

CONCURRING OPINION OF GINOZA, J.

The District Court found that the parties did not actually contemplate whether full or partial presentence investigation reports (PSIs) would be done at the time the Appellants entered their no contest pleas. Hence, the provisions in the plea agreements that PSIs would be completed are ambiguous and should be construed in favor of Appellants. State v. Abbott, 79 Hawaii i 317, 320, 901 P.2d 1296, 1299 (App. 1995).

Nonetheless, I agree with the majority that even if the plea agreements were breached, Appellants were afforded the appropriate remedy under the circumstances of this case. State v. Adams, 76 Hawaii i 408, 414-15, 879 P.2d 513, 519-20 (1994). Appellants were ultimately given the relief they had initially sought in that full PSIs were prepared and considered in resentencing them, and that relief is consistent with this court's decision in the first appeal. State v. Schaefer, 117 Hawaii i 490, 501, 184 P.3d 805, 816 (App. 2008).

I therefore concur in the result reached by the majority, which is to affirm the Judgments entered by the District Court.