

05-1575 SCHIRO V. LANDRIGAN

DECISION BELOW:441 F3d 638

LOWER COURT CASE NUMBER: 00-99011

QUESTIONS PRESENTED:

Respondent Jeffrey Landrigan actively thwarted his attorney's efforts to develop and present mitigation evidence in his capital sentencing proceeding. Landrigan told the trial judge that he did not want his attorney to present any mitigation evidence, including proposed testimony from witnesses whom his attorney had subpoenaed to testify. On post-conviction review, the state court rejected as frivolous an ineffective assistance of counsel claim in which Landrigan asserted that if counsel had raised the issue of Landrigan's alleged genetic predisposition to violence, he would have cooperated in presenting that type of mitigating evidence.

1. In light of the highly deferential standard of review required in this case pursuant to the Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 ("AEDPA"), did the Ninth Circuit err by holding that the state court unreasonably determined the facts when it found that Landrigan "instructed his attorney not to present any mitigating evidence at the sentencing hearing"?

2. Did the Ninth Circuit err by finding that the state court's analysis of Landrigan's ineffective assistance of counsel claim was objectively unreasonable under *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668 (1984), notwithstanding the absence of any contrary authority from this Court in cases in which (a) the defendant waives presentation of mitigation and impedes counsel's attempts to do so, or (b) the evidence the defendant subsequently claims should have been presented is not mitigating?

CERT. GRANTED 9/26/2006