



**User Name:** Andrea Jamison

**Date and Time:** Tuesday, September 26, 2017 11:59:00 AM CST

**Job Number:** 53981451

## Document (1)

1. [Lopez v. State, 2014 Minn. App. Unpub. LEXIS 281](#)

**Client/Matter:** -None-

**Search Terms:** 2014 Minn. App. Unpub. LEXIS 281

**Search Type:** Natural Language

**Narrowed by:**

**Content Type**  
Cases

**Narrowed by**  
-None-



Cited

As of: September 26, 2017 5:59 PM Z

## Lopez v. State

Court of Appeals of Minnesota

April 7, 2014, Filed

A13-0934

### Reporter

2014 Minn. App. Unpub. LEXIS 281 \*; 2014 WL 1344295

Silvia Lopez, A/K/A Manda Gutierrez, petitioner,  
Appellant, vs. State of Minnesota, Respondent.

**Notice:** THIS OPINION WILL BE UNPUBLISHED AND MAY NOT BE CITED EXCEPT AS PROVIDED BY MINNESOTA STATUTES.

**Prior History:** [\*1] Lincoln County District Court File No. 41-K5-01-000206.

**Disposition:** Affirmed.

### Core Terms

interests-of-justice, post conviction relief, injustice, district court, guilty plea

### Case Summary

#### Overview

HOLDINGS: [1]-The district court correctly concluded that defendant's petition for postconviction relief was time-barred under [Minn. Stat. § 590.01, subd. 4\(b\)\(5\)](#) (2012), because she failed to establish an injustice that would entitle her to invoke the interests-of-justice exception to the two-year limitations period in [Minn. Stat. § 590.01, subd. 4\(a\)](#) (2012), given that the claimed injustice—that defendant was unaware of her guilty plea's negative immigration consequences—was identical to the substance of the petition and was based on events that occurred before her conviction became final; [2]-Even if the interests-of-justice exception applied, defendant's petition for postconviction relief was still time-barred because she brought her petition after the two-year filing deadline in [Minn. Stat. § 590.01, subd. 4\(c\)](#) (2012).

#### Outcome

Judgment affirmed.

### LexisNexis® Headnotes

Criminal Law & Procedure > ... > Entry of Pleas > Guilty Pleas > Changes & Withdrawals

Criminal Law & Procedure > Postconviction Proceedings > General Overview

#### [HN1](#) [↓] Guilty Pleas, Changes & Withdrawals

A motion to withdraw a guilty plea made after sentencing must be raised in a petition for postconviction relief.

Criminal Law & Procedure > ... > Standards of Review > De Novo Review > Conclusions of Law

Criminal Law & Procedure > Postconviction Proceedings > General Overview

Criminal Law & Procedure > ... > Standards of Review > Abuse of Discretion > General Overview

Criminal Law & Procedure > ... > Standards of Review > Clearly Erroneous Review > Findings of Fact

Criminal Law & Procedure > Postconviction Proceedings > Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law

#### [HN2](#) [↓] De Novo Review, Conclusions of Law

An appellate court reviews the denial of postconviction relief for an abuse of discretion, reviewing legal

conclusions de novo and factual findings for clear error.

Criminal Law & Procedure > Postconviction Proceedings > General Overview

Governments > Legislation > Statute of Limitations > Extensions & Revivals

Governments > Legislation > Statute of Limitations > Time Limitations

### [HN3](#) **Criminal Law & Procedure, Postconviction Proceedings**

Generally, if no direct appeal is filed, a person must file a petition for postconviction relief within two years of the entry of judgment of conviction or sentence. [Minn. Stat. § 590.01, subd. 4\(a\)](#) (2012). However, a person whose conviction became final before August 1, 2005, had until July 31, 2007, to file a timely postconviction petition. And an otherwise untimely petition may be considered if it meets one of five exceptions—including the interests-of-justice exception—and is filed within two years of the date the claim arises. [Minn. Stat. § 590.01, subd. 4\(b\), \(c\)](#) (2012).

Criminal Law & Procedure > Postconviction Proceedings > General Overview

Governments > Legislation > Statute of Limitations > Extensions & Revivals

Governments > Legislation > Statute of Limitations > Time Limitations

### [HN4](#) **Criminal Law & Procedure, Postconviction Proceedings**

Under the interests-of-justice exception, a district court may consider a postconviction petition if the petitioner establishes that the petition is not frivolous and is in the interests of justice. [Minn. Stat. § 590.01, subd. 4\(b\)\(5\)](#) (2012). The supreme court has made clear that the interests-of-justice referred to in the subdivision relate to the reason the petition was filed after the 2-year time limit in [Minn. Stat. § 590.01, subd. 4\(a\)](#) (2012), not the substantive claims in the petition. In other words, the interests-of-justice exception is triggered by an injustice

that caused the petitioner to miss the primary deadline in subd. 4(a), not the substance of the petition. When the only injustice claimed is identical to the substance of the petition, and the substance of the petition is based on something that happened before or at the time a conviction became final, the injustice simply cannot have caused the petitioner to miss the 2-year time limit in subd. 4(a), and therefore is not the type of injustice contemplated by the interests-of-justice exception in subd. 4(b)(5).

**Counsel:** For Appellant: Herbert A. Igbunugo, Igbunugo Partners Int'l Law Firm, PLLC, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

For Respondent: Lori Swanson, Attorney General, St. Paul, Minnesota; Glen A. Petersen, Lincoln County Attorney, Tyler, Minnesota.

**Judges:** Considered and decided by Connolly, Presiding Judge; Chutich, Judge; and Smith, Judge.

**Opinion by:** SMITH

## Opinion

---

### UNPUBLISHED OPINION

**SMITH**, Judge

We affirm the district court's denial of appellant's petition for postconviction relief because the petition is time-barred under [Minn. Stat. § 590.01, subd. 4](#) (2012).

### FACTS

Appellant Silvia Lopez is a native of Mexico who has lived in the United States for more than 26 years. In December 2001, respondent State of Minnesota charged Lopez with one count of wrongfully obtaining public assistance. On April 18, 2002, Lopez executed a four-page plea petition, which included a one-sentence advisory regarding potential immigration consequences for noncitizen defendants. When the plea petition was submitted to the district court, Lopez's attorney noted that he had not gone through it with Lopez; Lopez had merely read through the petition with an interpreter. After stating that she understood **[\*2]** the charges against her and that she wished to waive the rights enumerated in the plea petition, Lopez admitted that between 1996 and 2000 she received public assistance for her and her children and failed to inform the applicable human services agency that she was employed and that an adult male (the children's father)

was living in her home. The district court accepted her guilty plea, stayed imposition of her sentence, and imposed conditions of probation, which included 150 days of house arrest and payment of restitution.

More than nine years later, in May 2011, Lopez's son—a U.S. citizen—filed a petition with U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) to help Lopez become a lawful permanent resident. Lopez applied to adjust her status to that of a lawful permanent resident. Recognizing that her 2002 conviction may present a barrier, Lopez subsequently applied to waive this potential ground of inadmissibility. On March 1, 2012, USCIS concluded that the conviction at issue constitutes a "crime involving moral turpitude" and renders Lopez ineligible to adjust her status to that of lawful permanent resident; USCIS also denied Lopez's waiver application.

On November 19, 2012, Lopez [\*3] moved to withdraw her guilty plea under [Minn. R. Crim. P. 15.05](#). Lopez argued that, because her attorney did not explain the immigration consequences of her guilty plea, the guilty plea was not accurate, voluntary, and intelligent, and her attorney provided ineffective assistance of counsel. Following a hearing and additional written argument, the district court concluded that Lopez's claims are time-barred and denied her request for postconviction relief.

## DECISION

[HN1](#) [↑] "[A] motion to withdraw a guilty plea made after sentencing must be raised in a petition for postconviction relief." [Lussier v. State, 821 N.W.2d 581, 586 n.2 \(Minn. 2012\)](#). [HN2](#) [↑] An appellate court "review[s] the denial of postconviction relief for an abuse of discretion," reviewing legal conclusions de novo and factual findings for clear error. [Greer v. State, 836 N.W.2d 520, 522 \(Minn. 2013\)](#).

[HN3](#) [↑] Generally, if no direct appeal is filed, a person must file a petition for postconviction relief within two years of "the entry of judgment of conviction or sentence." [Minn. Stat. § 590.01, subd. 4\(a\)](#). However, "[a] person whose conviction became final before August 1, 2005, had until July 31, 2007, to file a timely postconviction petition." [\*4] [Lussier, 821 N.W.2d at 586](#) (citing Act of June 2, 2005, ch. 136, art. 14, § 13, 2005 Minn. Laws 901, 1098). And an otherwise untimely petition may be considered if it meets one of five exceptions—including the interests-of-justice exception—and is "filed within two years of the date the claim arises." [Minn. Stat. § 590.01, subd. 4\(b\), \(c\)](#).

Lopez concedes that if her petition does not satisfy the interests-of-justice exception, it is untimely. We regretfully conclude that the petition does not satisfy the exception. [HN4](#) [↑] Under the interests-of-justice exception, a district court may consider a postconviction petition if the petitioner establishes "that the petition is not frivolous and is in the interests of justice." *Id.*, [subd. 4\(b\)\(5\)](#). The supreme court has "made clear" that "the interests-of-justice referred to in [this subdivision] relate to the *reason* the petition was filed after the 2-year time limit in [subdivision 4\(a\)](#), not the *substantive claims* in the petition." [Sanchez v. State, 816 N.W.2d 550, 557 \(Minn. 2012\)](#).

In other words, the interests-of-justice exception is triggered by an injustice that *caused* the petitioner to miss the primary deadline in [subdivision 4\(a\)](#), not the *substance* [\*5] of the petition. When the only injustice claimed is identical to the substance of the petition, and the substance of the petition is based on something that happened before or at the time a conviction became final, the injustice simply cannot have caused the petitioner to miss the 2-year time limit in [subdivision 4\(a\)](#), and therefore is not the type of injustice contemplated by the interests-of-justice exception in [subdivision 4\(b\)\(5\)](#).

*Id.* Here, the claimed injustice—that Lopez was unaware of her guilty plea's negative immigration consequences—is identical to the substance of the petition and is based on events that happened before her conviction became final. Although the *substance* of the petition likely has merit, Lopez has not identified any injustice that has *caused* her to miss the primary deadline. Lopez has not established that an injustice exists that entitles her to invoke the interests-of-justice exception to the statute of limitations.

Moreover, even if the exception applied, Lopez's petition still would be time-barred. The relevant exception extends the filing deadline to two years from the date the claim arose. [Minn. Stat. § 590.01, subd. 4\(c\)](#). A petitioner's claim "arises" [\*6] when a petitioner knew or should have known that [s]he had a claim." [Sanchez, 816 N.W.2d at 560](#). This is an objective, rather than a "subjective, actual knowledge standard." *Id.* at 558. Because a "crime involving moral turpitude" would have rendered Lopez ineligible to adjust her status at the time of her conviction, her claim arose in April 2002. See 8 U.S.C. § 1182 (a)(2)(A)(i)(I) (2000). Because Lopez brought her petition more than two years after this date, the petition would be untimely, even if the interests-of-justice exception applied.

We believe it unfortunate that USCIS denied Lopez's waiver application, but that decision is beyond the scope of our review. Under controlling law, the district court correctly concluded that Lopez's petition for postconviction relief is time-barred under [Minn. Stat. § 590.01, subd. 4](#).

**Affirmed.**

---

End of Document