

2
3 sentence imposed was vacated on the grounds of ineffective assistance of counsel. Civil No. 94-
4 1517 (JP), Docket # 34. As a result, on August 23, 1995, Mala was re-sentenced, and his
5 sentence was reduced to concurrent terms of imprisonment of 70 months for each of the first
6 and second counts, and 48 months for the third count. Over 10 years later, Mala filed a motion
7 requesting the expungement of his criminal record and conviction, which was denied by the
8 court. Crim No. 89-0002-1, Dockets ## 843 & 848. On January 14, 2009, Mala filed the present
9 writ, seeking to set aside his conviction on grounds of ineffective assistance of counsel. The
10 Government filed an opposition, and Mala replied.

11 **Standard of Review**

12 “Pursuant to the All Writs Act, federal courts have the authority to grant writs that were
13 traditionally available at common law.” Barreto-Barreto v. United States, 551 F.3d 95, 102-103
14 (1st Cir. 2008) (citing United States v. Sawyer, 239 F.3d 31, 37 (1st Cir. 2001) (citing 28
15 U.S.C. § 1651)). “A writ of error coram nobis is a common-law writ through which a rendering
16 court, subject to certain conditions, may correct its own judgment on the basis of some patent
17 error affecting the validity or regularity of that judgment.” Id. (citing Trenkler v. United States,
18 536 F.3d 85, 90, n.2 (1st Cir. 2008). It is “ordinarily available only to a criminal defendant who
19 is no longer in custody.” Id. (citing Trenkler, 536 F.3d at 98). To obtain relief under a writ of
20 error *coram nobis*, “the petitioner must 1) explain her failure to seek relief from judgment
21 earlier, 2) demonstrate continuing collateral consequences from the conviction, and 3) prove
22 that the error is fundamental to the validity of the judgment.” Id. (citing Sawyer, 239 F.3d at
23 38); see also United States v. George, 436 F. Supp 2d 274, 278 (D. Mass. 2006).

24 Albeit the “modern iteration *coram nobis* is broader than its common law predecessor,”
25 ranging from “technical errors to fundamental ones,” the Supreme Court has noted that the
26 availability of the writ is limited “to ‘extraordinary’ cases presenting circumstances compelling

2
3 its use ‘to achieve justice.’” United States v. Denedo, 129 S. Ct. 2213, 2220 (2009) (citing
4 United States v. Morgan, 346 U.S. 502, 511 (1954)).

5 **Applicable Law and Analysis**

6 On appeal, Mala argued that the charges against him should have been dismissed due to
7 violations to his right to a speedy trial. The First Circuit affirmed the district court’s judgment,
8 noting that “[b]ecause an evidentiary hearing was neither sought nor convened in this instance,
9 the assignment of error premised on the defendant’s constitutional right to a speedy trial
10 succumbs for want of satisfactory proof.” Mala, 7 F.3d at 1062. The Court then affirmed the
11 judgment below “without prejudice, however, to appellant’s right to raise his claim of
12 ineffective assistance in a proceeding brought pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255.” Id. at 1063.
13 Accordingly, as previously stated, Mala filed a §2255 petition alleging ineffective assistance
14 of counsel, and as a result thereof, his sentence was vacated. However, his conviction remained
15 unaltered. During the re-sentencing hearing held on August 23, 1995, Mala’s sentence was
16 reduced to concurrent terms of imprisonment of 70 months for each of the first and second
17 counts, and 48 months for the third count. Thereafter, Mala’s November 7, 2005 motion
18 requesting the expungement of his criminal record and conviction was denied by the court. Crim
19 No. 89-0002-1, Dockets ## 843 & 848.

20 On January 14, 2009, that is, over thirteen years after his re-sentencing, Mala filed the
21 present writ, seeking to set aside his conviction on grounds of ineffective assistance of counsel.
22 According to Mala, the district court’s prior finding of ineffective assistance of counsel failed
23 to take into consideration alleged violations to his right to a speedy trial. Mala argues that his
24 counsel failed to raise this issue in the 2255 petition. He contends that his indictment and
25 conviction would have been set aside but for his counsel’s omissions on this front.
26

2
3 In opposition, the Government argues that because Mala is currently in custody, he is not
4 entitled to a writ of *coram nobis*. Furthermore, they contend that Mala’s writ is a mislabeled §
5 2255 petition, insofar as he reasserts speedy trial act violations, and ineffective assistance of
6 counsel arguments already addressed by this court.

7 For purposes of determining whether Petitioner may seek *coram nobis* relief, this Court
8 finds that he is not currently “in custody.” United States v. Bucci, 97-10263, * 18, 2009 U.S.
9 Dist. LEXIS 71768 (D. Mass. Aug. 11, 2009) (citing Maleng v. Cook, 490 U.S. 488, 492, 109
10 S. Ct. 1923, 104 L. Ed. 2d 540 (1989) (holding that “...once the sentence imposed for a
11 conviction has completely expired, the collateral consequences of that conviction are not
12 themselves sufficient to render an individual ‘in custody’ for the purposes of a habeas attack
13 upon it”). Although the Government points out that Mala is currently in custody, it is for another
14 conviction in Crim. No. 05-00286 (JAF). Instead the record shows that Mala was released on
15 March 22, 1996 after serving his conviction in Crim. No. 89-0002-1. As such, he served the
16 amended sentence imposed in Crim. No. 89-0002-1.

17 Notwithstanding, to prevail in his present request, Mala must first explain why he failed
18 to seek relief from judgment earlier, considering that he was initially sentenced in 1991, and re-
19 sentenced in 1995. On this front, Mala argues that he recently became aware of the collateral
20 consequences stemming from his conviction, upon being sentenced to 78 months in Crim. No.
21 05-00286 (JAF), instead of 70 months, due to his prior conviction in 89-0002-1. Thus he
22 contends that there was no delay in seeking *coram nobis* relief. However, courts have
23 distinguished the delay in seeking relief from a conviction with delay in seeking relief from the
24 collateral consequences of the conviction. United States v. Kayode, Slip Op. No. 06-508-T, *5
25 (D.R.I. January 8, 2009). This follows case law requiring that the movant explain his failure to
26

2
3 seek relief *from judgment* earlier. Barreto-Barreto, 551 F.3d at 102-103 (citing Sawyer, 239 F.3d
4 at 38). Therefore, Mala’s arguments on this front fail.

5 This Court further notes that the three requisites to obtain relief under a writ of error
6 *coram nobis* as established by the First Circuit, must be viewed in light of the writ’s purpose.
7 *Coram nobis* relief allows courts to correct their own judgment on the basis of some patent error
8 affecting the validity or regularity of that judgment. Thus there must be an error that warrants
9 correction by the court. Additionally, the Supreme Court has emphasized its limited applicability
10 “to ‘extraordinary’ cases presenting circumstances compelling its use ‘to achieve justice.’”
11 Denedo, 129 S. Ct. at 2220.

12 Upon reviewing the record, this Court finds that even if Mala demonstrates continuing
13 collateral consequences from the conviction, he fails to show that a fundamental error affecting
14 the validity of the judgment was committed, and warrants the issuance of a writ of *coram nobis*.
15 See United States v. Michaud, 925 F.3d 37, 44 (1st Cir. 1991). More so considering that contrary
16 to Mala’s assertions, his arguments regarding alleged violations to his right to a speedy trial
17 were presented before the district court in the 2255 petition. See Docket # 32-4. Thus, his
18 counsel adequately argued said issue in support of Mala’s motion to set aside his conviction.
19 As a matter of fact, based upon review of Mala’s arguments, and the applicable law, the district
20 court reduced his sentence on ineffective assistance of counsel grounds. However, the alleged
21 error was found insufficient to vacate his conviction. Considering the foregoing, Mala cannot
22 once again revisit issues than were adequately addressed, and denied by the courts. It is well-
23 settled that re-labeling of 2255 arguments has been repeatedly rejected by the courts. See United
24 States v. Barrett, 178 F.3d 34, 55 (1st Cir. 1999). As such, *coram nobis* relief is unwarranted in
25 this case.

26 **Conclusion**

2
3 Based on the above, Petitioner's petition for writ of *coram nobis* is **DENIED.**

4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5 In San Juan, Puerto Rico, this 16th day of April, 2010.

6 *S/ Salvador E. Casellas*
7 SALVADOR E. CASELLAS
8 United States District Judge
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26