1		IN THE CIRCUIT			
2		FOR ORANGE COUR	TY, FL	ORIDA	
3	STATE OF FLORIDA,				
4	Plaintiff,			•	
5		CASE NUMBER:	48-20	09-CF-1739	3-A-O
6	vs.	DIVISION NUMB	BER: 1	9	×
7	TODD MICHAEL HANNIGAN,	VOLUME I of	r		
8	Defendant./			ie.	
9	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ENTENCING			
10	5.		OR	RIGINA	O Salara, and a salara
		BEFORE			Expany
11	THE HON	ORABLE TIM SHEA			
12					
13		In the Orange Cou Courtroom 6A	anty Co	urthouse <u> </u>	<u> </u>
14		Orlando, Florida August 17, 2010	32801		: <u></u>
15		Jean Dexter, RPR,	, CRR		
16				325 3	20
17	APPEARANCES:				Z.
18	JESSICA TRAVIS Assistant State Attorn	017	В	,	,
19	415 North Orange Avenue	*			
20	Orlando, Florida 32801 On behalf of the State				
21	ROBERT POWER				
22	Assistant Public Defen 435 North Orange Avenu				
23	Orlando, Florida 32801 On behalf of the Defend				
	on benair of the belefit	dani.			
24			6		
25	·				

1		-	_	-			
2		ΙN	DΕ	X	r.		
3							
4	SENTENCING						14
5	CERTIFICATE OF REP	ORTER	e	¥			17
6							
7				w			
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20				ä			
21						P	
22							
23	•						
24							
25							

1	
2	PROCEEDINGS
3	THE COURT: We are here on which case?
4	MR. POWER: Todd Hannigan. This is set for
5	sentencing today, Judge. There was a trial and a
6	verdict of guilty.
7	THE COURT: Where is Ms. Travis?
8	MS. TRAVIS: Right here, Your Honor.
9	THE COURT: Where is Mr. Hannigan?
10	THE DEFENDANT: (Indicating).
11	THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Hannigan.
12	Mr. Hannigan, raise your right hand, please.
13	TODD MICHAEL HANNIGAN
14	the defendant, was duly sworn.
15	THE COURT: Okay. It's my understanding you're
16	going to be arguing for a downward departure; is that
17	right?
18	MR. POWER: I'm going to be arguing initially to
19	give you the authority to do so. If the Court finds
20	there is no such authority or my argument is not
21	convincing, there's no reason to go into mitigation.
22	THE COURT: Okay.
23	MR. POWER: So first thing is to
24	THE COURT: Go ahead.
25	MR. POWER: The crux here is whether this Court has

Official Court Reporters 407-836-2280

authority to downward depart or exercise any type of
discretion when it comes to a minimum-mandatory
sentence. The scheme is under 893.135.
THE COURT: Well, the Court does have the authority
to downward depart if the defendant is sentenced under
an alternative sentencing scheme, but that's not the
case in this case.
MR. POWER: No youthful
THE COURT: Hang on. We have a court reporter. No
youthful offender.
MR. POWER: No, sir.
THE COURT: No other alternative sentencing scheme.
MR. POWER: There is no substantial assistance.
THE COURT: No substantial assistance.
MR. POWER: The prosecutor has not exercised any
discretion to come off the minimum mandatory. Now, the
question is whether or not, given those parameters, this
Court can downward depart and nonetheless entertain such
argument.
First thing's first, under 893.135(3)(c) excuse
me it says, any person who knowingly sells,
purchases, manufactures, delivers, or brings into this
state or who is knowingly in actual or constructive
possession

Official Court Reporters 407-836-2280

THE COURT: Slow down.

25

1	MR. POWER: of four-grams or more of any
2	morphine, opium, oxycodone, hydrocodone in this case
3	it's hydrocodone hydromorphone, or any salt,
4	derivative, isomer, or salt of an isomer thereof,
5	including heroin, as described therein. And it goes
6	further and further. And then it says, if it's 14 grams
7	or more, in this case in the jury trial, the
8	testimony was 22 grams 14 grams or more, but less
9	than 28 grams, such person shall be sentenced to a
10	mandatory-minimum term of imprisonment of 15 years.
11	As an aside, this is the only statutory scheme that
12	goes from three to 15 years. All of the other ones go
13	from three to seven to 15. For some reason, (c) is the
14	only one that handles it differently.
15	I would call to the Court's attention to
16	subsection
17	THE COURT: The key word there being shall.
18	MR. POWER: Shall.
19	THE COURT: Right.
20	MR. POWER: Right. There is, however, further
21	language in the statute under (3) where the Court is
22	admonished that notwithstanding the provisions of
23	Subsection 948, which is your probationary statute, with
24	respect to any person who is found to have violated the
25	section, adjudication of guilt or imposition of sentence

shall not be suspended, deferred or withheld, nor shall 1 any person be eliqible for parole prior to serving the 2 mandatory-minimum term of imprisonment prescribed by 3 . 4 this section. 5 What I'm suggesting to this Court is, based on (c), the statutory scheme has now been modified. 6 7 Additionally, there are more parameters now that 8 restrict a judge's ability to do anything in this case. 9 But in as much they decided to become specific, what 10 they have not said is you cannot downward depart or 11 entertain litigation. 12 Let's say they can't defer, can't suspend and can't 13 withhold, we're not seeking any of those. We're not 14 seeking to suspend or defer sentence or withhold adjudication of guilt, we're asking you to entertain 15 1.6 mitigation in a case whose facts, as you know, are very 17 different. I have some case law I would like to cite to the 18 I have already provided this case law to 19 Ms. Travis. Both of these cases are initially 20 indicating that a court cannot exercise its discretion; 21 however, they're distinguishable on the facts. One 22 entrapment defense is not brought up and the other 23 one -- these cases are Kelley versus State, found at 821 24

25

So.2d 1255. It is a 2002 decision out of the Fourth

DCA. In this case, the judge explained at sentencing on a 15-year minimum mandatory, that without the prosecutor's waiver, she had no discretion to go below the statutory mandated sentence minimum of 15 years for trafficking in an amount greater than 400 grams as charged. That's on page 2. It's highlighted for the Court.

6.

More importantly, under one, the holding of the Court, we agree with the trial court, that the 15-year minimum sentence was mandatory unless the prosecutor recommended otherwise. I would distinguish this case of Kelley in that in this case the Court was trying to determine whether or not this particular person was eligible for this because of police misconduct. So we have a variable here of police misconduct which may have, had it been properly argued, that is the entrapment defense, may have led to a different result.

And I have to cite this case law. It's against me, but the short answer is, according to this court, that the sentencing statutes in Florida do not permit the judge to avoid the minimum-mandatory provisions for the reasons suggested, which was this business of entrapment.

I have an obligation to cite that case. I think it's distinguishable. As you know, the facts here was a

person trying to commit suicide with Vicodin pills he had stolen from his mother, and he was found in a park drinking beer and popping these pills, getting up, I guess valor, to complete the job when police rolled up on him. He was arrested for possession of alcoholic beverage in a state park. And then from there it progressed to an arrest based on pills that were found within his vicinity.

So my first argument to this Court is because the statutory scheme does not specifically tell you as it does in (c), that you cannot suspend, defer, withhold. It does not specifically tell you that you cannot mitigate or find mitigation. I'm asking this Court to exercise its discretion where the statute has not limited you, that is, to do a downward departure and entertain mitigation.

with the Court. The 15-year minimum-mandatory sentence in this case is just a violation of the Eighth Amendment. It is cruel and unusual for a person who is in simple possession without peddling. The Hill case talks about the distinction between peddling and just an addict or possessor. As such, I would say the 15 years is oppressive and cruel and unusual, and, therefore, should not be imposed. And we should go and entertain

1 mitigation or otherwise go by the scoresheet.

2.0

I would entertain questions that you have, Judge, but, in essence, those are my two arguments. One, that you are not specifically deprived of your ability, and the other one is the Eighth Amendment is cruel or unusual. It's just too onerous, 15-year minimum mandatory day for day, for a person who is simply possessing without the cash value or any kind of monetary peddling.

MS. TRAVIS: Your Honor, the defendant was tried and a jury found the defendant guilty of trafficking in 14 grams or more of hydrocodone. Based upon the statute, the wording of the statute is that the judge shall sentence the defendant to 15 years and the minimum mandatory.

Based upon the cases that the defense cited, Hill versus State, which came out of the Second District Court of Appeals in 1993, Kelley versus State, which came out of the Fourth District Court of Appeals in 2002. And, Your Honor, I have another one which states essentially the same thing of Mond versus State which came out Second District Court Of Appeals in 1993.

THE COURT: Do you have a citation on that?

MS. TRAVIS: 627 So.2d 577.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Official Court Reporters 407-836-2280

1		MS. TRAVIS: Your Honor, in all three cases, the
2		defendant either pled no contest to the charge or was
3		found guilty by a trial of the charges, and all three of
4		the courts stated that the court has no discretion and
` 5		must sentence the defendant to the mandatory minimum.
6		In this case, Your Honor, that would be 15 years.
7		State requests that you sentence the defendant to that.
8		MR. POWER: My last argument, Judge, would be the
9		following:
10	190	THE COURT: Hang on one second. Is that it,
11		Ms. Travis?
12		MS. TRAVIS: That's all. Only that the Court does
13		not have any discretion to waive the minimum mandatory,
14		and that there can be no mitigation evidence to be
15		presented in order to allow the Court to mitigate from
16		that mandatory minimum.
17		THE COURT: Or that presentation of such evidence
18		be useless in light of the restraints placed by the
19		legislature.
20		MR. POWER: The last thing I would do is an analogy
21		between federal law and state law. Under state law, the
22	밁	two matters in which a mandatory-minimum sentence can be
23		avoided, or three matters, are a sentence scheme under
24		the youthful offender statute, the prosecutor through a
25		negotiated plea bargain or through substantial

assistance. There is a fourth category under the federal law, which is called the escape clause. This is to allow people who generally fall between the cracks cannot give substantial assistance because, although they're intertwined in the trafficking scheme, they don't have enough knowledge or it's repetitive, and, therefore, if you qualify under the five criteria of the federal statute, you are given what is called an escape clause. This is what I'm trying to see if this Court will entertain. There be an escape clause because of the way the facts fall.

6.

THE COURT: Well, I understand the argument you are making in the federal arena. As you can tell from my frayed robe, I make less money than a federal judge, number one. Number two, I don't have a lifetime appointment. There are differences.

In addition, while there are some marching orders I must take from the United States Supreme Court, clearly we all must take from the United States Supreme Court, we're talking about the Florida Legislature here.

Now, Mr. Hannigan, I will tell you that, based on the facts that have emerged in your case, that I do believe that this is an inappropriate sentence for you. I really believe that. But there are restraints placed on my ability to stray from the statutory framework for

sentencing. Unfortunately, this is one of them. I think Mr. Power has done a good job arguing. I think that there does seem to be a leap of logic here in the sentencing scheme. When you say if you process a certain amount of drugs, that, therefore, you are engaged in trafficking and there should be a harsher sentence rather than taking into account the kinds of facts and circumstances surrounding Mr. Hannigan's case.

Mr. Hannigan, if there should be some change in the legislative framework that would result in early release from sentence, no one would be more than happy than I.

I want you to understand that. Because I do think this is an inappropriate sentencing under these circumstances. The legislature has, in its infinite wisdom, decided to transfer a significant amount, which was once judicial discretion, to the prosecutorial arm of this state. There's nothing I can do about that.

There's nothing I can do about that at all.

I understand the argument you're making, Mr. Power, but it seems to me the arguments concerning the statutory framework are better made to the legislature than to this Court because under this set of circumstances, this Court does nothing more than perform an administerial function. I sign the papers. I'm on autopilot. So I would suggest you take it up with the

1	legislature.
2	I know that you have made your record, and this is
3	something you may want to take up on appeal. I would
4	encourage you to do so. Nonetheless, under this set of
5	facts and circumstances, the Court has no alternative,
6	Mr. Hannigan, but to move forward and sentence you under
7	the minimum-mandatory sentence. That's what the Court
8	intends to do.
9	I'm going to move forward to impose that sentence
10	in a moment. I just wanted to let the doctor know that
11	he's free to go at this time.
12	MR. POWER: Thank you, Doctor.
13	THE COURT: It doesn't make sense for me to take
14	testimony from a doctor since there really isn't any
15	room to maneuver, so to speak. Thank you very much for
16	coming this morning, Doctor.
17	Okay. Mr. Hannigan, as I indicated, unfortunately,
18	I must move forward with this sentence.
19	State, do you have a scoresheet there?
20	MS. TRAVIS: Your Honor, I believe I gave you a
21	scoresheet.
22	THE COURT: I have a scoresheet.
23	MR. POWER: My scoresheet reads 82.05 months. I've
24	gone over that with my client.
25	MS. TRAVIS: If I can remind the Court

Official Court Reporters 407-836-2280

1	THE COURT: Hang on. There was a 17 I had
2	indicated that
3	MS. TRAVIS: Seventeen and a half.
4	MR. POWER: Seventeen and a half years.
5	THE COURT: Seventeen and a half years. I'm going
6	to do I have not yet sentenced him yet, correct?
7	MS. TRAVIS: No, you did sentence him, however, you
8	set aside that sentencing to the next day.
9	THE COURT: What I'm going to do, I'm going to
10	impose the 15-year minimum-mandatory sentence on
11	Mr. Hannigan. I had indicated at first 17 and a half
12	years, but it will be a 15-year minimum mandatory served
13	day for day.
14	In addition, you're required to pay \$668 in felony
15	court costs.
16	Was the substance tested?
17	MS. TRAVIS: Yes, Your Honor.
18	THE COURT: So that's another \$100 FDLE drug
19	charge. Those costs and fees are due and payable now.
20	If they are not paid by the time you are released from
21	incarceration, I'll give you 60 days to report to
22	collections court to work out a payment plan with them.
23	In addition, the jury found you guilty on both
24	charges, so the Court's going to adjudicate you guilty
25	on both charges.

1	MS. TRAVIS: Your Honor, there is also the cost of
2	investigation of \$58.20 that you ordered previously.
3	THE COURT: Fifty-eight dollars and 20 cents.
4	That's payable to the Orlando Police Department. That
5	will be added to your costs and fees, Mr. Hannigan.
6	Okay: Anything else, Ms. Travis?
7	MS. TRAVIS: No.
8	THE COURT: Anything else from you, Mr. Power?
9	MR. POWER: No, Your Honor.
10	THE COURT: Okay.
11	THE CLERK: Count 2 is a misdemeanor.
12	THE COURT: Count 2 is a misdemeanor. Court's
13	going to sentence Mr. Hannigan to 261 days in the Orange
14	County Jail with credit for 261 days time served.
15	Mr. Hannigan, did you want to say something, sir?
16	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
17	THE COURT: You know, I apologize, I should have
18	asked you that, sir. Go ahead.
19	THE DEFENDANT: You know, I agree with you that
20	it's unfair punishment for the crime in this case. All
21	I wanted was some treatment, some help, and I don't feel
22	this is going to help me at all.
23	THE COURT: Based on the facts and circumstances
24	presented to this Court during trial, I agree that some
25	help would be appropriate; and as indicated, no one

1	would be happier than I if the laws change giving us
2	discretion. Unfortunately, that's not the circumstances
3	in this case.
4	THE DEFENDANT: If I can, can I file for an appeal?
5	THE COURT: Sure. Mr. Power is going to present me
6	with an affidavit of insolvency for purposes of appeal
7	and I'm going to sign that for you today.
8	THE DEFENDANT: Okay. Thank you.
9	THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Power is going to be right
10	over with the paperwork. Whatever you want to do with
11	fingerprinting, Oscar, is fine, but let Mr. Hannigan
12	sign that before you take him downstairs.
13	(The proceedings concluded.)
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	•
23	
24	
∠ 1	

25

1	CERTIFICATE .
2	
3	
4	STATE OF FLORIDA:
5	COUNTY OF ORANGE:
6	I, Jean Dexter, CRR, RPR, Official Court
7	Reporter of the Ninth Judicial Circuit of Florida,
8	do hereby certify, pursuant to Florida Rules of Judicial
9	Administration 2.535(h)(3), that I was authorized to and did
10	report in stenographic shorthand the foregoing proceedings,
11	and that thereafter my stenographic shorthand notes
12	were transcribed to typewritten form by the process
13	of computer-aided transcription, and that the
14	foregoing pages contain a true and correct
15	transcription of my shorthand notes taken therein.
16	cth cth
17	WITNESS my hand this day of
18	2010, in the City of Orlando, County of Orange,
19	State of Florida.
20	
21	
22	Jen Det
23	Jean Dexter, CRR, RPR
24	

25