

Berry Vs. City of Cincinnati

Berry Vs. City of Cincinnati

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/103200

Court : US Supreme Court

Decided On : Nov-05-1973

Appeal No. : 414 U.S. 29

Appellant : Berry

Respondent : City of Cincinnati

Judgement :

Berry v. City of Cincinnati - 414 U.S. 29 (1973)

U.S. Supreme Court Berry v. City of Cincinnati, 414 U.S. 29 (1973)

Berry v. City of Cincinnati

No. 73-5245

Decided November 5, 1973

414 U.S. 29

CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

SYLLABUS

Persons convicted prior to the decision in *Argersinger v. Hamlin*, [407 U. S. 25](#) (1972), are entitled to the constitutional rule enunciated in that case that, absent a knowing and intelligent waiver, an indigent accused may not be imprisoned for any offense, whether classified as petty, misdemeanor, or felony, if he was denied the assistance of counsel, if they allege and prove a bona fide existing case or controversy sufficient to invoke the jurisdiction of a federal court.

Certiorari granted; 34 Ohio St.2d 106, 296 N.E.2d 532, reversed.

PER CURIAM.

Petitioner, who was serving a sentence for a misdemeanor offense when *Argersinger v. Hamlin*, [407 U. S. 25](#) (1972), was decided, sought relief in the state courts claiming that, because *Argersinger* should be accorded retroactive effect and because his trial and sentencing were uncounseled, his conviction should be invalidated. The Supreme Court of Ohio refused to apply *Argersinger* to convictions occurring prior to that decision. *City of Cincinnati v. Berry*, 34 Ohio St.2d 106, 296 N.E.2d 532 (1973). Petitioner was enlarged on bail pending action on his claim, and faces reincarceration should the judgment of the Ohio courts remain undisturbed. The motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* and the petition for certiorari are granted, and the judgment of the Ohio Supreme Court is reversed. Those convicted prior to the decision in *Argersinger* are entitled to the constitutional rule enunciated in that case, *Kitchens v. Smith*, [401 U. S. 847](#) (1971); *Williams v. United States*, [401 U. S. 646](#) , [401 U. S. 653](#) and n. 6 (1971) (opinion of WHITE, J.); [Burgett](#)

Page 414 U. S. 30

v. Texas, [389 U. S. 109](#) , [389 U. S. 114](#) (1967); *cf. Adams v. Illinois*, [405 U. S. 278](#) (1972), if they allege and prove a bona fide, existing case or controversy sufficient to invoke the jurisdiction of a federal court. *Sibron v. New York*, [392 U. S. 40](#) , [392 U. S. 50](#) -58 (1968); *Carafas v. LaVallee*, [391 U. S. 234](#) , [391 U. S. 237](#) -238 (1968); *Ginsberg v. New York*, [390 U. S. 629](#) , [390 U. S. 633](#) -634, n. 2 (1968).

So ordered.

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com