for failing to strictly comply with the rule is a remand to allow the defendant to file a new motion to withdraw the guilty plea or reconsider the sentence, and to allow the court to conduct a hearing on that motion.

Where the attorney who filed the motion to reconsider the sentence became a judge before there was a hearing on the motion, the attorney who took over the representation, and who appeared at the hearing on the motion, was obligated to file a proper certificate on her own. Where the second attorney's certificate was inadequate, it is irrelevant whether the first attorney's certificate would have been sufficient had that attorney remained in the case.

The court also rejected the argument that inadequacies in the second attorney's certificate could be cured by that attorney's on-the-record statements concerning actions which she took in the defendant's behalf. "We shall not waste judicial resources by scouring through the record to determine whether an attorney actually complied with the rule. . . . Unless the record undermines the certificate . . . the only thing we consider in determining compliance with Rule 604(d) is the certificate itself."

Noting that the Appellate Court is "inundated" with cases lacking strict compliance with Rule 604(d) or where the attorney's certificate is ambiguous, the court stated:

While this court has said that strict compliance does not mean that counsel must recite "word for word" the verbiage of the rule . . . we now admonish attorneys that a "word for word" recitation is a better practice. We urge trial courts to be vigilant in ensuring compliance. Trial courts possess the power and duty to examine certificates, and they should reject those that do not comply, with instructions for counsel to file another certificate if need be, in accordance with the requirements of the rule. . . . We add that the State also has an obligation to examine a certificate and bring any noncompliance to the trial court's attention.

People v. Marquez, 2012 IL App (2d) 110475 Before he was sentenced, defendant filed a motion to withdraw his negotiated plea. After he was sentenced, defendant filed a motion to reconsider the trial court's denial of that motion. The trial court treated the motion to reconsider as a renewal of the untimely motion to withdraw the plea.

The court concluded that under these circumstances, defense counsel was required to file a new Rule 604(d) certificate. Because counsel failed to file a new certificate, the cause was remanded so that counsel could file a new certificate, defendant could file a new motion if he wished, and a new hearing could be held.

People v. Little, 2011 IL App (4th) 090787 At the hearing on defendant's motion to reconsider his sentence following a guilty plea, defense counsel filed a Rule 604(d) certificate stating that he had reviewed the transcript of the guilty plea and sentencing hearings. On appeal, defendant argued that defense counsel could not have read the guilty plea proceedings because the court reporter did not certify those proceedings until approximately two months after the certificate was filed.

The Appellate Court rejected the argument that the Rule 604(d) certificate was inadequate, finding that preparation of the transcripts cannot be equated with the court reporter's certification of those transcripts. The certification process is required under Supreme Court Rule 608(b), which pertains to the record on appeal, and does not indicate whether transcripts were prepared at an earlier date and made available to the parties.

The court distinguished **People v. Holford, 233 Ill.App.3d 12, 598 N.E.2d 420 (4th**

Dist. 1992), **People v. Hayes**, 195 Ill.App. 3d 957, 553 N.E.2d 30 (5th Dist. 1990), and **People v. Turner**, 403 Ill.App.3d 753, 936 N.E.2d 700 (4th Dist. 2010), finding that in each case there were indications in the record that the transcripts in question had not been prepared when defense counsel filed a Rule 604(d) certificate.

People v. Cooper, 2011 IL App (4th) 100972 Supreme Court Rule 604(d) requires that counsel who files a motion to withdraw a guilty plea or reconsider the sentence imposed on a guilty plea must also file a certificate indicating that he or she has: (1) consulted with the defendant either by mail or in person to ascertain defendant's contentions of error in the sentence or the entry of the plea of guilty, (2) examined the trial court file and report of proceedings of the guilty plea, and (3) made any amendments to the motion necessary for adequate presentation of any defects in the proceedings. The court reiterated precedent that the certificate is required of both appointed and retained counsel.

The court also found that where defense counsel fails to file the certificate by the time of the hearing on the motion to withdraw or reconsider, the appropriate remedy is to grant a continuance to afford counsel a chance to comply with the rule. Here, the trial court erred by striking the motion to reconsider. The cause was remanded for further proceedings consistent with Rule 604(d).

People v. Cloyd, 397 Ill.App.3d 1084, 931 N.E.2d 261 (4th Dist. 2010) Under Supreme Court Rule 604(d), a defense attorney who represents a guilty plea defendant on a motion to withdraw a plea or reconsider a sentence must file a certificate indicating that he or she has: (1) consulted with the defendant by mail or in person to ascertain any contentions of error, (2) examined the trial court file and report of proceedings of the plea of guilty, and (3) made any amendments to the motion necessary for adequate presentation of any issues. The court stressed that counsel has a duty to examine the report of proceedings even if he or she was counsel of record for the defendant and was present when the plea was entered. The court rejected the argument that to avoid the cost of preparing a transcript, an attorney who represented the defendant at the guilty plea may dispense with reviewing the guilty plea report of proceedings.

The cause was remanded to the trial court for the appointment of counsel, the filing of a new motion to withdraw the guilty plea or reconsider the sentence, a new hearing on the motion, and strict compliance with the terms of Rule 604(d).

People v. Morton, 404 Ill.App.3d 294, 936 N.E.2d 179 (5th Dist. 2010) Noting a conflict in Appellate Court authority, the court concluded that when a cause is remanded because trial counsel failed to file a Rule 604(d) certificate after representing the defendant in a motion to reduce sentence, a new motion to reconsider the sentence or withdraw the guilty plea is required only if necessary to adequately present issues arising from the plea or sentencing. The court rejected **People v. Oliver**, 276 Ill.App.3d 929, 659 N.E.2d 435 (2d Dist. 1995), which concluded that under Supreme Court precedent a new motion is required in every case.

People v. Neal, 403 Ill.App.3d 757, 936 N.E.2d 726 (4th Dist. 2010) Supreme Court Rule 604(d) requires that after representing a defendant on a motion challenging a guilty plea or the sentence imposed on the plea, defense counsel must file a certificate stating that he or she has: (1) consulted with the defendant to ascertain any contentions of error, (2) examined the trial court file, (3) examined the report of proceedings of the guilty plea, and (4) made any amendments to the motion necessary for adequate presentation of any issues arising from the proceedings. Strict compliance with Rule 604(d) is required.

Generally, only the certificate is considered in determining whether Rule 604(d) has been satisfied. However, the record may be considered to the extent that it undermines the certificate.

After representing defendant on a motion to reconsider the sentence, counsel filed a certificate stating that he met in person with the defendant “and discussed the issues raised in the motion to reconsider sentence.” The certificate also stated that counsel examined “all relevant documents regarding the defendant’s sentencing including, but not limited to the transcript of the sentencing hearing and the presentence investigation.”

The court found that the certificate was insufficient because it failed to show that counsel consulted with defendant about any contentions of error concerning the plea itself, or that counsel examined the transcript of the guilty plea proceeding. The court also noted that the transcript of the sentencing hearing was not prepared for some three months after the certificate was filed, rebutting counsel’s claim to have examined the transcript.

The cause was remanded for strict compliance with Rule 604(d), including the appointment of counsel, a new motion to challenge the plea or sentence, a new hearing, and a new Rule 604(d) certificate.

People v. Turner, 403 Ill.App.3d 753, 936 N.E.2d 700 (4th Dist. 2010) After defendant pleaded guilty, defense counsel filed a motion to reconsider sentence. Seven days later, the court reporter prepared and dated the transcript of the guilty plea proceedings. The following day, the court conducted a hearing on the motion to reconsider. The court acknowledged counsel’s 604(d) certificate, which was not dated or file stamped, and failed to state that counsel had made any amendments to the motion to reconsider necessary for adequate presentation of any defects in the proceedings.

The Appellate Court remanded the case for further proceedings due to the inadequacy of the certificate. Because counsel filed the motion to reconsider before the transcript was prepared, he was required to certify that he had made any necessary amendments to the motion.

People v. Smith, 365 Ill.App.3d 356, 847 N.E.2d 865 (1st Dist. 2006) The trial judge erred when he asked the defendant, who had filed a pro se motion to withdraw his plea, whether he wanted to stand on the motion or make further argument, but failed to ascertain whether he wanted counsel. Supreme Court Rules 604(d) and 605(b) require the appointment of counsel for an indigent at post-plea proceedings unless the trial court finds that the defendant knowingly and intelligently waives the right to counsel.

People v. Willis, 313 Ill.App.3d 553, 729 N.E.2d 961 (1st Dist. 2000) Counsel's Rule 604 (d) certificate was deficient where: (1) it was unclear whether counsel examined "the trial court file and the report of proceedings . . . or just the report of proceedings," and (2) counsel crossed out language indicating that she had "made amendments necessary for adequate preservation [rather than presentation] of defects in proceedings." The court held that it was unclear whether counsel thought no amendments were necessary, failed to make the necessary amendments, or knew that the purpose of the rule is to "ensure adequate 'presentation' of defects in the proceedings."

People v. Oliver, 276 Ill.App.3d 929, 659 N.E.2d 435 (2d Dist. 1995) Because defense counsel failed to file a certificate of compliance with Rule 604(d), the Court ordered a new hearing on the motion to withdraw the guilty plea. Upon remand, defendant's new counsel filed a Rule 604(d) certificate but stated that he would stand on the previous motion. The

State's Attorney stipulated that the testimony would be the same as at the prior hearing, and the trial court again denied the motion. The court held that where counsel failed to file a 604(d) certificate, the defendant is entitled to file a new motion to withdraw the plea. The court is then required to conduct a meaningful hearing on the motion. Although the parties may stipulate to testimony where appropriate, in this case "[t]he court and the parties clearly viewed the second hearing as a formality." Because the trial court failed to conduct a meaningful hearing, remandment was required. The fact that defendant was at the hearing "did not validate the proceedings." Finally, while defense counsel is primarily responsible for filing a 604(d) certificate, trial courts and prosecutors should insure that such certificates are on file before hearings are conducted. Thus, "courts can ensure that valuable judicial resources will not be wasted by needlessly conducting duplicative hearings." Compare, [People v. Kerkering](#), 283 Ill.App.3d 867, 671 N.E.2d 368 (4th Dist. 1996) (counsel need file new motion only if required to adequately present the issues).

[People v. Porter](#), 258 Ill.App.3d 200, 630 N.E.2d 1350 (2d Dist. 1994) Where the cause is remanded because defense counsel failed to file a Rule 604(d) certificate, the trial court may not merely rely on the matters presented in the prior hearing. Instead, a new hearing on the motion is required. But see, [People v. Cameron](#), 286 Ill.App.3d 541, 675 N.E.2d 1002 (1st Dist. 1997) (new hearing not required where defendant was personally present at hearing on remand, stipulated to consideration of the prior proceeding, and trial judge reviewed the transcripts of the earlier hearing; also, defense counsel stated that the defense had no further evidence to present).

[People v. Hopkins](#), 256 Ill.App.3d 203, 629 N.E.2d 780 (4th Dist. 1994) After being sentenced defendant moved to reconsider the sentence. The trial court denied the motion. Defendant was not provided with a transcript of the sentencing hearing and defense counsel failed to file an affidavit indicating that he had examined the record and consulted with the defendant. The Court held that defendant was entitled to a new hearing on the motion to reconsider sentence because defense counsel failed to file the affidavit required by Rule 604(d). Compare, [People v. Heinz](#), 259 Ill.App.3d 709, 632 N.E.2d 338 (2d Dist. 1994).

[People v. Holford](#), 233 Ill.App.3d 12, 598 N.E.2d 420 (4th Dist. 1992) Rule 604 certificates may not be filed in the Appellate Court. The Court criticized defense counsel and the State for attempting to file a certificate asserting that counsel had reviewed the report of proceedings when the record indicated the complete transcript had been unavailable until five days after the hearing.

[People v. Edwards](#), 228 Ill.App.3d 492, 592 N.E.2d 591 (4th Dist. 1992) On the day of the hearing on a motion to withdraw plea, defense counsel filed a Rule 604(d) certificate stating that she had consulted with defendant about his allegations of error and prepared the motion to withdraw the plea. However, the certificate failed to state that counsel had examined the report of proceedings of the guilty plea, as is required by the rule. Although the transcript of the guilty plea indicated that there was no error in connection with the plea, and though all defendant's allegations were based on matters outside the record, the Court found the certificate to be insufficient because it failed to indicate that counsel had examined the guilty plea transcript.

§24-9

Guilty Plea as Waiver of Errors

United States Supreme Court

Class v. United States, 538 U.S. ___, 138 S. Ct. 798, 200 L. Ed. 2d 37 (2/21/18) Defendant's guilty plea did not waive appellate review of his Second Amendment attack on the firearm statute under which he had been charged. Under the **Menna-Blackledge** doctrine, a guilty plea waives rights arising before or during trials, but not claims involving the State's power to "constitutionally prosecute" him.

The dissent would find the **Menna-Blackledge** doctrine diverges from longstanding precedent that guilty pleas waive all non-jurisdictional defects in a judgment.

Illinois Supreme Court

People v. Reed, 2020 IL 124940 A defendant is not foreclosed from asserting an actual innocence claim under the Post-Conviction Hearing Act simply because he pled guilty. To succeed on such a claim, however, a guilty plea defendant must satisfy a higher standard than that established in **People v. Washington**, 171 Ill. 2d 475 (1996) for post-trial actual-innocence claims (that the newly discovered evidence would probably change the result on retrial). Instead, to succeed on a post-plea claim of actual innocence, the defendant must show that the new evidence "clearly and convincingly demonstrates that a trial would probably result in acquittal."

Applying that standard here, the Supreme Court rejected defendant's claim of innocence. Reed pled guilty to a charge of armed violence. The factual basis provided that a police officer observed Reed flee from the police and described him as running oddly. The police gave chase, and Reed was located in a bedroom of the house into which he had fled. A shotgun and cocaine were also found in the house, and Reed's DNA was on the gun.

In his post-conviction petition, Reed asserted that he was actually innocent of armed violence because he did not reside at the home where the gun and drugs were found, did not have actual possession of the gun or drugs, was not linked to the drugs with DNA evidence, and was found in a different room from where the gun was located. The petition was supported by the affidavit of a co-defendant, Davie Callaway, stating that he owned the cocaine, and that Reed had no knowledge of the presence of drugs in the residence. Callaway testified consistently with his affidavit at the evidentiary hearing. The circuit court found Callaway's testimony not credible and not of such conclusive character as to probably change the result on retrial and denied the petition. And the Supreme Court concluded that the circuit court's credibility finding was not manifestly erroneous.

People v. Jackson, 199 Ill.2d 286, 769 N.E.2d 21 (2002) Because a voluntary guilty plea waives the right to require the State prove the elements of the crime beyond a reasonable doubt before a jury, a defendant who pleads guilty after being informed that an extended term is possible waives any Apprendi challenge to that sentence, even where she was never informed that extended term factors are elements of the crime and therefore must be proven beyond a reasonable doubt at trial. See also, **Hill v. Cowan**, 202 Ill.2d 151, 781 N.E.2d 1065 (2002) (State habeas corpus petitioner convicted pursuant to a guilty plea waived any Apprendi challenge to extended term sentence based on "exceptionally brutal or heinous behavior" factor).

People v. DelVecchio, 129 Ill.2d 265, 544 N.E.2d 312 (1989) A voluntary guilty plea

waives all non-jurisdictional questions. See also, [People v. Brown, 41 Ill.2d 503, 244 N.E.2d 159 \(1969\)](#).

Illinois Appellate Court

[People v. Bucio, 2023 IL App \(2d\) 220326](#) The trial court did not err in dismissing defendant's post-conviction petition alleging that 730 ILCS 5/5-4.5-115(b) violates equal protection. Section 5-4.5-115(b) enables certain prisoners sentenced on or after June 1, 2019, to apply for parole. Defendant argued that it violates equal protection because it denies the same opportunity to prisoners sentenced before June 1, 2019. The appellate court affirmed.

Defendant's challenge to 5-4.5-115(b) was not within the scope of the Post-Conviction Hearing Act. The Act permits a defendant to raise a claim of constitutional error in the proceedings which resulted in his or her conviction, but defendant's claim here arose from a statute passed several years after he was convicted and sentenced. Thus, he had no remedy under the Act.

Further, defendant's conviction was the result of a fully negotiated guilty plea, which acts as both an acceptance of present benefits and a relinquishment of benefits from future changes in the law, even constitutional ones, pursuant to [People v. Jones, 2021 IL 126432](#).

[People v. Kimmons, 2022 IL App \(2d\) 180589](#) Defendant, who had entered a fully-negotiated guilty plea to unlawful possession with intent to deliver cocaine, subsequently filed a post-conviction petition arguing that his trial counsel was ineffective for not filing a motion to suppress. The trial court summarily dismissed the petition as untimely and without merit.

The Appellate Court noted that summary dismissal on the basis of timeliness is unquestionably improper, but affirmed the dismissal on the basis that defendant's guilty plea had waived all non-jurisdictional errors, including whether counsel had rendered deficient performance by not filing a motion to suppress. Defendant argued that an exception to the waiver rule applied, specifically that he received deficient advice from counsel, rendering his plea involuntary. The court rejected that argument, citing the absence of any argument that defendant wished to challenge the warrant but was dissuaded from doing so by erroneous legal advice from counsel.

And, the court went on to conclude that even if the waiver rule was relaxed, defendant failed to state the gist of a claim that plea counsel's decision not to challenge the warrant was deficient. Defendant's claim was based on an argument that the warrant affidavit contained material omissions, specifically with regard to the criminal background of the confidential informant. But, the informant appeared before the issuing judge during the warrant application proceedings, and the applicable law provided that such appearance under oath obviated the need for additional evidence relating to the informant's reliability. Thus, a **Franks** motion would have been denied had it been filed.

[People v. Aceituno, 2022 IL App \(1st\) 172116](#) Because defendant pled guilty, the circuit court properly denied his post-conviction as-applied challenge to his 48-year sentence imposed for a murder committed shortly after his 18th birthday. Defendant alleged that his claim met the cause-and-prejudice test because he pled guilty before **Miller** and its progeny rendered life sentences inappropriate for most juveniles. The Appellate Court found [People v. Jones, 2021 IL 126432](#), dispositive.

In [Jones](#), the Supreme Court held that a knowing and voluntary guilty plea waives any constitutional challenge based on subsequent changes in the applicable law. Here, the

record showed a voluntary and knowing plea, and defendant did not allege otherwise. And while defendant's plea here was only partly negotiated, **Jones** does not delineate between open and negotiated pleas. Finally, **Miller** held only that a sentencing court must exercise discretion before imposing a life sentence. As in **Jones** the trial court here exercised discretion when deciding whether to accept the plea, and in sentencing defendant, thus satisfying the **Miller** standard.

People v. Johnson, 2022 IL App (3d) 180357-B Defendant, who was 16 years old at the time of the offenses, pled guilty to one count of second degree murder and one count of first degree murder, in exchange for the State's recommendation of consecutive sentences of 20 years and 90 years, respectively. At the plea hearing, the State advised that if convicted on the original charges, defendant would have been sentenced to a mandatory natural life term.

Defendant filed a successive post-conviction petition raising a **Miller** claim that his *de facto* life sentence was unconstitutional because it was imposed without consideration of youth and its attendant characteristics. The trial court dismissed the petition on the basis that defendant had entered into a fully negotiated plea. The Appellate Court originally concluded that defendant's plea did not waive his **Miller** claim, but the Illinois Supreme Court directed the Appellate Court to reconsider in light of **People v. Jones, 2021 IL 126432**. On reconsideration, the court found that it was bound by **Jones** and thus concluded that defendant had waived any **Miller** claim by pleading guilty. The court noted that the trial court was able to exercise its discretion in deciding whether to impose the sentence recommended by the State as part of the plea agreement. The dismissal of defendant's petition was affirmed.

People v. Johnson, 2021 IL App (3d) 180357 Defendant pled guilty to one count of first degree murder and one count of second degree murder and received an aggregate sentence of 110 years in prison. He was 16 years old at the time of the offenses.

The circuit court erred in denying defendant leave to file his successive post-conviction petition where he set forth a meritorious **Miller** claim. The claim was not waived by the plea. **Miller** set forth a new substantive rule that applies retroactively, and defendant could not have voluntarily relinquished a right that was not available to him at the time that he pled guilty. Because he received a *de facto* life sentence without a finding of permanent incorrigibility or irretrievable corruption, he was entitled to a new sentencing hearing.

People v. Johnson, 2021 IL App (1st) 152310 Trial court did not err in denying defendant leave to file successive post-conviction petition asserting that he was coerced into confessing by the police use of torture. As cause for not raising his claim in earlier proceedings, defendant alleged that he had newly discovered evidence of systemic police torture which was not available previously, as well as specific evidence of torture of a co-defendant by the same officers who had interrogated defendant. As prejudice, defendant argued that his coerced confession was used as the factual basis for his guilty plea.

It is well-established that a voluntary guilty plea waives all non-jurisdictional errors, including constitutional defects. The only method by which a defendant can challenge constitutional defects which occurred prior to a voluntary plea is to establish incompetent advice by counsel. While defendant's petition alleged ineffective assistance of counsel, he did not advance any such argument in the Appellate Court. Accordingly, because defendant waived any claim of a coerced confession by pleading guilty, denial of leave to file was proper.

In concluding, the Appellate Court acknowledged recent developments in the law involving emerging adults as it relates to sentencing and suggested such developments might also be applied to analyzing the voluntariness of confessions. Defendant here was 19 at the time he confessed, and there is a well-documented history of the use of torture by the Chicago Police Department. The Appellate Court stated that cases like this one “cry out for a reevaluation of the limits placed on defendants’ ability to challenge the voluntariness of their confessions and the effect those allegedly coerced confessions had on their decision to plead guilty.”

People v. Daniels, 2020 IL App (1st) 171738 Defendant did not waive a proportionate penalties challenge to his sentence by virtue of his having entered a negotiated guilty plea in 1995. Defendant could not have known at the time of his plea that he could argue that the natural life sentence to which he agreed in order to avoid the death penalty was potentially constitutionally disproportionate as applied to him where he was just 18 years old at the time of the offense. The court declined to apply the waiver principles enunciated in **People v. Jackson**, 199 Ill. 2d 286 (2002) to non-**Apprendi** claims.

Defendant established cause for not raising his proportionate penalties challenge previously because the law regarding sentencing of juvenile and young adult offenders has evolved significantly in the time since he was sentenced and filed his original post-conviction petition. Defendant established prejudice where he was 18 years old at the time of the offense, had a history of mental health issues, and had an unusually harsh childhood. Because he had “not yet had the opportunity to ask a court to consider” the fundamental question of whether his life sentence was unconstitutional as applied under recent developments in sentencing youthful offenders, the court reversed the denial of leave to file defendant’s successive post-conviction petition and remanded for further proceedings.

People v. Reed, 2019 IL App (4th) 170090 Rejecting the analysis of **People v. Shaw**, 2018 IL App (1st) 152994, the Appellate Court held that a defendant who pleads guilty cannot raise a freestanding claim of actual innocence without also alleging the plea was involuntary or otherwise unconstitutional. A freestanding claim of actual innocence is incompatible with a guilty plea because it requires non-cumulative evidence that will change the result of a retrial; the “non-cumulative” and “retrial” standards make little sense in the guilty plea context, suggesting they were not developed with guilty pleas in mind. Also, guilty pleas waive all non-jurisdictional claims of error, and a claim of actual innocence is non-jurisdictional. Finally, estoppel should apply because the defendant invited any error by pleading guilty.

People v. Patterson, 2018 IL App (1st) 160610 Defendant’s guilty plea did not waive his claim, raised for the first time in a post-conviction petition, that his armed habitual criminal conviction was unconstitutionally vague. Under **Class v. United States**, 138 S. Ct. 798 (2018), a guilty plea does not waive constitutional attacks on a statute that serves as the basis for the defendant’s conviction. However, defendant’s claim that AHC requires sequential and separately entered predicate offenses, was frivolous and patently without merit, and properly dismissed at the first stage.

People v. Hammons, 2018 IL App (4th) 160385 Rule 604(d), which warns that any issue not raised in a motion to reconsider sentence will be waived for appeal, does not apply to an appellate challenge to probationary conditions. The rule requires defendants to preserve

attacks on the judgment, not attacks on the conditions of the judgment. Thus, defendant did not forfeit his attack on the conditions of probation under 604(d) despite not raising the issue in his motion to reconsider sentence following his guilty plea. The common law rule of forfeiture, however, which states that issues not raised in the trial court are forfeited for appeal, does apply.

Defendant could not show that his probation conditions amounted to plain error. The first condition restricted him from associating with felons. This condition was reasonable in light of defendant's history of drug-related offenses, as congregating with criminals is reasonably linked to drug use and to other crimes, such as the theft and burglary charged in this case. The restriction was also rationally related to the goal of rehabilitation, and therefore did not violate defendant's right to freedom of association. The second condition required him to submit to warrantless searches of his person and property. However, this condition was not unreasonable because the waiver itself would only cover reasonable searches. See **People v. Eiland**, 217 Ill. App. 3d 250 (5th Dist. 1991).

People v. Kayser, 2013 IL App (4th) 120028 A trial court lacks jurisdiction to convict a defendant based upon actions that do not constitute a criminal offense. A guilty plea must confess some punishable offense to form the basis of a sentence. The effect of a plea of guilty is a record admission of whatever is well alleged in the indictment. If the charge is insufficient, the plea confesses nothing.

Defendant pleaded guilty to a charge that he failed to register his employment change as a sex offender where he failed to report that he was no longer employed. The Sex Offender Registration Act requires sex offenders to report a change in the place of employment, but not a loss of employment. The Appellate Court vacated defendant's conviction as void because his guilty plea was based on actions not constituting a criminal offense.

People v. Mueller, 2013 IL App (5th) 120566 A guilty plea waives all non-jurisdictional defenses or defects. However, a stipulated bench trial avoids the waiver rule while allowing the parties to proceed with the benefits and conveniences of the guilty plea procedure. There is a subtle difference between a stipulated bench trial and a guilty plea.

Where the State's entire case is presented by stipulation and the defendant does not preserve or present a defense, or where the stipulation includes an agreement that the evidence is sufficient to convict, the stipulation is tantamount to a guilty plea whether or not a defense is preserved. If a stipulated bench trial is tantamount to a guilty plea, all non-jurisdictional issues are waived including those which the parties sought to preserve by utilizing the stipulated bench trial procedure. Although in this case the parties thought they were conducting a stipulated bench trial, and the trial court stated several times that the purpose of the procedure was to preserve issues for appeal, by stipulating that the evidence was sufficient to convict the parties transformed the stipulated bench trial into a guilty plea which waived all non-jurisdictional issues.

The court stated:

To eliminate any misunderstanding in a stipulated bench trial, the trial court should elicit from the accused that he is presenting and preserving a defense and that he is not stipulating that the evidence is sufficient to convict, because failure to establish either of these factors renders a would-be stipulated bench trial tantamount to a guilty plea. . . . If the wrong language is used in a stipulated bench trial, the trial becomes tantamount to a guilty plea and the very issue sought

to be preserved is foreclosed. . . . This is precisely what happened in the instant case.

Compare, [People v. Weaver, 2013 IL App \(3d\) 130054](#) (if a stipulated bench trial is tantamount to a guilty plea, the trial court is required to give Supreme Court Rule 402 admonishments; even where a stipulated bench trial is tantamount to a guilty plea, however, it is a stipulated bench trial rather than a guilty plea, and the defendant need not file a motion to withdraw the plea in order to appeal.)

[People v. Villafuerte-Medrano, 2012 IL App \(2d\) 110773](#) An order is “void” if entered by a court which lacks jurisdiction or which exceeds its jurisdiction by entering an order beyond its inherent power. An order is void only where jurisdiction is lacking. By contrast, an order erroneously entered by a court which has jurisdiction is merely “voidable.” Once jurisdiction is acquired, it is not lost because the court makes a mistake in determining the facts, the law, or both.

Where the court has subject matter and personal jurisdiction, it is not divested of jurisdiction because it accepts a guilty plea which violates double jeopardy. Thus, a conviction based on such a plea is voidable rather than void. To raise a double jeopardy challenge to such a plea, the defendant is required to file a timely motion to withdraw the plea. Otherwise, the entry of the guilty plea waives the double jeopardy challenge.

The court acknowledged that under federal constitutional law, a guilty plea does not waive a double jeopardy challenge where the double jeopardy violation can be established on the face of the charge. The court concluded that even in that case, however, the defendant must preserve the issue on appeal. In other words, a court may not review a double jeopardy claim that has not been preserved for appeal.

Here, the conviction based on defendant’s guilty plea was voidable rather than void. Because defendant failed to file a timely motion to withdraw the plea, the court could not consider the claim that the conviction violated double jeopardy.

[People v. Knight, 405 Ill.App.3d 461, 937 N.E.2d 789 \(3d Dist. 2010\)](#) A freestanding claim of actual innocence is cognizable in post-conviction proceedings following a conviction resulting from a guilty plea when the defendant can show that the plea was not knowing or voluntary.

Defendant’s petition stated a cognizable claim of actual innocence despite his plea of guilty because it alleged that defendant pleaded guilty despite his innocence because of his fear of what gang members would do to him if he did not accept responsibility for the murder.

[People v. Miller, 346 Ill.App.3d 972, 806 N.E.2d 759 \(2d Dist. 2004\)](#) A defendant who pleads guilty may not ordinarily raise constitutional violations that occurred prior to the plea. However, a defendant may challenge his plea as involuntary where the advice he received from counsel was not within the range of competence required for attorneys representing criminal defendants. The defendant must show that counsel’s performance was objectively unreasonable and caused prejudice. Where a guilty plea is involved, the prejudice requirement is satisfied if there is a reasonable probability that, had counsel not erred, defendant would have gone to trial.

[People v. Mendez, 336 Ill.App.3d 935, 784 N.E.2d 425 \(3d Dist. 2003\)](#) A post-conviction petitioner did not waive his claim of ineffective assistance of counsel by pleading guilty. Although a guilty plea generally results in a waiver of challenges that are not related to the voluntariness of the plea, a guilty plea is voluntary only if it is entered with the assistance of

competent counsel. Because the defendant sought to challenge his plea due to the ineffectiveness of trial counsel, the guilty plea did not waive the error.

People v. Bowman, 335 Ill.App.3d 1142, 782 N.E.2d 333 (5th Dist. 2002) Generally, a guilty plea in which the defendant admits that he was in fact guilty of the offenses waives any claim that constitutional rights were violated before the plea was entered. Where defendant entered an **Alford** plea, however, and the factual basis for the plea primarily concerned the defendant's confession, defendant was permitted to collaterally attack his plea upon subsequently discovering evidence suggesting that the confession had been obtained by deception.

People v. Spurlock, 19 Ill.App.3d 474, 311 N.E.2d 739 (5th Dist. 1974) Defense counsel advised the court that defendant's plea was based on the State's agreement to permit him to reserve for appeal his motions to dismiss. The Court held that the plea was involuntary because neither the prosecution nor the defense are able to preserve such motions for review. **People v. Bivens**, 43 Ill.App.3d 79, 356 N.E.2d 665 (5th Dist. 1976) A guilty plea waives a defendant's right to discharge under the speedy trial statute, and also waives a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel due to counsel's failure to advise defendant of the right to such a discharge.

§24-10

Stipulated Bench Trial

Illinois Supreme Court

People v. Galarza, 2023 IL 127678 At a stipulated bench trial for DUI and failure to reduce speed to avoid an accident, the evidence showed that at 5 a.m. on the day in question, paramedics found a single vehicle crashed head-on into a tree. Defendant's girlfriend was in the driver's seat, but she stated that the defendant was driving, and that he jerked the wheel and crashed the car. Defendant, who was outside of the car, showed signs of intoxication and had a BAC of .203. He admitted he was driving, though at trial his defense was that his girlfriend was the driver. The trial court found defendant guilty and the appellate court affirmed.

Defendant asserted that the trial court erred when it failed to provide guilty plea admonishments. Guilty plea admonishments are required if a stipulated bench trial is “tantamount” to a guilty plea. A stipulated bench trial is tantamount to a guilty plea under two circumstances: (1) the State’s entire case is to be presented by stipulation and the defendant does not present or preserve a defense; or (2) the stipulation includes a statement that the evidence is sufficient to convict the defendant.

Defendant argued that (1) applied because the only defense he presented was insufficiency of the evidence, which is not a defense that preserves any issues for appeal and was simply a denial of one of the facts – that defendant drove the car – to which he stipulated. The court disagreed, holding “defendant did more than deny stipulated facts, he presented a defense.” While the stipulated evidence showed defendant admitted he was the driver, defense counsel’s argument to the contrary presented a genuine question of fact for the trial court to decide. The stipulated bench trial was therefore not tantamount to a guilty plea.

People v. Bellmyer, 199 Ill.2d 529, 771 N.E.2d 391 (2002) A stipulated bench trial is tantamount to a guilty plea if the defendant stipulates not only to the evidence, but also to

its sufficiency to convict. Where the defendant presents a defense, a stipulated bench trial is not tantamount to a guilty plea. Where the parties stipulated to the evidence they would introduce but contested whether an insanity defense would be proven, the proceeding was a bench trial.

People v. Horton, 143 Ill.2d 11, 570 N.E.2d 320 (1991) The Court held that a stipulated bench trial is not normally tantamount to a guilty plea if the defendant preserves a defense. However, if defense counsel concedes the evidence is sufficient to convict, defendant should be given guilty plea admonishments even though an issue is preserved.

People v. Smith, 59 Ill.2d 236, 319 N.E.2d 760 (1974) A stipulated bench trial, when designed to establish guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, is tantamount to a guilty plea and requires the protections set forth in Supreme Court Rule 402. See also, **People v. Stepheny**, 56 Ill.2d 237, 306 N.E.2d 872 (1974).

Illinois Appellate Court

People v. Villareal, 2022 IL App (2d) 200077 After her motion to suppress was denied, defendant proceeded to a stipulated bench trial in order to preserve the suppression issue for review. On appeal, the court first found that defendant's stipulated bench trial was tantamount to a guilty plea where the trial judge repeatedly confirmed that defendant was stipulating to the evidence's sufficiency to support a finding of guilt.

The court then noted that there is a split of authority regarding whether a defense is effectively preserved by a stipulated bench trial that is tantamount to a guilty plea, citing **People v. Bond**, 257 Ill. App. 3d 746 (2d Dist. 1994) (defense not waived by stipulated bench trial tantamount to a guilty plea), and **People v. Gonzalez**, 313 Ill. App. 3d 607 (2d Dist. 2000) (consideration of issue foreclosed by stipulated bench trial that was tantamount to a plea). The appellate court went on to find that **Gonzalez** was based on a misreading of **People v. Horton**, 143 Ill. 2d 11 (1991), which did not suggest that a defendant fails to preserve issues by stipulating to the sufficiency of the evidence. Accordingly, the court stated it was following its earlier decision in **Bond** and would reach the merits of defendant's preserved suppression issue.

Ultimately, the court found the suppression issue without merit. There was no dispute that the traffic stop which led to the search was valid. During the stop, the officer smelled cannabis, and a passenger handed him two small bags of cannabis. This supported a warrantless search of the vehicle and any containers therein that might reasonably contain contraband, which included defendant's purse. Inside the purse, the officer observed an identification card. The officer testified that he immediately knew the card was fraudulent, entitling him to remove it and investigate further. Defendant asserted that the identification was in a tight, opaque sleeve in her wallet, however, and that it's incriminating nature was not immediately observable. The appellate court concluded that, under either version, the search was proper. Either the plain view exception applied if the officer's version was correct, or the search of the wallet sleeve was justified by the possibility that contraband such as cannabis or other drugs could be easily concealed in that location. Accordingly, the appellate court affirmed.

People v. Burns, 2020 IL App (3d) 170103 Defendant's stipulated bench trial was tantamount to a guilty plea where defense counsel explicitly stipulated to the sufficiency of the evidence, even though counsel's stipulation was made prior to the court's lunch break and

the formal stipulated bench trial proceedings were not held until after that break. While defendant was not admonished of the right to plead not guilty or the right to a jury trial, there was substantial compliance with Rule 402's admonishment requirement here because defendant did plead not guilty by proceeding to a stipulated bench trial and defendant previously entered a valid jury waiver.

People v. Taylor, 2018 IL App (2d) 150995 “[A] stipulation is tantamount to a guilty plea when one of two conditions is met: (1) the State presents its entire case by stipulation and defendant fails to preserve a defense; or (2) the stipulation concedes that the evidence is sufficient to support a guilty verdict.” Defendant alleged that his guilty plea was tantamount to a guilty plea because he did not “preserve” a defense under (1), having raised only a constitutional challenge that need not be preserved, and because he conceded the “truth” of the factual basis under (2).

A stipulated bench trial is not tantamount to a guilty plea even if the defense “preserved” is a constitutional attack on the statute that does not have to be preserved because it could be raised on appeal from a guilty plea. The defense need only be proffered. As for (2), to concede the sufficiency of the evidence, a defendant must do more than just accept the truth of the stipulated facts; rather, the defendant must remove the question of sufficiency from the purview of the trial court. Thus, the trial court did not err in failing to provide guilty plea admonishments under Rule 402(a).

The special concurrence noted that courts continue to use “preserve” in this context when the rule has been interpreted to require only the “proffer” of a defense. It urges courts to abandon the former so as to “encourage greater use of stipulated bench trials as a valuable tool to conserve court resources.”

People v. Campbell, 2015 IL App (3d) 130614 A stipulated bench trial is tantamount to a guilty plea when the State’s whole case is presented by stipulation and the defendant does not present or preserve a defense, or when the stipulation states that the evidence is sufficient to convict. When a stipulated bench trial is tantamount to a guilty plea, the trial court must admonish the defendant pursuant to [Illinois Supreme Court Rule 402\(a\)](#). And if relevant, the court must admonish the defendant that by stipulating that the evidence is sufficient to convict, he waives his right to a jury trial.

Prior to trial and after receiving proper admonitions, defendant waived his right to a jury. On the next court date, defendant agreed to plead guilty in exchange for a sentencing cap. The court properly admonished defendant pursuant to [Rule 402\(a\)](#), including re-admonishing him about his right to a jury trial, and then accepted his plea.

Following sentencing, defendant successfully moved to withdraw his guilty plea. The parties then reached an agreement that in exchange for a 15-year sentence defendant would proceed with a stipulated bench trial. The trial court again admonished defendant pursuant to [Rule 402\(a\)](#), but did not admonish him about his right to a jury trial. The State presented a stipulated factual basis including a provision that the evidence was sufficient to prove defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. The trial court found defendant guilty.

The Appellate Court held that the stipulated bench trial was tantamount to a guilty plea and thus the trial court had an obligation to fully admonish defendant pursuant to [Rule 402\(a\)](#), including his right to a jury trial, and that by proceeding with a stipulated bench trial defendant would be waiving his right to a jury trial. Although the trial court had previously admonished defendant about his right to a jury trial, because defendant had previously waived his right to a jury trial, it was critical that the court inform him that the right was

reinstated when he withdrew his guilty plea and his prior waiver had no effect.

The Appellate Court held that the failure to properly admonish defendant about his right to a jury trial affected his fundamental right to a jury and thus was reviewable under the second prong of plain error. Defendant's conviction was reversed and remanded for further proceedings after proper admonitions.

People v. Mueller, 2013 IL App (5th) 120566 A guilty plea waives all non-jurisdictional defenses or defects. However, a stipulated bench trial avoids the waiver rule while allowing the parties to proceed with the benefits and conveniences of the guilty plea procedure. There is a subtle difference between a stipulated bench trial and a guilty plea.

Where the State's entire case is presented by stipulation and the defendant does not preserve or present a defense, or where the stipulation includes an agreement that the evidence is sufficient to convict, the stipulation is tantamount to a guilty plea whether or not a defense is preserved. By contrast, if the stipulated bench trial includes a stipulation to the State's evidence but not to the legal conclusions to be drawn from the evidence, it is not tantamount to a guilty plea.

The court found that if a stipulated bench trial is tantamount to a guilty plea, all non-jurisdictional issues are waived including those which the parties sought to preserve by utilizing the stipulated bench trial procedure. Although in this case the parties thought they were conducting a stipulated bench trial, and the trial court stated several times that the purpose of the procedure was to preserve issues for appeal, by stipulating that the evidence was sufficient to convict the parties transformed the stipulated bench trial into a guilty plea which waived all non-jurisdictional issues.

The court stated:

To eliminate any misunderstanding in a stipulated bench trial, the trial court should elicit from the accused that he is presenting and preserving a defense and that he is not stipulating that the evidence is sufficient to convict, because failure to establish either of these factors renders a would-be stipulated bench trial tantamount to a guilty plea. . . . If the wrong language is used in a stipulated bench trial, the trial becomes tantamount to a guilty plea and the very issue sought to be preserved is foreclosed. . . . This is precisely what happened in the instant case.

Compare, **People v. Weaver, 2013 IL App (3d) 130054** (if a stipulated bench trial is tantamount to a guilty plea, the trial court is required to give Supreme Court **Rule 402** admonishments; even where a stipulated bench trial is tantamount to a guilty plea, however, it is a stipulated bench trial rather than a guilty plea, and the defendant need not file a motion to withdraw the plea in order to appeal.)

People v. Weaver, 2013 IL App (3rd) 130054 A guilty plea forfeits all non-jurisdictional defenses or defects. By contrast, a stipulated bench trial allows a defendant to enjoy the advantages of a guilty plea while avoiding the forfeiture rule concerning an issue which he seeks to raise on appeal.

Courts recognize two types of stipulated bench trials. First, the defendant may stipulate to the evidence but not to his or her guilt. Second, the defendant may stipulate to the sufficiency of the State's evidence to convict. Either type of stipulated bench trial allows the parties to enjoy the benefits and conveniences of a guilty plea while preserving certain issues, such as those raised in a motion to quash or suppress evidence.

A stipulated bench trial is tantamount to a guilty plea if the State presents its entire case by stipulation and the defendant fails to preserve a defense, or if the defendant concedes by stipulation that the evidence is sufficient to support a guilty verdict. If a stipulated bench trial is tantamount to a guilty plea, Supreme Court [Rule 402](#) admonishments must be given. [Rule 402](#) admonishments inform guilty plea defendants of several matters, including the nature of the charge, the minimum and maximum sentences, the right to plead not guilty, and the consequences of a guilty plea.

Even where a stipulated bench trial is tantamount to a guilty plea for the purpose of requiring [Rule 402](#) admonishments, it is a stipulated bench trial rather than a guilty plea. Therefore, the defendant is not required to file a motion to withdraw the plea before taking an appeal. Instead, an appeal is commenced by filing a notice of appeal.

The court rejected the State's argument that a defendant who was convicted after a stipulated bench trial, and who stipulated that if the matter went to trial there would be sufficient evidence to support a guilty verdict, was required to file a motion to withdraw a guilty plea before appealing the issues raised in a pretrial motion to suppress.

[People v. Mitchell](#), 353 Ill.App.3d 838, 819 N.E.2d 1252 (2d Dist. 2004) A stipulated bench trial is tantamount to a guilty plea where the defendant stipulates not only to the admissibility of evidence, but also to the sufficiency of the evidence to convict. If a stipulated bench trial is tantamount to a guilty plea, the trial court must admonish the defendant pursuant to Supreme Court [Rule 402](#). Where the stipulation filed in the trial court stated that defendant waived "all claims and issues based on . . . the sufficiency of evidence" the language was "clearly and unequivocally a stipulation as to the sufficiency of the evidence to convict." Because the stipulation was tantamount to a guilty plea, the trial court erred by failing to give guilty plea admonitions under Supreme Court [Rule 402](#).

[People v. Fish](#), 316 Ill.App.3d 795, 737 N.E.2d 694 (3d Dist. 2000) Where the defendant was convicted in a stipulated bench trial at which defense counsel specifically conceded that the evidence was sufficient to convict, the trial court committed plain error by failing to give adequate admonitions under Supreme Court Rule 402. Guilty plea admonishments are required where a stipulated bench trial is equivalent to a guilty plea, including where the defense stipulates that the evidence is sufficient to support a conviction.

[People v. Young](#), 25 Ill.App.3d 629, 323 N.E.2d 788 (1st Dist. 1975) A stipulated bench trial in this case was not tantamount to a plea of guilty, because the defendant "did not waive his right to assert the defense of self-defense and did assert and preserve that defense in the stipulated evidence." See also, [People v. Leckner](#), 149 Ill.App.3d 314, 500 N.E.2d 721 (4th Dist. 1986).

§24-11

Juvenile Proceedings

Illinois Supreme Court

[In re William M.](#), 206 Ill.2d 595, 795 N.E.2d 269 (2003) Under [In re A.G.](#), 195 Ill.2d 313, 746 N.E.2d 732 (2001), Supreme Court Rule 604(d) applies to juvenile proceedings and if a juvenile adjudication is based on the minor's admission to a delinquency petition, a motion to withdraw the admission or reconsider the disposition must be filed before an appeal can be taken. The filing of a post-admission motion is not a jurisdictional requirement for an

appeal, however. Thus, an appeal need not necessarily be dismissed because the appellant failed to file an appropriate post-dispositional motion. In adult cases, strict compliance with Supreme Court Rule 604(d) is required. Therefore, the failure to file an appropriate post-plea motion requires dismissal of an appeal and forces the defendant to present his claims in post-conviction proceedings. Because it is an open question whether the Post-Conviction Hearing Act applies to juveniles, however, and a juvenile might have no remedy other than a direct appeal, dismissal of the appeal would be "too harsh a sanction." Instead, where "a juvenile defendant fails to comply with the written motion requirements of Rule 604(d) prior to filing an appeal, the appellate court has no discretion and must remand the cause to the circuit court for strict compliance with Rule 604(d)." See also, [In re B.K.](#), 358 Ill.App.3d 1166, 833 N.E.2d 945 (5th Dist. 2005).

[In re A.G.](#), 195 Ill.2d 313, 746 N.E.2d 732 (2001) Because the purpose of the Juvenile Court Act has changed and "virtually all the constitutional requirements of a criminal trial have been introduced into juvenile delinquency proceedings," the attorney certificate requirement of Supreme Court Rule 604(d) applies where a delinquent minor files a motion to reconsider a disposition or withdraw an admission to a delinquency petition. The court declined to decide, however, whether a delinquent minor's failure to file a post-admission motion pursuant to Rule 604(d) bars a notice of appeal. Because trial counsel did not file a certificate of compliance with Supreme Court Rule 604(d), the trial court's order denying the motion to reconsider the disposition was vacated. The cause was remanded for compliance with Rule 604.

Illinois Appellate Court

[People v. Robinson](#), 2021 IL App (1st) 181653 Defendant pled guilty to murder and attempt murder, committed at age 17, and received concurrent sentences of 35 and 30 years. The defendant's post-conviction petition stated the gist of a claim that his guilty plea was secured by the threat of a now unconstitutional *de facto* life sentence. As in [People v. Parker](#), 2019 IL App (5th) 150192, the Appellate Court held that the defendant's belief that he faced a 60-year maximum, rather than a potential 40-year maximum, rendered his plea involuntary.

The Appellate Court rejected the State's argument that defendant's fully negotiated plea foreclosed his claim. Defendant's rights under the eighth amendment in this context were not known at the time he pled guilty; therefore, he could not have voluntarily relinquished them. The court also rejected the State's argument that defendant lacked a claim because he did not receive a *de facto* life sentence, as the key question is not whether he received a life sentence, but whether his decision to accept the plea was involuntary due to the threat of a potential *de facto* life sentence.

[In re R.C.K.](#), 285 Ill.App.3d 310, 674 N.E.2d 494 (2d Dist. 1996) Rule 604(d) applies to appeals from delinquency adjudications based on admissions. Because defense counsel failed to file a 604(d) certificate, the Appellate Court reversed the order denying the motion to reconsider the sentence and remanded the cause for filing of the certificate and a new hearing.

Updated: July 11, 2024

