1348.

11/04

57

Trib i

Sic

IN THE TENNESSEE SUPREME COURT AT KNOXVILLE

STEPHEN M. WEST,		1
) No. E2010-02258-SC-R11-PD	7.
Petitioner-Appellant,) No. E2010-02258-CCA-R28-PD	7
) Case No. 629	
V.) (POST CONVICTION)	
) DEATH PENALTY CASE	
STATE OF TENNESSEE,)	
) EXECUTION SET NOV. 9, 2010	
Respondent-Appellee.	j	

MOTION FOR STAY OF EXECUTION

COMES NOW, Stephen Michael West, through undersigned counsel, and hereby requests this Court to enter an Order staying the November 9, 2010 execution date for the following reasons:

- On April 30, 2010, the State of Tennessee asked this Court to set an execution date for Mr. West.
- 2. On May 24, 2010, counsel for Mr. West responded, arguing that this Court should deny the State's Motion for three primary reasons: First, carrying out the death sentence in this case would be manifestly unfair where the actual killer of the two victims in this case received a life sentence.
 Second, no court has ever evaluated Mr. West's extensive mitigating evidence under the proper legal standard. And finally, no execution date should be set for an inmate who, like Stephen West, suffers from severe mental illness.
- On July 15, 2010, this Court set November 9, 2010, as Mr. West's execution date.

- 4. Since that date, Mr. West filed a Motion to Reopen his Post-Conviction Petition. In that Motion, Mr. West requested reopening because: (1) new law from this Court establishes his right to relief based on the fact that his trial counsel was burdened with a conflict of interest at the time of his capital trial; (2) that new case law from the United States Supreme Court demonstrates his right to relief due to ineffective assistance of counsel during the penalty phase of his capital trial; and (3) that this Court should establish a categorical ban on executing inmates, like Stephen West, who suffer from severe mental illness. That Motion was denied by the trial court. The Court of Criminal Appeals denied Mr. West's Application for Permission to Appeal. Mr. West's Application for Permission to Appeal
- 5. Mr. West's Application to this Court raises important questions of law that demonstrate the need for the exercise of this Court's supervisory authority. In particular, Mr. West's issues highlight the need for a careful review of the effectiveness of trial counsel as well as all available mitigating evidence before any death sentence is carried out.

 Furthermore, recent developments in the science and treatment of severe mental illness, as well as the evolving standards of decency, call on this Court to exercise its supreme authority to interpret the Tennessee Constitution and to recognize that the severely mentally ill must be exempt from the death penalty in this State.
- 6. In addition to the case now pending before this Court, Mr. West has filed a

11/04/20

Motion for Relief from Judgment pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 60(b) in the federal court. That action is now pending before the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals. (West v. Bell, Sixth Circuit Case Nos. 10-6333 and 10-6338).

Mr. West has argued in that action that the habeas courts erred in failing to consider abundant mitigating evidence. The habeas courts should have granted plenary de novo review of his claims of ineffective assistance of counsel during the sentencing phase of his capital trial once the court had concluded that the Tennessee courts' application of the standards enunciated in Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668 (1984) was unreasonable.

- 7. The United States Supreme Court has accepted *certiorari* in a case that raises the question of whether habeas courts may consider evidence not presented during state post-conviction proceedings after the federal courts find the state court rulings were unreasonable. *Cullen v. Pinholster*, No. 09-1088, 130 S.Ct. 3410 (Mem.)(2010). The very same issue forms the basis of Mr. West's 60(b) motion.
- 8. Significant legal questions remain unresolved in Mr. West's case. In particular, where important issues affecting the integrity of the trial process and of the appropriateness of the death penalty are before the Court, a stay is warranted. Furthermore, where the United States Supreme Court is poised to address an important issue affecting the outcome of the case, this Court should grant a stay of execution.

1.1/04/2

11.5

WHEREFORE, for all of the foregoing reasons, this Court should stay Mr. West's November 9, 2010 execution.

Respectively submitted,

FEDERAL DEFENDER SERVICES OF EASTERN TENNESSEE, INC.

Stephen A. Ferrell, BPR# 25170

800 S. Gay St., Suite 2400

Knoxville, TN 37929

(865) 637-7979 Fax: (865) 637-7999

,

MILLER & MARTIN, LLP

Roger W. Dickson, BPR#1933

832 Georgia Avenue, Suite 1000

Chattanooga, TN 37402

(423) 756-6600

11/04/20

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing document

was emailed and Fed Ex overnight to:

Jennifer Smith, Esquire
Office of Attorney General & Reporter
Criminal Justice Division
P. O. Box 20207
Nashville, TN 37202-0207
phone: (615) 741-4349

fax: (615) 532-7791

email: Jennifer.Smith@ag.tn.gov

this the 4th day of November, 2010.

Stephen A. Ferrell