

NO. 26149

IN THE INTERMEDIATE COURT OF APPEALS
OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

RAITA FUKUSAKU, Petitioner-Appellant, v.
STATE OF HAWAII, Respondent-Appellee

APPEAL FROM THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIRST CIRCUIT
(S.P.P. NO. 02-1-0087)

FILED
2006 SEP 12 AM 8:32
CLERK, APPELLATE COURTS
STATE OF HAWAII

SUMMARY DISPOSITION ORDER

(By: Burns, C.J., Watanabe and Lim, JJ.)

Raita Fukusaku (Appellant) appeals the May 30, 2003 order of the Circuit Court of the First Circuit (circuit court)¹ that denied, without a hearing, his November 22, 2002 Hawaii Rules of Penal Procedure (HRPP) Rule 40 (2002) petition for post-conviction relief (Rule 40 Petition). In the Rule 40 Petition, Appellant sought to vacate his double murder convictions because of purportedly perjured testimony given at his jury trial.

After a meticulous review of the record and the briefs submitted by the parties, and giving careful consideration to the arguments advanced and the issues raised by the parties, we dispose of Appellant's points of error on appeal as follows:

1. Regardless of whether the analysis proceeds under State v. McNulty, 60 Haw. 259, 588 P.2d 438 (1978), or under State v. Teves, 5 Haw. App. 90, 679 P.2d 136 (1984), Appellant is not entitled to a new trial, because there is no reasonable possibility the purportedly perjured testimony contributed to

¹ The Honorable Dan T. Kochi presided.

would not have called [the witness] if they had knowledge[.]"
Second Amended Opening Brief at 23. Appellant's due process
claim cannot stand for this alternative reason. See Napue, 360
U.S. at 269 (due process applies where the state "knowingly
use[s] false evidence, including false testimony, to obtain a
tainted conviction"); In re Carvelo, 44 Haw. 31, 38, 352 P.2d
616, 623 (1959) (Napue is applicable where "the defendant was
convicted on perjured testimony known to be false by the
prosecution at the time of the trial").

3. Accordingly, Appellant's Rule 40 Petition is
"without trace of support either in the record or from other
evidence submitted by the petitioner[,]" HRPP Rule 40(f), and the
circuit court's order denying the Rule 40 Petition without a
hearing was therefore correct. Barnett v. State, 91 Hawai'i 20,
26, 979 P.2d 1046, 1052 (1999).

Therefore,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the circuit court's May 30,
2003 order denying the Rule 40 Petition is affirmed.

DATED: Honolulu, Hawai'i, September 12, 2006.

On the briefs:

Myles S. Breiner,
for Petitioner-Appellant.

Donn Fudo,
Deputy Prosecuting Attorney,
City and County of Honolulu,
for Respondent-Appellee.


Chief Judge


Associate Judge


Associate Judge