1 2	(Add your Name) CDC NO(Add Current Housing Address)	
3		
$\frac{3}{4}$		
5		
6	Petitioner In Pro Per (Add your Name)	
7	(Aud your Name)	
8		
9		
10	)	
11	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
12	FOR THE COUNTY OF (Add County Name)	
13		
14		
15	THE PEOPLE OF CALIFORNIA, ) Superior Ct. No.	
16	Plaintiff, MOTION FOR FRANKLIN	
17	) HEARING; REQUEST FOR $_{ m V.}$ ) APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL	
18	v. ) APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL ) [Pen. Code § 1203.01; Code	
19	(Add your Name), ) Civ. Proc. § 187; In re Cook (2019)	<b>}</b> )
20	) 7 Cal.5th 439] Defendant. )	
21		
$\frac{22}{2}$		
23		
24	TO THE JUDGE OF THE (Add County) SUPERIOR COURT AND THE (Add County) DISTRICT ATTORNEY:	
$\begin{bmatrix} 25 \\ 26 \end{bmatrix}$		
$\begin{bmatrix} 26 \\ 27 \end{bmatrix}$	Defendant (Add your Name) (CDC No) moves	
$\begin{bmatrix} 27 \\ 28 \end{bmatrix}$	under authority of <i>In re Cook</i> (2019) 7 Cal.5th, 439, and Penal Code	
	section 1203.01 for a proceeding to be held in which defendant may	

1	preserve mitigating evidence of youth as described in <i>People v. Franklin</i>
2 3	(2016) 63 Cal.4th 261 and <i>In re Cook, supra,</i> for purposes of defendant's
4	possible youth offender parole hearing. (Pen. Code, § 3051)
5	DAMED:
6	DATED:
7	Respectfully submitted,
8	
9	
10	(Addresse None) In Day Don
11	(Add your Name) , In Pro Per
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	2

## 1 ARGUMENT 2 (Add your Name) QUALIFIES FOR A FRANKLIN HEARING 3 BECAUSE DOE COMMITTED THE CHARGED OFFENSE WHEN HE WAS (Add Age at time of offense) YEARS 4 OLD 5 6 Introduction Α. 7 (Add your Name) was born on (Add birthdate) 8 The incident occurred on (Add date of incident) \_\_\_\_\_\_. (Add 9 10 your Name) was (Add age at time of offense)\_\_\_ years, \_\_\_\_months, 11 and \_\_\_days old at the time of the offense. (Add your Name) is serving 12 13 a (Add sentence)\_\_\_\_\_ to life sentence that entitles him to a youth 14 offender parole hearing. (Pen. Code, § 3051.) 15 16 (Add your Name) had no opportunity at his sentencing hearing to 17 make a record of mitigating evidence to support a future application for 18 19 parole. Case and statutory law entitle Doe to a *Franklin* hearing. 20 (People v. Franklin (2016) 63 Cal.4th 281, 284.) 21 *In re Cook* (2019) 7 Cal.5th, 439, and Penal Code section 1203.01 22 23 now authorize a proceeding to be held in which Doe may preserve 24 mitigating evidence of youth as described in *People v. Franklin* (2016) 25 26 63 Cal.4th 261 and *In re Cook, supra,* for a defendant's youth offender 27 28 3

3

## The Franklin Hearing В.

5

4

6

7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25 26

27

28

Penal Code section 3051, which our Supreme Court has characterized as "the heart of Senate Bill No. 260," requires the Board of Parole Hearings to "conduct a 'youth offender parole hearing' during the 15th, 20th, or 25th year of a juvenile offender's incarceration. [Citation.]. . . A juvenile offender whose controlling offense carries a term of 25 years to life or greater is 'eligible for release on parole by the board during his or her 25th year of incarceration at a youth offender parole hearing, unless previously released or entitled to an earlier parole consideration hearing pursuant to other statutory provisions." (*Franklin*, 63 Cal.4th at p. 277.)

Section 3051, subdivision (f) describes various types of evidence the Board may consider at a youth offender parole hearing. Subdivision (f)(1) provides, in relevant part: "In assessing growth and maturity, psychological evaluations and risk assessment instruments, if used by the board, . . . shall take into consideration the diminished culpability of juveniles as compared to that of adults, the hallmark features of youth, and any subsequent growth and increased maturity of the individual."

Subdivision (f)(2) further provides that "Family members, friends, school personnel, faith leaders, and representatives from community-based organizations with knowledge about the individual before the crime or his or her growth and maturity since the time of the crime may submit statements for review by the board."

Section 4801 further provides that when reviewing the parole suitability of a prisoner who was 25 years of age or younger at the time of the offense, the Board must "give great weight to the diminished culpability of juveniles as compared to adults, the hallmark features of youth, and any subsequent growth and increased maturity of the prisoner in accordance with relevant case law." (§ 4801, subd. (c).)

## C. Doe Qualifies for a *Franklin* Hearing

On (Add sentencing date)\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, the trial judge sentenced (Add age at sentencing)\_\_\_\_\_\_ year old (Add your Name) to (Add sentence)\_\_\_\_\_\_ years to life in state prison. (Add your Name) had no "Second Strike" or "Third Strike" sentence (Penal Code section 667, subds. (b)-(i)). (Add your Name) sentence did not include a five-year prior serious felony enhancement (Penal Code section 667, subd. (a)) nor a "One Strike" sentence for a sex offense subject to

"Jessica's Law" (Penal Code section 667.61). (Add your Name) sentence did not include a term of "life without the possibility of parole" (LWOP). (Add your Name) has not committed a crime since he was sentenced.

At his (Add sentencing date) \_\_\_\_\_\_ sentencing, (Add your Name) had no chance to present mitigation evidence for use at a future youth offender parole hearing. (Add your Name) did not have an opportunity or motivation at sentencing to present sufficient information about how (Add your Name) youth and other circumstances during the offense affected (Add your Name) actions and other mitigating evidence that would help (Add your Name) when he became eligible for parole.

(Add your Name) should be granted the chance to supplement the record with information relevant to his eventual youth offender parole hearing. (*Rodriguez, supra*, 4 Cal.5th at pp. 1131-1132; *Franklin, supra*, 63 Cal.4th at p. 284.) "In so doing, the trial court may exercise its discretion to conduct this process efficiently, ensuring that the information introduced is relevant, noncumulative, and otherwise in accord with the governing rules, statutes, and regulations." (*Rodriguez*, at p. 1132.)

## **CONCLUSION** (Add your Name) prays for the Court to grant his motion under Penal Code 1203.01. (Add your Name) also respectfully requests that counsel be appointed for the Franklin hearing/1203.01 motion. DATED: Respectfully submitted, (Add your Name), In Pro Per

1	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
2	I certify: that on (Add date of mailing), I served the:
3	MOTION FOR FRANKLIN HEARING; REQUEST FOR
4	APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL by depositing a copy, enclosed in a separate, sealed envelope, with postage fully prepaid, in the United
5	States mail at Los Angeles, County of Los Angeles, California, each of
6	which envelopes was addressed as follows:
7	(Add address of Court where you were sentenced)
8	——————————————————————————————————————
9	
10	
11	(Add address for District Attorney's Office)
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.
17	
18	Dated:
19	
20	(Add your Name), In Pro Per
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

I