

Electronically Filed  
Supreme Court  
SCWC-13-0003478  
15-JAN-2016  
08:21 AM

SCWC-13-0003478

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

---

STATE OF HAWAII,  
Respondent/Plaintiff-Appellee,

vs.

DAVID LEE GLADMAN,  
Petitioner/Defendant-Appellant.

---

CERTIORARI TO THE INTERMEDIATE COURT OF APPEALS  
(CAAP-13-0003478; CASE NO. 1DTA-13-01011)

SUMMARY DISPOSITION ORDER

(By: McKenna, Pollack, and Wilson, JJ.,  
with Wilson, J., concurring separately,  
and Nakayama, J., dissenting separately,  
with whom Recktenwald, C.J., joins)

Petitioner/Defendant-Appellant David Lee Gladman  
(Gladman) seeks review of the Intermediate Court of Appeals's  
(ICA) September 18, 2015 Judgment on Appeal filed pursuant to its  
August 17, 2015 Summary Disposition Order (SDO). The ICA  
affirmed the District Court of the First Circuit's (district

court) judgment.<sup>1</sup> The district court adjudged Gladman guilty of Operating a Vehicle Under the Influence of an Intoxicant (OVUII), in violation of Hawai'i Revised Statutes (HRS) § 291E-61(a)(3) (Supp. 2010).<sup>2</sup> We accepted Gladman's application for writ of certiorari and now vacate the ICA's Judgment on Appeal and the district court's judgment, and remand the case to the district court.

After being arrested for OVUII, Gladman was taken to the police station, where he was read an implied consent form.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The Honorable Lono Lee presided.

<sup>2</sup> HRS § 291E-61(a)(3) (Supp. 2010) provides:

(a) A person commits the offense of operating a vehicle under the influence of an intoxicant if the person operates or assumes actual physical control of a vehicle:

. . .

(3) With .08 or more grams of alcohol per two hundred ten liters of breath . . . .

<sup>3</sup> The form read in relevant part:

1. \_\_ Any person who operates a vehicle upon a public way, street, road, or highway or on or in the waters of the State shall be deemed to have given consent to a test or tests for the purpose of determining alcohol concentration or drug content of the persons [sic] breath, blood or urine as applicable.

2. \_\_ You are not entitled to an attorney before you submit to any tests [sic] or tests to determine your alcohol and/or drug content.

3. \_\_ You may refuse to submit to a breath or blood test, or both for the purpose of determining alcohol concentration and/or blood or urine test, or both for the purpose of determining drug content, none shall be

(continued...)

Gladman then chose to take a breath test, which resulted in a breath alcohol content reading of 0.119 grams of alcohol per 210 liters of breath. On certiorari, Gladman contends that he did not constitutionally consent to the breath test because his consent was coerced by the implied consent form, which conveyed a threat of imprisonment and significant punishment for refusal to submit to a breath, blood, or urine test under HRS § 291E-68 (Supp. 2010).

In State v. Won, 136 Hawai'i 292, 361 P.3d 1195 (2015), we held that the "coercion engendered by the Implied Consent Form runs afoul of the constitutional mandate that waiver of a constitutional right may only be the result of a free and unconstrained choice," and, thus, a defendant's decision to submit to testing after being read the implied consent form "is invalid as a waiver of his right not to be searched." Following this decision, the result of Gladman's breath test is the product of a warrantless search, and the ICA erred by concluding that the district court properly denied Gladman's motion to suppress the

---

<sup>3</sup>(...continued)

given [sic], except as provided in section 291E-21. However, if you refuse to submit to a breath, blood, or urine test, you shall be subject to up to thirty days imprisonment and/or fine up to \$1,000 or the sanctions of 291E-65, if applicable. In addition, you shall also be subject to the procedures and sanctions under chapter 291E, part III.

breath test result.<sup>4</sup> Accordingly, Gladman's OVUII conviction cannot stand.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the ICA's September 18, 2015 judgment on appeal affirming the district court's August 22, 2013 judgment is vacated, and the case remanded to the district court for further proceedings consistent with our opinion in State v. Won.

DATED: Honolulu, Hawai'i, January 15, 2016.


Jonathan Burge  
for petitioner

/s/ Sabrina S. McKenna

Brian R. Vincent  
for respondent

/s/ Richard W. Pollack

/s/ Michael D. Wilson



Robert T. Nakatsuji  
for *amicus curiae*  
Attorney General of  
the State of Hawai'i

---

<sup>4</sup> Because we vacate the ICA's judgment based on lack of consent, we do not reach his remaining points of error.