



to advise the defendant of this statutory limitation on parole eligibility rendered the plea involuntary. After consideration of the record as a whole, the Court finds the proper remedy here is to modify the sentences imposed to run concurrently.

### **DECISION**

The Petition for the Writ of Certiorari is **DENIED**. The Judgment and Sentence of the District Court of Garvin County in Case No. CF-2005-232 is **MODIFIED** to run concurrently with the Judgment and Sentence in Case No. CF-2005-231. Pursuant to Rule 3.15, Rules of the Court of Criminal Appeals, Title 22, Ch. 18, App. (2005), the **MANDATE** is **ORDERED** issued upon the delivery and filing of this decision.

AN APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF GARVIN COUNTY  
THE HONORABLE GARY BARGER, SPECIAL JUDGE

APPEARANCES AT TRIAL  
BILLY D. VANDEVER  
113 NORTH WILLOW  
PAULS VALLEY, OK 73075  
ATTORNEY FOR THE DEFENDANT

ARLAN BULLARD  
BRANT ELMORE  
ASSISTANT DISTRICT ATTORNEYS  
GARVIN COUNTY COURTHOUSE  
201 W. GRANT STREET  
PAULS VALLEY, OK 73075  
ATTORNEYS FOR THE STATE

OPINION BY LEWIS, J.  
CHAPEL, P.J.: Concurs  
LUMPKIN, V.P.J.: Dissents  
A. JOHNSON, J.: Concurs  
C. JOHNSON, J.: Concurs

APPEARANCES ON APPEAL  
S. GAIL GUNNING  
APPELLATE DEFENSE COUNSEL  
OKLA. INDIGENT DEFENSE SYSTEM  
P.O. BOX 926  
NORMAN, OK 73070  
ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT

NO RESPONSE NECESSARY

## **LUMPKIN, VICE-PRESIDING JUDGE: DISSENT**

I dissent to the decision reached in the Court's summary opinion, which purports to follow *Ferguson v. State*, 2006 OK CR 36, \_\_ P.3d \_\_, but instead misapplies. I did not agree with *Ferguson*, and my writing in that case is a vivid example of the types of problems I foresaw, problems like the one occurring today.

In this case, the defendant entered a blind plea. That being so, the defendant agreed to allow the trial judge to sentence him within the range of punishment without any sort of agreement or understanding or expectation of what that sentence might ultimately be. So long as the sentence was within the range of punishment set out by our legislature, which it was, then the defendant allowed the judge to set the punishment. As such, he has waived any claim with respect to the sentence levied, especially when there has been no showing of a lack of voluntariness on his part.

Moreover, the defendant received the minimum sentence available for the crime charged. Consecutive sentences are presumed under our statutes and are to be expected when a defendant has eight prior felony convictions.

The defendant states no real basis for modification to concurrent sentences. He does not even state that he was not told about the applicability of the 85% rule. Rather, he says the record does not show he was informed of it. It is highly likely his attorney informed him of the parameters of that rule,

and we must presume that was the case, unless we are willing to say that defendants must forego the attorney client privilege if they are hopeful or relief.

And finally, while I do not agree with *Ferguson*, today's decision does not even follow it. The only possible outcome when a plea is shown to be involuntary is to vacate the plea and sentence and remand the case so that the defendant may prepare for trial. We cannot say, "yes, the plea was involuntary, but we'll overlook that and simply modify the sentence." In this case, I would affirm the judgment and sentence.