E. SCOTT BRADLEY JUDGE SUSSEX COUNTY COURTHOUSE 1 The Circle, Suite 2 GEORGETOWN, DE 19947

April 14, 2009

Lester J. Hickman SBI No. James T. Vaughn Correctional Center 1181 Paddock Road Smyrna, DE 19977 James E. Liguori, Esquire Liguori, Morris & Yiengst 46 The Green Dover, DE 19901

Adam D. Gelof, Esquire Department of Justice 114 East Market Street Georgetown, DE 19947

RE: State of Delaware v. Lester J. Hickman Def. ID # 0104000979 Amended Memorandum Opinion - Motion for Postconviction Relief

Dear Counsel and Mr. Hickman:

I have revised the above-reference memorandum opinion to make it clear what the

practice is in Sussex County regarding the waiver of a preliminary hearing.

Very truly yours,

E. Scott Bradley

cc: Prothonotary's Office

April 14, 2009

Lester J. Hickman SBI # James T. Vaughn Correctional Center 1181 Paddock Road Smyrna, DE 19977

RE: State of Delaware v. Lester J. Hickman Def. ID # 0104000979 Amended Memorandum Opinion - Motion for Postconviction Relief

Date Submitted: February 23, 2009

Dear Mr. Hickman:

This is my decision on your fourth motion for postconviction relief. The State of Delaware charged you by information with Trafficking in Cocaine, Possession with the Intent to Deliver Cocaine, Maintaining a Dwelling for Keeping Controlled Substances, Conspiracy in the Second Degree, Possession of Cocaine, and Possession of Drug Paraphernalia on May 2, 2001. You were convicted of Trafficking in Cocaine, Possession with the Intent to Deliver Cocaine, Maintaining a Dwelling for Keeping Controlled Substances, and Possession of Drug Paraphernalia on August 30, 2001. The Supreme Court affirmed your convictions on June 7, 2002.¹

You now argue, almost eight years after the information was filed against you, that the Superior Court lacked jurisdiction over you because you allegedly did not waive your right to (1) a preliminary hearing, and (2) be prosecuted by indictment. You were represented at trial by James E. Liguori, Esquire. The State was represented by Deputy Attorney General Adam D.

¹ *Hickman v. State*, 801 A.2d 10, 2002 WL 1272154 (Del. June 7, 2002)(TABLE).

Gelof, Esquire. Liguori and Gelof submitted affidavits in response to your allegations. Given that your argument is not supported by the available records, I have concluded that there is no need to have an evidentiary hearing.

Your argument that the Superior Court did not have jurisdiction over you is procedurally barred.² You should have raised it before trial and on your direct appeal. You did not do either. Moreover, you also have not shown cause for relief from this procedural bar or prejudice from this alleged violation of your rights. Therefore, your argument is barred.³

Moreover, there is no merit to your argument. In general, offenses within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Superior Court must be prosecuted by indictment.⁴ However, offenses other than capital crimes may be prosecuted by information if the defendant waives his right to be prosecuted by indictment.⁵ The waiver may either be in writing or in open court.⁶ The purpose of a preliminary hearing is to determine if there is probable cause to arrest a defendant.⁷ Not having a preliminary hearing is not a jurisdictional issue.⁸ Since this is not a jurisdictional issue, your argument is without merit.

Your argument is also not supported by the facts. Gelof and Liguori both stated in their

 3 Id.

⁵ Superior Court Criminal Rule 7(b).

⁶ Id.

⁷ State v. Bailey, 2004 WL 2914320 (Del. Super. Dec. 13, 2004).

⁸ State v. Lum, 2007 WL 1041415, at *6 (Del. Super. March 22, 2007), aff'd, 941 A.2d 1018, 2007 WL 4442633 (Del. Dec. 20, 2007)(TABLE).

² Superior Court Criminal Rule 61(i)(3).

⁴ Superior Court Criminal Rule 7(a).

affidavits that you waived your right to a preliminary hearing and to be prosecuted by indictment. The record shows that you did waive your preliminary hearing in the Court of Common Pleas on April 12, 2001. The record contains the probable cause sheet from the Court of Common Pleas.⁹ The probable cause sheet states, "Liguori, atty waived." The longstanding practice in Sussex County is for a defendant to waive both (1) his right to a preliminary hearing, and (2) his right to be prosecuted by indictment in exchange for a copy of the police report.¹⁰ Since the defendant has waived his right to be prosecuted by indictment as part of this exchange, the State may then proceed by information. That is exactly what happened here.

CONCLUSION.

Your fourth motion for postconviction relief is DENIED. IT IS SO ORDERED.

Very truly yours,

E. Scott Bradley

cc: Prothonotary's Office Adam D. Gelof, Esquire James E. Liguori, Esquire

⁹ See Exhibit A.

¹⁰ In re Miller, 1995 WL 656783, at *2 (Del. Super. Oct. 11, 1995).

Exhibit A

PRELIMINARY HEARING CALL JAR 04/12/2001 NUMBER: 0019 SCHEDULE PRELIN LENGTH: 1 day(s) Related: HICKMAN LESTER AKA: : HICKMAN LESTER J DOB: : 07/26/1955 DOB: : 07/26/1955 0104000979 \$81**/**: 00124045 INDICATORS; Arrest Date: 04/02/2001 Indictment Date: SEQ DESCR. Cr.A# DISP BAIL TYPE POSTED? ---<u>-----</u> ____ ----

 TRF.COC.5-505
 PS-01 -1098

 PWITD NSII CS
 PS-01 -1099

 MAINT DWELLING
 PS-01 -1100

 CONSF 2ND
 PS-01 -1101

 POSS,USE,CONS.N
 PS-01 -1102

001 15000.00 CASH 002 10000.00 CART 600 2000.00 Remo 004 2000.00 czista 005 500.00 SÀ POSS DRUG PARAP NS-01-04-0028 006 500.00 SE Capias/Warrant History: DOC Location: SCI SUBSEX CORR INSTITUTION Date Return Issued By Warrant Comments Date Act. ____ ----19930524 R6 -- NOT WANTED -- WRK REL HOST: SUSSEX WORK RELEASE CE 19930709 C 19940601 07 CRIMINAL TRESPASS 19960606 05 RONALD TATE / TERRORISTIC THREATENING 19940919 A 19960722 A 19980525 07 DEBORAH JESTER / AGGRAVATED NENACING 19980617 A 19990410 07 JAY BURNE / TERRORISTIC THREATENING DISORDERLY CONDU 19990412 A 20001222 07 TERRORISTIC THREATENING 20001225 A 20001229 A -Continuance History: Declu 30,000, Date **Byent** Reason ---------_____ History through the courts:) - Here and damage Scheduled Date Event ----04/12/2001 SCHEDULE PRELIM CASE TRANSFERRED TO APR 12 2001 SUPERIOR COURT