\*\*\*NOT FOR PUBLICATION IN WEST'S HAWAI'I REPORTS AND PACIFIC REPORTER \*\*\*

Electronically Filed Supreme Court SCWC-11-0000427 15-JAN-2014 08:53 AM

## SCWC-11-0000427

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF HAWAI'I

STATE OF HAWAI'I, Respondent/Plaintiff-Appellee,

vs.

WENDY PIERCE, Petitioner/Defendant-Appellant.

CERTIORARI TO THE INTERMEDIATE COURT OF APPEALS (CAAP-11-0000427; CASE NO. 2DTC-10-006049)

## DISSENTING OPINION BY RECKTENWALD, C.J. IN WHICH NAKAYAMA, J. JOINS

For the reasons set forth in my dissenting opinion in <u>State v. Apollonio</u>, 130 Hawai'i 353, 364-371, 311 P.3d 676, 687-694, I respectfully dissent from the majority's conclusion that the lack of a mens rea allegation in the charge requires that the case be dismissed without prejudice despite the defendant's untimely objection to the sufficiency of the charge. In my view, where a defendant does not object to a deficient charge in the trial court, the defendant is required to show how he or she was prejudiced by the error. In the instant case, the defendant has not demonstrated how she was prejudiced by the deficient charge. Accordingly, I respectfully dissent.

DATED: Honolulu, Hawaiʻi, January 15, 2014.

/s/ Mark E. Recktenwald
/s/ Paula A. Nakayama

