

# Table of Contents

## CHAPTER 1. ANALYZING THE CASE AND THE POTENTIAL CLIENT

- § 1:1 The initial call
- § 1:2 Advise your client so that he/she has a chance to win
- § 1:3 Lucynski Redux: Now that the constitution is violated and we know it, what do we do about it?
- § 1:4 Determine whether there are any legal issues with the detention/arrest
- § 1:5 Bond revocation is clarified for proper procedure and process
- § 1:6 The basis for the stop: The first line of defense
- § 1:7 What was the basis of the stop?
- § 1:8 Looking behind the stated reason to stop or detain the client: is there anything there?
- § 1:9 The lawyer should be familiar with the Michigan Vehicle Code (MVC)
- § 1:10 Did the stop have anything to do with your client's driving?
- § 1:11 Courts continue to dissect the "dangling object"
- § 1:12 The preliminary breath test and evidential breath test: To take or not to take?
- § 1:13 How the chemical test and preliminary breath test are used
- § 1:14 The initial face-to-face consultation
- § 1:15 Generating income and building your OWI practice by protecting yourself
- § 1:16 Make sure the potential client understands his/her rights
- § 1:17 Client questionnaire
- § 1:18 Sanctions on OUILs
- § 1:19 CNLF CR retainer agreement minimum fee
- § 1:20 DNLf criminal flat fee
- § 1:21 The Michigan Supreme Court and mistake of law

## CHAPTER 2. MICHIGAN DRUNK DRIVING STATUTES AND JURY INSTRUCTIONS

- § 2:1 Start preparing for trial using the law
- § 2:2 Michigan Supreme Court creates a new standard for operating and open to the public with respect to driveways
- § 2:3 Check to see whether the state or a local unit of government is prosecuting your client
- § 2:4 —Cities and townships have expanded authority to prosecute
- § 2:5 The jury instructions educate the client and the jury
- § 2:6 Start measuring the battlefield
- § 2:7 The judge will tell the jurors that they do not have to convict your client despite the results of any chemical test

MICHIGAN CRIMINAL LAW AND PROCEDURE OWI

- § 2:8 Use the state’s own evidence as a sword and a shield in fitting the facts with the jury instructions so that the jury understands why they must return a verdict of not guilty
- § 2:9 The court will help you raise questions in the minds of the jurors about the possible inaccuracies of the breath tests
- § 2:10 The court will tell the jury that it does not have to accept a test result as *per se* reliable
- § 2:11 Was anything going on at the time the test was given to your client that may raise doubt about the reliability of the chemical test?
- § 2:12 The court instructs the jury that the result of the breath test does not necessarily matter
- § 2:13 Make sure that the client understands that the jury instructions explain the law in a way that can win the case
- § 2:14 The inference instruction
- § 2:15 The final blow to the chemical test
- § 2:16 The statutes must be navigated with all of the administrative rules to fully evaluate the case and the consequences
- § 2:17 The two ways to prove intoxication
- § 2:18 Defining and proving operating
- § 2:19 Defining motor vehicle
- § 2:20 Motorized recreational vehicles
- § 2:21 The definition of open to the general public or generally accessible to motor vehicles
- § 2:22 The disjunctive term “accessible to motor vehicles” in the statute
- § 2:23 The penalties—The three strikes = a felony rule
- § 2:24 OWI vs. OWVI
- § 2:25 The Court of Appeals issues an opinion on the visibly impaired statute
- § 2:26 Other penalties
- § 2:27 Child endangerment
- § 2:28 Commercial driver licenses
- § 2:29 OUID
- § 2:30 Zero tolerance and MIP
- § 2:31 The impact of *People v. Feezel*: Whether “Zero Tolerance” for marijuana still exists and the role of proximate cause in OUID causing death
- § 2:32 Movement to study the effect of marijuana while driving
- § 2:33 The future of a *per se* level of THC while operating
- § 2:34 Michigan State Police step-up the pursuit of “drugged drivers” with roadside saliva testing effort
- § 2:35 Prescription drugs—Not your Father’s DUI
- § 2:36 The DRE testimony in the experimental age and controlling the narrative
- § 2:37 Proximate cause and the role of an intoxicated decedent
- § 2:38 Deer in road does not break the chain of causation (whether it was really there or not)
- § 2:39 It’s a bird; it’s a plane; it’s superdrunk
- § 2:40 Plea bargaining under superdrunk

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 2:41 Sobriety court license
  - § 2:42 Veterans courts
  - § 2:43 Traffic Offenses (M Crim JI Chapter 15)
  - § 2:44 Witness credibility (M Crim JI 3.6)
  - § 2:45 “Any intoxicating substance” is now grounds for an OWI arrest and prosecution
  - § 2:46 Implied consent testing *may* see an expansion
  - § 2:47 The Michigan Legislature misses an opportunity to study the effect of “one more” on the human body; .08 remains the legal threshold for a per se violation of the law
  - § 2:48 Reforming preliminary examinations
  - § 2:49 Preliminary examination reform—Conduct after 2014 reformation
  - § 2:50 Freedom of information, LEIN Act and dashboard justice
  - § 2:51 Michigan Supreme Court changes standard for Brady violation
  - § 2:52 Watercraft and marine safety
  - § 2:53 Bad driver fees to be phased out
  - § 2:54 DWI sobriety courts are ready for prime time
  - § 2:55 Michigan legislature ups the ante for OWI causing death/serious impairment
  - § 2:56 Michigan Court of Appeals holds admission of victim’s BAC was not outcome determinative in reckless driving causing death case
  - § 2:57 OWI causing death—Enough to charge second degree murder? Unpublished Michigan Court of Appeals opinion to watch
- Appendix 2A. Excerpts from the court transcript of *People v. Love*

## CHAPTER 3. DISCOVERY

- § 3:1 What is available: Constitutional obligations of the prosecutor versus MCR 6.201
- § 3:2 Prosecutors are now obligated to learn of information that could help the defendant
- § 3:3 What evidence does law enforcement have that the prosecutor does not?
- § 3:4 Obtaining data regarding the gas chromatograph
- § 3:5 Using strategic discovery for the gas chromatograph data
- § 3:6 Information regarding the datamaster
- § 3:7 Motion practice to obtain discovery
- § 3:8 FOIA letters to supplement appearance and demands
- § 3:9 The liability for a public body is expensive
- § 3:10 Calibration report
- § 3:11 NPAS policy
- § 3:12 Subpoena
- § 3:13 Motion and memo to inspect datamaster
- § 3:14 Datamaster letter
- § 3:15 DUI discovery checklist for a FOIA request
- § 3:16 Laboratory report
- § 3:17 The current and future state of discovery and transparency at the Michigan State Police forensic science division

## CHAPTER 4. CHEMICAL TESTING

- § 4:1 Introduction
- § 4:2 The Datamaster DMT is replaced by the Intoxilyzer 9000
- § 4:3 What we know about the Michigan Datamaster DMT in 2021
- § 4:4 The Datamaster DMT is headed for the ash heap: 2023 update
- § 4:5 Breath test uncertainty status
- § 4:6 Administrative rules
- § 4:7 The MSP fails to follow its own rules in purchasing the weekly simulator equipment in 2012
- § 4:8 Proper maintenance of the instrument is mandatory under the rules
- § 4:9 Repair of the instrument in accordance with the rules
- § 4:10 The rules also require certain steps be followed prior to and during operation of the breath instrument
- § 4:11 Preliminary breath tests
- § 4:12 The breath test and how it works
- § 4:13 Blood analysis
- § 4:14 Administrative rules for blood analysis
- § 4:15 ASCLAD-LAB Accreditation and Uncertainty
- § 4:16 Calibration of the Instruments
- § 4:17 Datamaster DMT Uncertainty and BAC Datamaster Uncertainty; too little too late?
- § 4:18 Shake up at the Michigan State Police in 2018: Intoximeters is in and NPAS is out
- § 4:19 The process for collection/handling/testing
- § 4:20 When the rules do not matter—Upholding the validity of blood draws in non-medical environments
- § 4:21 Method validation, limits of detection and traceability
- § 4:22 Traceability
- § 4:23 Statutes
- § 4:24 Limits of implied consent and helping your client around the consequences
- § 4:25 The implied consent act cannot justify admission of a blood analysis when the officer knew that the citizen was not qualified to consent to a blood draw
- § 4:26 Getting a new trial when the MSP forensic science team hides the ball
- § 4:27 A missing datamaster ticket will not preclude the admissibility of the breath result because the datamaster is “like a clock telling-time”
- § 4:28 Case law
- § 4:29 Datamaster logs and Fontenot: The battle may not be over
- Appendix 4A. Evidential breath testing log
- Appendix 4B. Evidential breath test inspection report
- Appendix 4C. BAC DATAMASTER evidence ticket
- Appendix 4D. OD-80 DATAMASTER dmt
- Appendix 4E. Simulator test

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|              |   |
|--------------|---|
| Appendix 4F. | Simulator test accuracy checks  |
| Appendix 4G. | Transcript Summaries  |
| Appendix 4H. | DMT comparison technical note   |
| Appendix 4I. | Sgt. Curtis cross-examination from the Telder trial transcript  |
| Appendix 4J. | Geoffrey French testimony from the Spitzley pre-trial hearing transcript                                    |
| Appendix 4K. | Intoxilyzer 9000 Exception Message Guide  |
| Appendix 4L. | <i>[Reserved]</i>   |
| Appendix 4M. | BIPM GUM Summary  |
| Appendix 4N. | <i>[Reserved]</i>   |
| Appendix 4O. | Interview questions pertaining to forensic blood draws  |
| Appendix 4P. | Alcohol and drug determination (FSD 93)   |
| Appendix 4Q. | Chain of custody log sample   |
| Appendix 4R. | Measurement of Uncertainty Associated with Alcohol Measurement by the Datamaster DMT                        |
| Appendix 4S. | Datamaster DMT Breath Curve   |
| Appendix 4T. | Datamaster DMT Ticket Samples   |
| Appendix 4U. | Opinion granting in part and denying in part defendants motions to suppress the datamaster logs and results |
| Appendix 4V. | Background of Breath Testing and the Problems in the State of Michigan                                      |
| Appendix 4W. | <i>[Reserved]</i>   |
| Appendix 4X. | Gasper Testimony  |
| Appendix 4Y. | Statement to the Senate Judiciary Committee on Current Problems with Chemical Testing in Michigan           |

## CHAPTER 5. SUPPRESSION AND EVIDENTIARY ISSUES

|       |   |
|-------|---|
| § 5:1 | Is the Fourth Amendment implicated?   |
| § 5:2 | Supreme Court establishes a fourth amendment exception with unique and limited application                        |
| § 5:3 | Court of appeals gives an officer a “pass” on the wrong call about a license plate                                |
| § 5:4 | Is the Fourth Amendment implicated?—Dissipation of blood or breath is not an exception to the warrant requirement |
| § 5:5 | Supreme Court: Warrants required for blood but not for breath   |
| § 5:6 | GPS tracking devices: the Court expands the privacy right in a vehicle  |
| § 5:7 | Fourth Amendment issues regarding the stop  |
| § 5:8 | The investigatory stop  |
| § 5:9 | Vehicle searches  |

## MICHIGAN CRIMINAL LAW AND PROCEDURE OWI

- § 5:10 “Knock and Talk:” The “Safe Harbor” Case Gains New Vitality  
after *People v. Frederick*
  - § 5:11 Excluding irrelevant evidence from jury by motion in limine
  - § 5:12 Bringing a suppression motion
  - § 5:13 Renewed vitality for the Fourth Amendment
  - § 5:14 Probable cause: Always scrutinize a warrantless arrest
  - § 5:15 The three phases of a DWI investigation—using the officer’s  
training as a tool to attack probable cause
  - § 5:16 —Vehicle in motion
  - § 5:17 —Personal contact
  - § 5:18 —Standardized field sobriety tests (SFSTs)
  - § 5:19 The remedy
  - § 5:20 Standardized field sobriety tests and the required foundation  
for an officer’s opinion
  - § 5:21 —Drug recognition examiners
  - § 5:22 Due process motion
  - § 5:23 Fifth Amendment issues regarding the stop
  - § 5:24 Is Consent subject to challenge under the Implied Consent  
Act?
  - § 5:25 A driver’s home is her castle
  - § 5:26 Sixth Amendment issues and pursuing *all* of the evidence
  - § 5:27 The breath test instrument
  - § 5:28 The datamaster operator
  - § 5:29 Blood test results
  - § 5:30 Motion to suppress for lack of probable cause to arrest
  - § 5:31 Motion to suppress statement of defendant
  - § 5:32 Motion to suppress for lack reasonable suspicion
  - § 5:33 NPAS non-disclosure
  - § 5:34 Motion to suppress
  - § 5:35 MCOLES study on standardized field sobriety tests
  - § 5:36 Probable cause to search a driver
  - § 5:37 Amendments to the drunk driving statute on SFSTs; DREs  
and RSTs: the war continues
  - § 5:38 Case law update
- Appendix 5A. Sample Opinion Dismissing Case Where Validity of  
Standardized Field Sobriety Tests Compromised

## CHAPTER 6. NEGOTIATION

- § 6:1 Political pressures
- § 6:2 Realistic expectations
- § 6:3 The anatomy of the procedures of the OWI case from arrest to  
trial
- § 6:4 Dealing with the recalcitrant prosecutor
- § 6:5 Using litigation risk to get the maximum result
- § 6:6 When your client refuses a reasonable plea offer

## CHAPTER 7. LICENSE ISSUES

- § 7:1 Introduction

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 7:2 A form of creative plea bargaining to save the client’s license is halted by the Secretary of State
- § 7:3 The license appeal process
- § 7:4 Implied consent penalties and administrative hearings before the secretary of state
- § 7:5 The implied consent hearing—Balancing the hearsay rule with rudimentary due process
- § 7:6 Does the client hold a professional license or other license that is impacted by a drinking and driving or other alcohol-related conviction?
- § 7:7 Standards for issuance of license (Mich. Admin. Code r. 257.313)
- § 7:8 License restoration proceedings; continued expansion of the use of Breath Alcohol Ignition Interlock Devices (BAIID) on appeal
- § 7:9 Appeal diagram
- § 7:10 Request for driver evaluation
- § 7:11 Substance abuse evaluation
- § 7:12 Conduct of hearings (Mich. Admin. Code r. 257.310)
- § 7:13 CDL guide
- § 7:14 Michigan CDL Help Desk

## **CHAPTER 8. TRIAL PREPARATION AND STRATEGY**

- § 8:1 Generally
- § 8:2 Jury selection
- § 8:3 Opening statements
- § 8:4 The option for an impaired instruction for the prosecution
- § 8:5 THC and driving: Emerging into an enlightened world of marijuana use and driving illegally—The standard legally remains hazy but the “Any Amount” standard is probably history
- § 8:6 Motion to suppress evidence when search based on strong odor of marijuana—Medical marijuana caregiver
- § 8:7 Using the prosecution’s evidence to exonerate the client through cross-examination
- § 8:8 Vitality of confrontation clause
- § 8:9 Defense witnesses
- § 8:10 Should your client testify?
- § 8:11 The Supreme Court interprets the Drunk Driving Statute as prohibiting multiple punishments
- § 8:12 Closing arguments
- § 8:13 Sample letter
- § 8:14 Opening statement
- § 8:15 Notice and demand procedure for forensic reports
- Appendix 8A. Disclosure of forensic laboratory report (MCR 6.202)
- Appendix 8B. Sample lab report with certificate of accreditation
- Appendix 8C. Sample notice of objection to MCR 6.202

## **CHAPTER 9. SENTENCING**

- § 9:1 Jail exposure and preparing the client
- § 9:2 Sentencing factors
- § 9:3 OWI III
- § 9:4 —Work release tether programs
- § 9:5 Attacking prior convictions
- § 9:6 Collateral consequences and the cost of prosecution
- § 9:7 Expungement prohibition
- § 9:8 Sample sentencing memorandum
- § 9:9 Guidelines scoring
- § 9:10 Sentencing grid
- § 9:11 Sentencing manual worksheet
- § 9:12 Legislative analysis by the House Fiscal Agency
- § 9:13 The Michigan Supreme Court strikes down mandatory sentencing guidelines: The impact creates an uncertain outcome for Felony DUI Cases with aggravating factors

### **Table of Laws and Rules**

### **Table of Cases**

### **Index**