

TACTICAL INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE IN CAPITAL TRIALS

KYLE GRAHAM*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1646
I. Ineffective Assistance at the Penalty Phase	1651
A. The Mechanics of Capital Trials	1651
B. <i>Strickland v. Washington</i> : The Deferential Baseline for Review of Ineffective Assistance Claims.....	1653
C. <i>Williams, Wiggins, and Rompilla</i> : The Modern Trend Toward Heightened Scrutiny of Mitigation Investigations	1656
D. The Present State of Ineffective Assistance Law as It Relates to Failures to Investigate and Present Mitigation Evidence.....	1661
II. <i>Poindexter v. Mitchell</i> : Debating Intentional Ineffective Assistance	1670
III. Evaluating the Efficacy of Intentional Ineffective Assistance	1675
A. The "Reasonable Investigation" Standard.....	1680
B. Absence of Prejudice	1682
C. Incompetence of Post-Conviction Counsel.....	1684
D. Adverse Findings of Fact and Rulings of Law	1686
E. Disappearing Evidence.....	1688
Conclusion	1690

* Deputy District Attorney, Mono County, California. J.D., *Yale Law School*, 2001. The author thanks Karl Keyes and Greg Wolff for their input and advice.