

VIRGINIA CRIMINAL SENTENCING COMMISSION



Judicial Departure Reasons § 19.2-298.01

April 9, 2018

If the judge does not write a specific departure explanation, the Commission will accept the following as the reason for departure for the purposes of its own analysis:

Complete this form ONLY for applicable felonies sentenced on or after July 1, 2016.	Final Disposition Fill In After Sentence Has Been Pronounced
OFFENDER First Middle Last Suffix	SENTENCE Total Time Imposed Before Suspension
Date of Birth:	Total Effective Time to Serve
CCRE: V A Offender ID: PSI #: ◆ COURT	Post Release
Judicial Circuit	Check Plea Agreement, Plea and Recommendation,
Preparer Name Commonwealth's Attorney Probation Officer Prosecuting Commonwealth's Attorney Defense Attorney CONVICTIONS	or Oral Sentence
Offense Counts VCC Offense Date Primary Offense	Recommendation box Event Written Plea Agreement Accepted (Rule 3A:8(c) (1) (A) or (C))
Additional Offenses Image: Control of the set of	 Plea and Recommendation Accepted (Rule 3A:8 (c) (1) (B)) Oral Sentence Recommendation Accepted
	Check Detention or Diversion Center box
Check Jury Trial box	
	Diversion Center Incarceration Detention Center Incarceration Electronic Monitoring Drug Court
Jury Trial Sentence Set by Jury: Jury Trial Sentence Set by Jury Trial Sent	Site Control Continuation Drug Court Unsupervised Probation/Good Behavior § 18.2-251/§ 18.2-258.1 Youthful Offender Specify DJJ
	Control Content interformation Content
	□ Briedon Gondon Maderson
	Electronic Monitoring Unsupervised Probation/Good Behavior § 18.2-251/§ 18.2-258.1 Substance Abuse Treatment Other REASON FOR DEPARTURE Must be completed pursuant to § 19.2-298.01(B)

Information Requested by General Assembly

For a number of years, the General Assembly has requested a sentencing guidelines report for judges up for re-appointment.

A report like this one is generated for each such judge.

This year, for the first time, the Commission received a request from a legislator for the percentage of missing departure reasons for each active circuit court judge. Sentencing Guidelines Concurrence and Departure Rates CY 2010 – CY 2017 (Through June)

Statewide Summary

YEAR	CONCURRENCE	MITIGATION ^{1,2}	AGGRAVATION	CASES	DEPARTURE REASON MISSING (CASES)
2010	79.3%	11.5%	9.2%	24,089	3.8% (919)
2011	79.1%	11.0%	9.9%	24,079	4.2% (1,002)
2012	78.0%	11.8%	10.2%	23,946	4.1% (970)
2013	78.2%	11.2%	10.6%	24,885	3.3% (831)
2014	79.6%	10.7%	9.7%	24,727	2.9% (723)
2015	80.2%	10.4%	9.4%	23,777	2.5% (604)
2016	81.1%	9.7%	9.2%	23,526	2.4% (556)
2017	81.2%	9.7%	9.1%	11,714	2.5% (290)
TOTAL	79.5%	10.8%	9.7%	180,743	3.3% (5,895)

The percentage of missing departure reasons has declined overall since 2011.

Note: Figures for CY2017 are through June only.

¹ There were a total of 262 jury recommendations between 2010 and 2017 that were below the guidelines recommendation. By law, judges are not permitted to increase a sentence recommended by a jury (§ 19.2-303).

² Mitigation category includes 278 defendants committed to DJJ under the provisions of § 16.2-285.1 between January 2010 and June 2017.

Information Requested by General Assembly

MEREDITH FARRAR-OWENS

100 NORTH NINTH STREET RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23219 TEL (804) 225-4398 FAX (804) 786-3934

DIRECTOR

HON. EDWARD L. HOGSHIRE (RET.) CHAIRMAN



Commonwealth of Virginia

Supreme Court of Virginia Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission

January 24, 2018



Dear Judge

You may recall Chief Justice Lemons' 2017 State of the Judiciary address, in which he shared the General Assembly's concern regarding judges not filing a written explanation for departing from the sentencing guidelines as required by § 19.2-298.01(B).

Two pieces of legislation have been filed in the 2018 General Assembly that pertain to sentencing guidelines departure reasons (House Bill 1055 and House Bill 1312). As amended, House Bill would provide that a sentenced person may seek a writ of mandamus to enforce the requirement that the court file a written departure explanation, if the judge has failed to do so. House Bill 1312, as introduced, would allow a court's departure from the sentencing guidelines to be reviewable on appeal if the court failed to file the required written departure explanation and the sentence imposed exceeded the maximum of the sentencing guidelines range by more than 12 months.

In addition, the Commission's staff recently received a request from a legislator for the rate of missing departure reasons for each circuit court judge during fiscal year 2017. Commission staff compiled the statistics and submitted the information to the legislator last week. I am writing to make you aware that legislators have expressed concern in instances similar to yours in which the percentage of missing departure reasons is well above the statewide average. Our staff cautioned legislators that some judges had sentenced a small number of felony cases during the year, which would affect the results.

Should you have any questions or if you would like additional information, please do not hesitate to call the Commission's staff director, Meredith Farrar-Owens, at (804) 371-7626.

With kind regards

Edward L. Hogshire Retired Judge Chairman

After the report was submitted to the General Assembly, a letter was sent from the Commission's Chair to judges whose percentage of missing departures reasons were well above the statewide average for FY2017.

Ongoing Commission Activities Related to Guidelines Departure Reasons

- Commission is stressing the importance of departure reasons in pre-bench training and at judicial conferences.
- Commission is sending guidelines forms for certain cases back to the judge if no departure reason can be discerned.
 - This is currently done for cases that must be reported to the Virginia Child Protection Accountability System (§ 63.2-1530) and, since 2017, cases involving modification of a jury sentence (§ 19.2-295).
- When fully developed, the Commission's webbased guidelines application will prompt the judge whenever a departure reason is needed.



Options for the Commission's Consideration

- Staff could start returning all guidelines forms submitted without a departure reason to the sentencing judge or notify judge via e-mail in such cases.
- 2. Staff could accept departure reasons for guidelines previously submitted by the clerk.
 - FY2017 and FY2018
- 3. Staff could revise the guidelines cover sheet to facilitate the judge's use of check boxes for indicating departure reasons.



Options for the Commission's Consideration

- 4. Staff could attempt additional steps to verify the name of the sentencing judge recorded on the guidelines form.
 - Sometimes, the judge indicated on the front of the guidelines cover sheet is not the judge who ultimately sentences the offender.
 - Staff make every effort to identify the sentencing judge based on his/her signature; however, judges do not always sign the guidelines form.
 - To address this, staff could request additional data from the Circuit Court Case Management System (CMS) that includes judge identifier and attempt to match it to sentencing guidelines data.

Judges who use the SWIFT application to review the guidelines, record the sentence, and enter departure reasons will sign the form with an electronic signature code, which will eliminate errors of this kind.

7

Options for Modified Guidelines Cover Sheet

Final Disposition Fill In After Sentence Has Been Pronounced	
•	Final Disposition Fill In After Sentence Has Been Pronounced
	T Indi Disposition Fin in Alter Sentence has been Pronounced
Total Time Imposed Before Suspension	
Total <u>Effective</u> Time to Serve	Total Time Imposed Before Suspension
Post Release	Total Effective Time to Serve Life sentence +
Post Release Term § 18.2-10	
	Post Release
Post Release Supervision Period § 19.2-295.2(A)	Post Release Term § 18.2-10
Probation Period (Supervised) § 19.2-303	Post Release Supervision Period § 19.2-295.2(A)
Good Behavior Period (§ 19.2-306)	
Check all that apply Years Monthe Days	Probation Period (Supervised) § 19.2-303
Incarceration Sentence to Run Concurrently With Another Sentencing Event	Good Behavior Period (§ 19.2-306)
Written Plea Agreement Accepted = Rule 3A:8(c)(1) (A) or (C)	
	Incarceration Sentence to Run Concurrently With Another Sentencing Event
	Written Plea Agreement Accepted = Rule 3A:8(c)(1) (A) or (C)
	Plea and Recommendation Accepted = Rule 3A:8(c)(1)(B)
Restitution Fine Fine	Oral Sentence Recommendation Accepted
Other Sentencing Programs (check all that apply) Day Reporting Community-Based Program	□ Restitution \$ □ Fine \$
Detention Center Incarceration CCAP Detention/Diversion Center Incarceration, 22-28 weeks	Other Sentencing Programs OR GENERAL DEPARTURE REASONS (check all that apply)
Diversion Center Incarceration CCAP Detention/Diversion Center Incarceration, 42-48 weeks	Day Reporting
Electronic Monitoring Drug Court	Detention Center Incarceration CCAP Detention/Diversion Center Incarceration, 22-28 weeks
Intensive Probation Vouthful Offender	Diversion Center Incarceration CCAP Detention/Diversion Center Incarceration, 42-48 weeks
□ § 18.2-251/§ 18.2-258.1 □ DJJ Commitment □ Indeterminate □ Determinate	Electronic Monitoring Drug Court
Substance Abuse Treatment Other	Intensive Probation
	□ § 18.2-251/§ 18.2-258.1 □ DJJ Commitment □ Indeterminate □ Determinate
REASON FOR DEPARTURE AND/OR MODIFICATION OF JURY SENTENCE Must be completed pursuant to § 19.2-298.01(B) and/or § 19.2-295(B)/ § 19.2-303	Substance Abuse Treatment Other
Must be completed pursuant to § 19.2-298.01(B) and/or § 19.2-295(B)/ § 19.2-303	SPECIFIC REASON FOR DEPARTURE AND/OR MODIFICATION OF JURY SENTENCE
Jury Sentence Imposed	Must be completed pursuant to § 19.2-298.01(B) and/or § 19.2-295(B)/ § 19.2-303
Plea Agreement or	
Recommendation Accepted	
CCAP	
DJJ Commitment	
SENTENCING DATE	
New Judge's Signature	SENTENCING DATE
ATTACH COURT ORDER AND MAIL Pursuant to § 19.2-298.01(E)	
After sentencing, send to:	U Judge's Signature
Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission • 100 North Ninth Street • Fifth Floor • Richmond, Virginia 23219	ATTACH COURT ORDER AND MAIL Pursuant to § 19.2-298.01(E) After sentencing, send to:

