

REL: 05/25/2007 JENKINS

Notice: This opinion is subject to formal revision before publication in the advance sheets of Southern Reporter. Readers are requested to notify the **Reporter of Decisions**, Alabama Appellate Courts, 300 Dexter Avenue, Montgomery, Alabama 36104-3741 ((334) 242-4621), of any typographical or other errors, in order that corrections may be made before the opinion is printed in Southern Reporter.

ALABAMA COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

OCTOBER TERM, 2006-2007

CR-05-1577

James Oscar Jenkins, Sr.

v.

State of Alabama

Appeal from Mobile Circuit Court
(CC-95-456)

WISE, Judge.

AFFIRMED BY UNPUBLISHED MEMORANDUM.

McMillan, Shaw, and Welch, JJ., concur. Wise, J., concurs specially, with opinion. Baschab, P.J., concurs in the result.

CR-05-1577

WISE, Judge (concurring specially).

Although this Court affirms the denial of Jenkins's motion for sentence reconsideration, I write specially to express my agreement with Justice Stuart's dissent in Ex parte Butler, [Ms. 1051636, March 16, 2007] ___ So. 2d ___ (Ala. 2007), in which she opined that "a court does not have jurisdiction to entertain a motion for sentence reconsideration filed by an inmate who has been convicted of an offense that is statutorily defined as a violent offense." ___ So. 2d at ___. Accord Holt v. State, [Ms. 1050800, December 22, 2006] ___ So. 2d ___, ___ (Ala. 2006) (Stuart, J., dissenting).

Although I originally concurred with this Court's opinion in Holt v. State, [Ms. CR-04-1250, March 3, 2006] ___ So. 2d ___ (Ala.Crim.App. 2006), writ quashed, [Ms. 1050800, December 22, 2006] ___ So. 2d ___ (Ala. 2006), and joined Judge Baschab's special concurrence, I am now persuaded by Justice Stuart's dissents in both Holt and Ex parte Butler, that this Court's decision in Holt was an overly broad construction of both § 13A-5-9.1 and the Alabama Supreme Court's opinion in Kirby v. State, 899 So. 2d 968 (Ala. 2004). In my opinion,

CR-05-1577

the circuit court lacked jurisdiction even to consider Jenkins's motion for sentence reconsideration, given that he was convicted of first-degree robbery -- statutorily defined as a violent offense. See § 12-25-32(13)a.28., Ala. Code 1975. In my opinion, the Supreme Court should revisit its holdings in these cases and adopt Justice Stuart's position. Moreover, to the extent that this Court's decision in Holt v. State allows violent convicted offenders such as Jenkins relief from the sentence imposed as a result of their violent conduct, that decision should be revisited to prevent an injustice such as this one from occurring in future cases. Clearly, this could not have been the intent of the Alabama Legislature when it enacted § 13A-5-9.1, Ala. Code 1975.