1 2 3	FAY ARFA, A LAW CORPORATION Fay Arfa, Attorney at Law State Bar No. 100143 10100 Santa Monica Blvd., #300					
4	Los Angeles, CA 90067					
5	Tel.: (310) 841-6805 Fax: (310) 841-0817					
6	info@bestdefender.com					
7	Attorney for Defendant					
8	JOHN DOE					
9						
10						
11	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA					
12						
13	FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES					
14						
15	THE PEOPLE OF CALIFORNIA,) Case No					
16	Plaintiff, Plaintiff, REPLY TO OPPOSITION					
17) TO MOTION FOR v.) MILITARY DIVERSION					
18) (Pen. Code, § 1001.80);					
19	JOHN DOE,) EXHIBIT B					
20	Defendant.					
21	TO THE COURT AND THE LOS ANGELES DISTRICT ATTORNEY:					
22						
23	Defendant, JOHN DOE, through counsel, respectfully submits					
24	this Reply to the prosecutor's Opposition to Military Diversion. Seventy-					
25	one-year-old JOHN DOE qualifies for military diversion because he					
26	one year ora o orier is quantities for infiltrary diversion because ne					
27	1					
28	REPLY TO OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR MILITARY DIVERSION (Pen. Code, § 1001.80) EXHIBIT B					

1	honorably served the United States military and suffers from a military
2	
3	service connected disability. (Pen. Code, § 1101.80)
4	DATED: April 30, 2020
5	Respectfully submitted, FAY ARFA, A LAW CORPORATION
6	
7	/s Fay Arta
8	Fay Arfa, Attorney for Defendant
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18 19	
$\begin{vmatrix} 19 \\ 20 \end{vmatrix}$	
$\begin{bmatrix} 20 \\ 21 \end{bmatrix}$	
$\frac{21}{22}$	
23	
24	
24 25	
$\begin{vmatrix} 26 \end{vmatrix}$	
27	2
- '	<u>"</u>

ARGUMENT

JOHN DOE QUALIFIES FOR MILITARY DIVERSION BECAUSE HE SERVED HIS COUNTY HONORABLY AND HE SUFFERS FROM A SERVICE CONNECTED DISABILITY

A. Introduction

The prosecutor incorrectly argues that 71-year-old JOHN DOE (DOB: XX/XX/XXXX) does not qualify for military diversion because JOHN DOE failed to prove that he served in the military, failed to prove that his disability has a connection to his alleged crime, and failed to submit properly authenticated documents. The prosecutor also argues that JOHN DOE fails to present a proper treatment plan. (Opposition 1)

Not so. The prosecutor misstates the Military Diversion law.

JOHN DOE qualifies for military diversion because he served in the

United States Navy from December 4, 1968 to September 10, 1976 and
received an Honorable Discharge. He served as Navy Corpsman in

Vietnam and experienced significant trauma. Mr. JOHN DOE is Service

Connected at a 100% rating for injuries sustained during his service
and a 50% rating for Post Traumatic Stress Disorder. (See Exhs. A¹, B,

	¹ JOHN DOE	refers to Ex	xhibit A (VA	Social W	$^{\prime}$ orker		
)	attached to	his original	motion,	filed on	February	18,
2020	for military	diversion					

3 4

1

5

6

7

9

8

11

10

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

JOHN DOE qualifies for military diversion because he served in the military and suffers from a military connected disability. The law requires nothing more. (Pen. Code, § 1001.80)

Military Diversion Focuses on Treatment and Rehabilitation В.

Section 1001.80 was enacted in 2014 and amended in 2017. Military diversion represents a relatively new addition to the state's diversion programs, which generally authorize trial courts to divert eligible persons charged with qualifying offenses from the normal criminal process into treatment and rehabilitation. (People v. Superior Court (On Tai Ho) (1974) 11 Cal.3d 59, 61; People v. Bishop (1992) 11 Cal.App.4th 1125, 1128.)

The primary purpose of diversion is rehabilitation. (Bishop, supra, at p. 1130.) As described by the California Supreme Court in its analysis of California's drug diversion statute, "[D]iversion is intended to offer a second chance to offenders who are minimally involved in crime and maximally motivated to reform, and the decision to divert is predicated on an in-depth appraisal of the background and personality of the particular individual before the court." (On Tai Ho, supra, at p. 66.)

The rehabilitative purpose of military diversion requires the trial court to assess whether an eligible candidate *might benefit* from

-- 23

specialized treatment for veterans and potentially complete diversion in furtherance of the statutory objectives. (*Wade v. Superior Court* (2019) 33 Cal. App. 5th 694, 715.)

C. The Trial Court Has Discretion to Grant Military Diversion

The prosecutor argues that the trial court has discretion to grant military diversion. (Opposition at 3) JOHN DOE agrees. Section 1001.80 grants discretionary authority to the trial court. (§ 1001.80, subd. (b) ["The court may place a defendant in military diversion upon determining the person, charged with a misdemeanor offense, meets the dual criteria for eligibility set forth in subd. (a)"].

D. Martin satisfies the Dual Criteria for Eligibility

Citing Wade v. Superior Court, 33 Cal.App.5th at 715, the prosecutor argues that Martin must satisfy three criteria, namely, that (1) he served in the military; (2) that he suffers from a service related trauma or condition; and (3) the court must consider other factors including sentencing guidelines, victim impact, and community safety. (Opposition at 4) Absolutely, positively, not so.

Penal Code section 1101.80 requires the court to make two, not three, findings in a misdemeanor case. "(1) The defendant was, or currently is, a member of the United States military. (2) The defendant may be suffering from sexual trauma, traumatic brain injury, post-traumatic stress disorder, substance abuse, or mental health

problems as a result of his or her military service. The court may request, using existing resources, an assessment to aid in the determination that this paragraph applies to a defendant." (Pen. Code, § 1101.80 subd. (b).)

Wade held that "[t]he rehabilitative purpose of military diversion requires the trial court to assess whether an eligible candidate *might* benefit from specialized treatment for veterans and potentially complete diversion in furtherance of the statutory objectives." (Wade, 33 Cal. App. 5th at 715) (Italics added.) Trial court had no discretion to deny Wade's request based on the inherently dangerous nature of driving while intoxicated.) *Id.* at 717

E. Military Diversion Applies to Any Misdemeanor

The prosecutor improperly argues that JOHN DOE must show how the disabilities he suffered from his military service caused him to commit the crime and the treatment plan does not address sexual misconduct. (Opposition at 4) Absolutely, positively, not so.

Section 1001.80 authorizes a trial court to grant pretrial diversion to a defendant charged with a misdemeanor who was, or currently is, a member of the United States military, and who may be suffering from sexual trauma, traumatic brain injury, posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD), substance abuse, or mental health problems as a result of his or her military service. (§ 1001.80, subd. (a).)

"The Legislature did not limit eligibility by type or category of misdemeanor crime, suggesting a broader intent than other diversion statutes which do exclude specific offenses or conduct. [Citation]." (Wade, 33 Cal. App. 5th at 710-11) (Italics added.)

F. JOHN DOE Has Submitted an Appropriate Medical Plan

The prosecutor again incorrectly argues that JOHN DOE does not qualify for military diversion because (1) JOHN DOE's treatment plan does not address sexual conduct; (2) No evidence shows that JOHN DOE's alleged sexual misconduct and PTSD are connected. (Opposition at 7).

The prosecutor wants this Court to make JOHN DOE provide a medical and mental health treatment plan beyond what the VA already provides for JOHN DOE. (Opposition 7) The prosecutor faults JOHN DOE because he may already have received individual counseling at the Valley Vet center. (Opposition at 7)

The statute does not support the prosecutor's position. Penal Code section 1001.80 subdivision prefers that JOHN DOE be treated at a VA medical center. Penal Code section 1101.80 provides:

The court, in making an order . . . to commit a defendant to an established treatment program, shall give preference to a treatment program that has a history of

successfully treating veterans who suffer from sexual trauma, traumatic brain injury, post-traumatic stress disorder, substance abuse, or mental health problems as a result of military service, including, but not limited to, programs operated by the United States Department of Defense or the United States Department of Veterans Affairs. (Pen. Code, § 1101.80 subd. (f).) (Italics added.)

Penal Code section 1101.80 also provides:

The court and the assigned treatment program may collaborate with the Department of Veterans Affairs and the United States Department of Veterans Affairs to maximize benefits and services provided to a veteran. (Pen. Code, § 1101.80 subd. (g).)

Penal Code section 1101.80 provides:

A pretrial diversion program shall utilize existing resources available to current or former members of the United States military to address and treat those suffering from sexual trauma, traumatic brain injury, post-traumatic stress disorder, substance abuse, or mental health problems as a result of military service. (Pen. Code, § (k)(2).) (Italics added.)

G. Penal Code Section 1101.80 Does Not Require a Formal Hearing

1	states that JOHN DOE suffers from 100% disabilities for injuries				
2	sustained during his service. (Opposition 5) writes the letter in				
3					
4	her official capacity as a social worker on official Department of				
5	Veterans Affairs stationary.				
6	JOHN DOE also submits his declaration, under oath, in which he				
7	declares that he served in the United States Navy and in combat with				
8	the Marine Corps in Viet Nam. While in combat, JOHN DOE suffered				
9	significant trauma. He has a 100% service connected disability rating				
10	for injuries he sustained during his military service. He has a 50%				
11	service connected disability rating for <i>Post Traumatic Stress Disorder</i>				
12					
13	(PTSD). JOHN DOE suffers from military connected disabilities				
14	including degenerative arthritis, migraine headaches, sleep apnea,				
15	traumatic brain injury, and tinnitus. (See Exh. B at p. 2, ¶¶ 3-6.)				
16	The prosecutor describes JOHN DOE's military background,				
17	based on's statement as "hearsay, indeed multiple hearsay."				
18 19	(Opposition at 5) Not so. For example, in <i>People v. Wade</i> , at Wade's				
$\begin{vmatrix} 19 \\ 20 \end{vmatrix}$	hearing, the prosecutor argued the case without presenting any				
21					
22	witnesses. The prosecutor also submitted a written opposition brief.				
23	Wade did not hold that the hearing on Wade's military diversion				
24	required live witnesses. (Id. at 717)				
25	Here, JOHN DOE submitted a report from who opined				
26	that JOHN DOE meets the criteria for military diversion. The				
27	9				
-					

prosecutor has not submitted any information to disprove ______'s written statement. JOHN DOE also submits a declaration showing that he qualifies for military diversion. (Exh. B)

The prosecutor argues that this Court must hold a proper evidentiary hearing to decide whether to grant JOHN DOE pretrial diversion. (Opposition at 4) JOHN DOE disagrees. Penal Code section 1101.80 does not contemplate a formal evidentiary hearing. Penal Code section 1101.80 states only that, if the court finds JOHN DOE to be qualified for pretrial military diversion, "the court, with the consent of the defendant and a waiver of the defendant's speedy trial right, may place the defendant in a pretrial diversion program . . . " (Pen. Code, § 1101.80 subd. (b); see also *Wade, supra*, 33 Cal. App. 5th at 701 [Wade submitted a brief and letters from an army superior and from his treating psychiatrist].) (Wade at 702.)

Only if the court finds that a defendant is performing unsatisfactorily in the program or not benefitting from the treatment and services of the program, "after notice to the defendant, the court shall hold a hearing to determine whether the criminal proceedings should be reinstituted . . . " (Pen. Code § 1001.80 subd. (c).)

H. This Court Should Grant JOHN DOE Military Diversion

JOHN DOE is eligible for military diversion. In her letter dated

1	January 30, 3030, VA clinical social workerwrites, "Mr.
2	JOHN DOE is eligible for VA medical, mental health, and substance
3	
4	abuse treatment. He is currently engaged in individual counseling
5	service at the Valley Vet Center " (Exh. A)
$\frac{6}{7}$	also proposes a VA treatment plan pending Court
8	approval:
9	1. Veteran to bide by the conditions of Lancaster Court.
10	2. Maintain medical, mental health and medication
11	compliance.
12	3. Abstain from illicit drugs and alcohol use.
13	4. Engage in individual and group counseling services at
14	the Valley Vet Center. (Frequency and duration per clinician's recommendation. (See Exhibit
15	A)
16 17	"As a Combat Veteran, Mr. JOHN DOE is eligible to participate in
18	both Combat PTSD individual and 'Seeking Safety' group counseling
19	services at theq Valley Vet Center. The Vet Centers are
20	staffed by license psychologists, marriage and family therapists, and
21	
22	social workers. The Vet Centers provide the sense of community and
23	camaraderie that service members develop in Military, allowing for a
24	safe place to work on all reintegration problems." (See Exhibit A)
25 26	(Italics added.)
2627	
41	11

1	JOHN DOE is currently enrolled at the Veterans Center for
2	treatment with MSW JANE DOE The Veterans Center provides "
3	treatment with Mow oalve Doe The veterans center provides
4	counseling for all War Zone Veterans (specifically those veterans
5	presenting with symptoms of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder." (Exh. B
6	at 5) JOHN DOE has attended nine individual counseling sessions and
7	av s, s s 111 / 2 s 2 110s diversion 11110 1110 1110 1110 1111 g s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s
8	nine PTSD group counsel sessions on a biweekly basis since November
9	2019. (Exh. B at 2, ¶¶ 7, 8; Exh. B at 5.)
10	Mr. JOHN DOE is retired, stable and lives with his wife, Nancy.
11	Will. Golffy Bolf is feeling, stable and fives with this wife, reality.
12	He is 71 years old. (DOB: xx/xx/xxxx) (See Exhs. A, B at 2 ¶10)
13	CONCLUSION
14	Mr. JOHN DOE respectfully requests that this Court grant him
15	Mr. JOHN DOE respectiony requests that this Court grant min
16	Military Diversion. (Penal Code § 1001.80.)
17	DATED: April 29, 2020
18	D 46 11 1 14 1
19	Respectfully submitted, FAY ARFA, A LAW CORPORATION
20	
21	s/Fay Arfa
22	37 Say Voja
23	Fay Arfa, Attorney for Defendant
24	
25	
26	
27	12

ATTORNEY'S CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

not a party to the cause, and my business address is 10100 Santa Monica Blvd.#300, Los Angeles, CA 90067; that on May 4, 2020, I

which envelopes was addressed as follows:

served the: REPLY TO OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR MILITARY

DIVERSION (Pen. Code, § 1001.80); EXHIBIT B by depositing a copy, enclosed in separate, sealed envelope, with postage fully prepaid, in the

United States mail at Los Angeles, County of Los Angeles, CA, each of

I certify: that I am an active member of the State Bar of CA and

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on May 4, 2020 at Los Angeles, CA.

/s Fay Anfa

Fay Arfa, Attorney