

## Chapter HSS 31

### PROBATION-PAROLE REVOCATION PROCEDURE

HSS 31.01 Authority and Applicability      HSS 31.03 Revocation of Probation and Parole  
HSS 31.02 Definitions

**HSS 31.01 Authority and applicability.** (1) These rules are promulgated under the authority of s. 227.014 (2), Stats. They interpret ss. 46.001, 46.03 (6), 53.11, 53.19, 53.31, 57.06, 57.072, 161.47, 971.17, and 973.10, Stats.; ss. 54.04 and 54.07, Stats. (1975); and ch. 48, Stats.

(2) This chapter applies to the adults on probation or parole and youth on aftercare in the legal custody of the department. This chapter will cease to apply to youth on the effective date of revocation rules relating specifically to youth.

**History:** Cr. Register, December, 1981, No. 312, eff. 1-1-82.

**HSS 31.02 Definitions.** The definitions under s. HSS 328.03, Wis. Adm. Code, apply to this chapter.

**History:** Cr. Register, December, 1981, No. 312, eff. 1-1-82.

**HSS 31.03 Revocation of probation and parole.** (1) **GENERAL.** (a) *Revocation.* A client's probation or parole may be revoked and the client transported to a correctional institution or court if the client violates a rule or condition of supervision.

(b) *Investigation.* A client's agent shall investigate the facts underlying an alleged violation and shall meet with the client to discuss the allegation within a reasonable period of time after becoming aware of the allegation.

(c) *Recommendation.* After investigation and discussion under par. (b), the agent shall decide whether to:

1. Take no action because the allegation is unfounded;
2. Resolve alleged violations by:
  - a. A review of the rules of supervision followed by changes in them where necessary or desirable, including return to court;
  - b. A formal or informal counseling session with the client to reemphasize the necessity of compliance with the rules or conditions; or
  - c. An informal or formal warning that further violation may result in a recommendation for revocation; or
3. Recommend revocation for an alleged violation.

(d) *Report.* An agent shall report all alleged client violations of the rules or conditions of supervision to the agent's supervisor. The following shall be reported:

Register, December, 1981, No. 312

1. The facts underlying the alleged violation, including conflicting versions regarding the nature and circumstances of the alleged violation;
2. The agent's investigatory efforts and conclusions;
3. A brief summary of the agent's discussion with the client;
4. The agent's recommendation regarding disposition and the reasons for it;
5. A statement as to the custody status of the client;
6. Any pending criminal charges, guilt plea, confession, or conviction for the conduct underlying the alleged violation; and
7. Reference to the client's prior adjustment, including but not limited to alleged violations, violations, and abscondings.

(2) **CASE REVIEW.** The purpose of case review is to decide whether there is probable cause to believe the client committed a violation of the rules or conditions of supervision, whether parole or probation revocation should be pursued, and whether the client should be in custody during revocation proceedings.

(a) *Agent initiation.* If the agent's immediate supervisor reasonably concludes, on the basis of the agent's report under sub. (1) (d) that revocation proceedings should be pursued, a review shall be held in accordance with this subsection.

(b) *Supervisor initiation.* If a client's agent does not recommend revocation for the client's alleged misconduct, the agent's immediate supervisor may initiate revocation proceedings under par. (a). If the agent's supervisor initiates revocation proceedings, another supervisor shall conduct the case review under this subsection.

(c) *Notice.* Written notice of a case review shall be given to the client, the client's attorney, and the state public defender if there is a claim or appearance of indigency. The notice shall include:

1. The rule or condition that the client is alleged to have violated;
2. The facts underlying the alleged violation;
3. A statement that the client has the right to a case review before the agent's supervisor who shall decide whether to proceed to a revocation hearing with a hearing examiner; and that the client may be represented by counsel at the review;
4. A statement that the client and client's attorney, if any, may review the relevant evidence in the file to be considered at the case review;
5. An explanation of the possible consequences of any decision;
6. An explanation of the client's rights at the case review which include:
  - a. The right to be present at the review;
  - b. The right to deny the allegation and speak on the client's own behalf;
  - c. The right to present documentary evidence;

d. The right to receive a written decision, stating the reasons for it, based upon the evidence presented;

e. The right to waive rights to be present at the review; and

f. The right to counsel, but if counsel fails to appear the supervisor may proceed with the review in his or her absence.

7. A statement that the client may be placed in custody and detained pending a final decision under this subsection by decision of the agent's supervisor.

(d) *Time and place.* The case review shall take place as close to the site of the alleged violation as is feasible and not sooner than one day and not later than 5 days after receipt of service of notice to the client. The client may waive these time limits in writing. If the client's attorney is not present at the scheduled review, the supervisor shall proceed with the review.

(e) *Procedure.* At the case review, a supervisor shall review the allegation and discuss it with the client, the client's attorney, if any, and agent. The supervisor and client shall exchange all relevant information and evidence. The agent or supervisor may question the client and the client may make statements in the client's own behalf. The supervisor shall make a written summary of the review including the responses from the client and the evidence presented.

(f) *Decision.* 1. After the case review, the supervisor shall decide, based upon the evidence presented, whether there is probable cause to believe that the client committed the conduct and that the conduct constitutes a violation of the rules or conditions of supervision; and if the supervisor decides there is probable cause to believe the client committed the violation and has considered alternatives to revocation, he or she may recommend revocation.

2. If the supervisor decides there is probable cause, he or she shall decide whether the client shall be detained in custody under s. HSS 328.22, Wis. Adm. Code.

3. If the supervisor does not conclude that there is probable cause to believe the client committed the violation, or if the supervisor concludes that there are desirable alternatives to revocation, revocation shall not be pursued. If revocation is not pursued, the client shall continue under supervision under the established rules and conditions.

4. The supervisor shall issue a written decision based upon the evidence presented, stating the reasons for it, and shall provide copies to the client, the client's attorney, if any, and agent within a reasonable time after the case review. The decision shall indicate whether revocation is recommended and whether the client shall be detained. The supervisor shall notify the hearing examiner's office in writing if notice of a final revocation hearing is to be sent under sub. (3) (a).

(g) *Reissuance of notice.* 1. Failure to issue proper notice of the case review may result in dismissal of the supervisor's decision under par. (f). Proper notice may then be issued and a case review may be held under this subsection.

2. If a supervisor's decision under par. (f) is that there is no probable cause to believe the client committed the violation, and additional rele-

vant information regarding the alleged violation becomes known after the decision, an amended notice may be issued and a case review held under this subsection.

(h) *Waiver*. A case review need not be held if the client waives his or her right to review. The procedure under sub. (4) shall be followed whenever there has been a waiver.

(3) **FINAL REVOCATION HEARING.** (a) *Notice*. If revocation was recommended under sub. (2) (f), notice shall be sent by the hearing examiner's office within 10 days of the date of the case review decision. The client, the client's attorney, if any, and the department's representative shall be given written notice of a final revocation hearing. The notice shall include:

1. The date, time, and place of the hearing and a statement that the client or the client's attorney, if any, may, within 5 days of receiving the notice, request in writing that the hearing be rescheduled under the time limits of par. (c);

2. The rule or condition that the client is alleged to have violated;

3. A statement that the client has the right to a final revocation hearing before an impartial hearing examiner who shall determine, based upon the evidence presented, whether the client violated the rules or conditions of supervision and shall, after considering any mitigating or extenuating circumstances, determine whether the violation, even though factually established, necessitates revocation;

4. A statement of the relevant evidence to be considered at the hearing which may include reference to:

- a. Any documents;
- b. Any physical or chemical evidence;
- c. Results of a breathalyzer test;
- d. Any incriminating statements by the client;
- e. All police reports regarding the allegation;
- f. All warrants issued; and
- g. Relevant photographs;

5. A statement that whatever relevant information or evidence is in the possession of the department is available for inspection unless otherwise confidential;

6. A statement of which statements from unavailable witnesses will be used and why the witness is unavailable;

7. The sources of information relied upon unless such disclosure would threaten the personal safety of another;

8. An explanation of the client's rights at the hearing which are:

- a. The right to be present at the hearing;
- b. The right to deny the allegation;

- c. The right to present witnesses;
- d. The right to present documentary evidence;
- e. The right to question witnesses in accordance with par. (d);
- f. The right to assistance of counsel;
- g. The right to waive a hearing in accordance with par. (b);
- h. The right to receive a written decision stating the reasons for it based upon the evidence presented;
- i. The right to appeal the decision in accordance with par. (j); and

9. In parole revocation cases, the agent's recommendation for forfeiture of good time pursuant to s. HSS 328.24, Wis. Adm. Code.

(b) *Waiver*. A client may knowingly, voluntarily, and intelligently waive the right to a final hearing in writing. The waiver shall result in a review under sub. (4).

(c) *Time*. 1. The final revocation hearing shall be held within a reasonable time from the date of the case review decision to recommend revocation and detain the client.

2. The client or the client's attorney, if any, may request, within 5 days of receiving notice, that the hearing be rescheduled by making a request in writing to the hearing examiner's office stating the reasons for the request. A copy of this request shall be sent to the department's representative by the client or client's attorney.

(d) *Nondisclosure of identity of witnesses by decision of the hearing examiner*. 1. A hearing examiner may decide that a witness shall not be called to testify at a hearing if the physical safety or mental health of another is endangered. The hearing examiner shall indicate the fact of the omission in the hearing record.

2. A hearing examiner may accept communications from a party seeking permission to withhold the names of any witnesses if disclosure of the witnesses would endanger the physical safety or mental health of another. All such communications should state the reasons supporting nondisclosure.

3. A hearing examiner may question a witness outside the presence of the client. The examiner shall indicate in the hearing record that such questioning has occurred.

4. Any information, statements, evidence or testimony obtained by the hearing examiner under this section may be used as evidence presented for the purpose of par. (f). If such evidence is relied on by the hearing examiner, a full record shall be kept. The client shall have access to the information relied upon, but not the identity of the witness. The department shall determine who has access to records of identity of witnesses.

(e) *Procedure*. 1. The hearing shall be conducted in accordance with par. (a). The alleged violation shall be read aloud, and all witnesses for and against the client, including the client, shall have a chance to speak and respond to questions by the client, the client's attorney, if any, and the department's representative.

2. The hearing officer shall weigh the credibility of the witnesses and, where appropriate, state his or her conclusions in the hearing record.

3. Evidence to support or rebut the allegation may be offered. Evidence gathered by means not consistent with this chapter, ch. HSS 328, or in violation of the law may be admitted as evidence at the hearing.

4. The hearing examiner may accept hearsay evidence and may require the client or the client's attorney, if any, to submit questions to the hearing examiner to be asked of any witnesses questioned outside the presence of the client.

5. Repetitious and irrelevant questions shall be forbidden.

6. The department has the burden of proof to establish, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the client violated the rules or conditions of supervision.

7. The examiner may take an active role to elicit facts regarding the alleged violation not raised by the client or the client's attorney, if any, or the department's representative.

8. Alternatives to revocation and notice of an alibi defense offered by the client, the client's attorney, if any, and the department's representative shall be considered by the examiner if the examiner and the other party's representative have received them at least 5 days before the final hearing takes place, unless, for cause, the examiner allows a shorter notice.

9. A verbatim record shall be kept of the testimony and evidence presented at the hearing.

10. A continuance may be granted with the consent of both parties. The examiner may issue any necessary recommendation to give the department's representative and the client reasonable opportunity to present a full and fair record.

(f) *Decision.* 1. After the hearing, the examiner shall consider only the evidence presented.

2. The examiner shall:

a. Decide whether the client committed the conduct underlying the alleged violation;

b. Decide if the client committed the conduct, whether the conduct constitutes a violation of the rules or conditions of supervision;

c. Decide if the client violated the rules or conditions of supervision, whether revocation should result; and

d. Make specific findings as to dangerousness, whether a decision not to revoke would unduly depreciate the seriousness of the violation, whether there is a need for further correctional treatment, and whether this is best provided in an institutional setting.

3. If the examiner finds that a client violated the rules or conditions of supervision, revocation shall not result unless the examiner finds that continuation of supervision would be inconsistent with the goals and objectives of supervision under ch. HSS 328, Wis. Adm. Code. The spe-

cific goal or objective and the reason it would be inconsistent with continuation of supervision shall be expressly stated in the decision.

4. If the examiner finds that the client did not violate the rules or conditions of supervision, revocation shall not result and the client shall continue with supervision under the established rules and conditions.

5. The examiner shall issue a written decision, based upon the evidence and client's record, to either revoke or not revoke the client's probation or parole. Examiners are encouraged to make the decision at the hearing. The examiner may include recommendations about what action would be in the best interests of the client, what the role of the agent, supervisor or bureau should be in implementing such recommendations, or comments about any other matter relevant to the case.

(g) *Order.* The examiner's order stating the decision to revoke or not revoke and the reasons for it shall be written and forwarded within 10 working days after the hearing to the client, the client's attorney, if any, the agent's supervisor, the regional chief, and the department's representative. An extension of 5 working days is permitted if there is cause for the extension and the examiner notifies the parties of the reasons for it.

(h) *Effect of order and appeal.* The examiner's order shall take effect and be final 10 working days after the date it is issued unless the client or the client's attorney, if any, or department's representative files an appeal with supporting materials under par. (j) with the secretary.

(i) *Synopsis.* If an appeal is filed, a synopsis of the testimony at the hearing shall be prepared by the examiner and forwarded to the secretary prior to the secretary's review. The synopsis may be either written or recorded.

(j) *Materials submitted for review.* The client's attorney, if any, client or the bureau shall submit all relevant materials, including petitions, letters, briefs, and reply briefs to the secretary and the other party. Materials submitted for review shall be filed with the secretary within 10 working days from the date of the decision. An extension of this time limit may be granted by the secretary.

(k) *Secretary's decision.* 1. The secretary shall review the synopsis, the examiner's decision, and all materials submitted for review under par. (j).

2. The secretary shall decide to modify, sustain, reverse, or remand the examiner's decision based upon the evidence presented at the hearing and the materials submitted for review.

3. The secretary's written decision shall be forwarded to the client, the client's attorney, if any, the agent's supervisor, the regional chief, and the department's representative within 7 working days after receipt of the required materials for review, unless the time is extended.

(4) **PROCEDURE WHEN REVOCATION HEARINGS ARE WAIVED.** (a) If a final revocation hearing was waived, the supervisor may recommend revocation. A waiver may be withdrawn by the client prior to the secretary's decision if the client establishes that it was not knowingly, voluntarily, or intelligently made.

(b) If the supervisor recommends revocation, the recommendation shall include the reasons for it and the facts underlying the alleged violation. A record of waivers, confessions, convictions for the conduct underlying the alleged violation, or evidence of a client's guilty pleas or continuation of a criminal proceeding following a determination of probable cause for the conduct underlying the alleged violation shall be prepared. The complete record shall be sent to the secretary within a reasonable period of time after acceptance of the waivers, confession, or record of the guilty plea or conviction.

(c) The secretary shall decide whether to revoke the client's probation or parole.

(d) The secretary's decision shall state the reasons for it based upon the information provided and shall be delivered to the client, the client's attorney, if any, the regional chief, and the supervisory staff member who recommended revocation within 10 days of receipt of the recommendation.

(5) **TERMINATION OF REVOCATION PROCEEDINGS.** The supervisor may recommend to the regional chief that revocation proceedings be terminated without revocation of a client's probation or parole or that the client be released from custody status, or both, at any time before the hearing examiner's decision is issued, if there is sufficient reason for doing so. The regional chief shall decide.

(6) **CONCURRENT CRIMINAL PROSECUTION AND ACQUITTAL IN CRIMINAL PROCEEDING.** All revocation actions under this section shall proceed regardless of any concurrent prosecution of the client for the conduct underlying the alleged violation. An acquittal in a criminal proceeding for a client's conduct underlying an alleged violation shall not preclude revocation of that client's probation or parole for that same conduct.

(7) **RECORDS.** A summary of all alleged violations, revocation actions, and proceedings under this section against a client shall be maintained in the client's record.

(8) **TRANSPORT TO A CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION.** A client shall be transported to a correctional institution or to court for sentencing as soon as it is feasible after a revocation decision becomes final.

(9) **CLIENT WAIVER OF RIGHT TO ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL.** A client may waive his or her right to counsel under this section provided the supervisor, hearing examiner, or secretary accepting the waiver is satisfied that such waiver is knowingly, voluntarily, and intelligently made.

(10) **SPECIAL REVOCATION PROCEDURES.** All clients are subject to revocation under this section except as noted under this subsection. Those clients committed under ss. 161.47 or 971.17, Stats., or ss. 54.04 or 54.07, Stats. (1975), shall follow the revocation procedures under this subsection and subs. (5) to (7) as follows:

(a) If a client committed under s. 161.47, Stats., allegedly violates the rules or conditions of supervision, an agent shall proceed as noted under sub. (1) (b) - (d) and shall, upon the approval of a supervisor, notify the committing court of the alleged violation and submit a report under sub. (1) (d) to the court within a reasonable time after becoming aware of the alleged violation. If the court decides that the client should remain on



probation, supervision shall continue under the previous rules and conditions unless they are modified by the court.

(b) Clients committed under s. 971.17, Stats., may only have their parole revoked by the court.

(c) If a client committed under s. 54.04, Stats. (1975), allegedly violates the rules or conditions of probation, field staff shall proceed as noted under subs. (1) (b) - (2) (g) except that a case review shall be held and a decision issued by the supervisor within 96 hours after the detention of the client for the alleged misconduct. The supervisor may extend this time limit for good cause. If the supervisor recommends revocation, the agent shall notify the committing court of the decision within a reasonable period of time. The court shall determine whether revocation shall occur. No final revocation hearing may be held by the department. If the court decides that the client should remain on probation, supervision shall continue under the previous rules and conditions unless they are modified by the court.

(d) If a client committed under s. 54.07, Stats. (1975), allegedly violates the rules or conditions of parole, field staff shall proceed as noted under subs. (1) (b) - (2) (g) except that a case review shall be held and a decision issued by the supervisory staff member within 96 hours after the detention of the client for the alleged misconduct. A final revocation hearing shall then be held in accordance with this section.

(11) **HARMLESS ERROR.** If a time requirement under this section is exceeded, the secretary may deem it harmless and disregard it if it does not affect the substantive rights of the client. Substantive rights are affected when a variance tends to prejudice a fair proceeding or disposition involving a client.

**History:** Cr. Register, December, 1981, No. 312, eff. 1-1-82.

**Note:** Providing a revocation procedure that is fair and effective, reasonably speedy and which does not hinder the overall correctional process is a difficult challenge. These objectives are sometimes in conflict. For example, it is important to give adequate and timely notice to a client and his or her attorney of revocation proceedings. At the hearings, the client should have the opportunity to examine and cross-examine witnesses. But there are costs involved in this. The period during which a client is subject to revocation proceedings can be very stressful. The client may be in custody. These two facts can seriously interrupt the correctional process. This is also true when a client is in an adversary relation to an agent, who probably will continue to supervise the client when the client returns to the community, or with parents, friends, or teachers who have information related to the revocation decision.

These are just a few examples of the issues that must be resolved in developing a fair, efficient revocation procedure that is consistent with these and the other objectives of this chapter.

The broad outlines for the revocation process have been drawn by the U.S. Supreme Court. This framework, which will be developed briefly here, leaves the state with some flexibility to devise a procedure that fairly resolves the sometimes conflicting goals of the supervision.

In *Morrissey v. Brewer*, 408 U.S. 471 (1972), the U.S. Supreme Court outlined the procedures for adult parole revocation. In *Gagnon v. Scarpelli*, 411 U.S. 778 (1973), the U.S. Supreme Court held that the procedures in *Morrissey* applied to the revocation of adult probation as well.

A final revocation hearing to determine whether the parolee violated and whether to revoke occurs within a reasonable time of a case review under this section. While no specific time limit is set, it is the department's goal to hold the final hearing within 30 to 40 days of the case review if the client is detained following the case review. This is difficult to accomplish because of the shortage of hearing examiners, the difficulty of accommodating busy attorney's and agent's schedules, and the shortage of hearing rooms in county jails. It is clear

Register, December, 1981, No. 312

that the public as well as the client have an interest in speedy revocation proceedings. These rules are intended to help expedite the process.

Revocation of parole under *Morrissey* requires an effective two-step process or a prompt final hearing. The hearing should be held within a reasonable time after a decision to pursue revocation at the case review. The requirements for the hearing are:

- (1) That the parolee must be given written notice of the alleged violations;
- (2) That the parolee is entitled to disclosure of the evidence against him or her;
- (3) That the parolee has the right to appear and speak on his or her own behalf;
- (4) That the parolee has the right to present witnesses and evidence;
- (5) That the parolee has the right to confront and cross-examine witnesses against him or her; and
- (6) That the parolee has the right to receive a written decision, stating the reasons for it, based upon the evidence presented.

*Morrissey* gave the states flexibility to implement these requirements. The revocation procedures in this chapter reflect an attempt to provide a fair procedure that is also efficient and speedy.

There are several significant changes from past practice. The first is a change from the so-called preliminary hearing to the case review. The focus of case review is threefold: to determine whether there is probable cause to believe there was a violation of the rules or conditions of probation or parole, to determine whether, if there is probable cause, it makes correctional sense to revoke, and to determine whether the client should remain in custody during revocation proceedings.

Experience teaches that careful attention should be paid to the question of whether to revoke at this stage. While it is important to be sure there is probable cause to believe a violation has occurred, this is usually easy to establish. Unfortunately, under the old procedure, attention was too often focused on this question. This is due, in part, to the fact that the preliminary hearing accorded the client the right to confrontation. In practice, the preliminary had become identical to the final hearing. This is not efficient, and it caused attention to be drawn away from the issue of whether it made correctional sense to proceed with revocation.

The case review provided in the rule does not require the calling of witnesses at the case review. Rather, probable cause may be found on the basis of affidavits and other reliable statements and documents.

It is hoped that by making the proceeding less formal and adversary, the client, the client's attorney, the agent and the agent's supervisor can frankly discuss the issues in an atmosphere that focuses attention on the most important issues. This modification of present practice should also add to the efficiency of the process and save some money. It seems clear that there is no right to confrontation at the case review, in the light of the fact that this is not required in a criminal case. *Gerstein v. Pugh*, 420 U.S. 103 (1975); *Flowers v. DHSS*, 81 Wis. 2d 376, 260 N.W. 2d 727 (1978).

A second modification in the revocation process at this initial stage is to permit the agent's immediate supervisor to make the determinations required. In the past, a supervisor other than the revoking agent's supervisor, conducted the preliminary hearing. Experience has taught that, while it is important for the person conducting the hearing to be objective, it is also important that the person be familiar with the case under review. This greatly enhances the decision as to whether it is wise to proceed in the revocation process or to seek alternatives, because the supervisor is familiar with the client and the agent who must work together for successful supervision.

It is true that the agent's supervisor has had some involvement in the case and this may suggest that he or she will not be sufficiently detached. It is worth noting, however, that in the initial stages of the process, the supervisor's only decision is to decide that a case review is desirable. This is a decision to review the case with the client and agent, and not a decision to revoke. The chapter reflects the view that the supervisor will be sufficiently objective and that the fairness of the case review will not be compromised by his or her involvement. Indeed, knowledge of the case more often will enhance his or her capacity to make decisions at the case review. If the supervisor has initiated the case review, that supervisor may not be the decision maker at the case review.

Support for the view that the supervisor may play the role called for in the rule is found in *Parham v. J. R.*, 442 U.S. 584 (1979). In that case, the court held that a physician who did the Register, December, 1981, No. 312

initial tests and evaluation of a youth was an adequately neutral factfinder to decide whether to commit the youth and to make future decisions on the continuing need for commitment to a mental health institution. See also, *Hortonville Ed. Assn. v. Hortonville Joint School Dist.*, #1, 426 U.S. 482 (1976); *State ex. rel. Terry v. Percy*, 95 Wis. 2d 476, 290 N.W. 2d 713 (1980) (Terry III).

Subsection (1) (a) states that a client may be revoked for violating the rules or conditions of supervision. The rules or conditions may proscribe an activity which is not in itself a violation of the criminal law. *State v. Evans*, 77 Wis. 2d 226 (1977). Some examples of violations for which revocation may result are failure to account for one's whereabouts, failure to report, absconding, leaving the state without an agent's permission, failure to notify an agent of a change of address, and consumption of alcoholic beverages. See e.g., *State v. Garner*, 54 Wis. 2d 100 (1972); *State ex. rel. Cressi v. Schmidt*, 62 Wis. 2d 400 (1974); *State ex. rel. Solie v. Schmidt*, 73 Wis. 2d 620 (1976); *State ex. rel. Prellwitz v. Schmidt*, 73 Wis. 2d 35 (1976); *State v. Evans*, 77 Wis. 2d 226 (1977); *State ex. rel. Shock v. DHSS*, 77 Wis. 2d 362 (1977); *State ex. rel. Flowers v. DHSS*, 81 Wis. 2d 376 (1978); *State v. Gerard*, 57 Wis. 2d 611 (1973), *appeal dismissed*, 414 U.S. 804 (1973); *State ex. rel. Mulligan v. DHSS*, 86 Wis. 2d 517 (1979).

Subsection (1) (b) provides for an agent's investigation after an alleged violation. The investigation should be thorough since the information uncovered may form the basis of a decision to revoke a client's probation or parole. It should also be performed as soon as possible after the alleged violation so as not to cause undue interruption of a client's supervision. This is consistent with existing practice.

Subsection (1) (c) states that an agent may recommend revocation or resolve minor alleged violations by alternatives to revocation. Experience teaches that the latter provision is necessary since minor, often excusable or unintended violations may occur that are handled best by immediate action by the agent. For example, a client may fail to report at the prescribed time, but after investigation the agent may conclude that the failure was reasonable because the client was ill or misunderstood the reporting rule. Some criminal law violations, such as some motor vehicle offenses, also may not require revocation. Revocation may not be appropriate, but a review of the rules, counseling, or warning may be desirable. Of course, if investigation proves the allegation groundless, that fact should be recorded and no action should be taken against the client. The alternatives noted under sub. (1) (c) 2a-c are derived from *State ex. rel. Plotkin v. DHSS*, 63 Wis. 2d 535 (1973). The alternatives noted under sub. (1) (c) 2 a-c allow a decision-maker to exercise discretion on a case by case basis which is necessary to provide fairness and satisfy the goals under this chapter.

Subsection (1) (d) requires an agent to report all alleged violations to his or her supervisor. Alleged violations, with any action taken under sub. (1) (c) may be appropriately reported in a chronological log summary. However, if revocation is recommended, the agent should submit a report directly to the agent's supervisor. All of the information required under this subsection need not be included in a single written report.

Subsection (2) (c) provides for notice of a case review. The bureau should notify the State Public Defenders Office as soon as possible. If the supervisor reviews the report submitted by an agent and concludes that a review is necessary, notice of the review should be sent to the client, the client's attorney (if any), and agent. The notice must state the rights that the client has at the review. The notice and list of rights are in substantial accord with existing practice and *Morrissey*. However, in the interest of speed and efficiency, no witnesses need be called to appear at the review. This is a departure from past practice, but, as the above discussion notes, is not likely to be unfair to the client.

Subsection (2) (d) sets the time limits for initiating the case review. Timeliness is important to ensure the prompt gathering and preservation of evidence and to ensure the speedy resolution of the allegations which may enable the client to continue with supervision without undue interruption. These limits are consistent with the requirement under *Morrissey*. This subsection also requires a review in the vicinity of the arrest or alleged violation to permit the client to prepare a defense and to put it on the record before memories have dimmed and before he or she is removed to a distant state. *State ex. rel. Flowers v. DHSS*, 81 Wis. 2d 376 (1978). However, where an alleged violation has occurred at a distant location, there are acceptable alternatives to holding the review at the place of the alleged violation. For example, transporting witnesses to the hearing, or where appropriate, conventional substitutes for live testimony including affidavits, depositions, and documentary evidence may be resorted to, consistent with the requirements of due process. *State ex. rel. Harris v. Schmidt*, 69 Wis. 2d 668 (1975).

A case review need not include the client if a client waives his or her rights to be present under sub. (2) (c) or if the client pled guilty to, confessed, or was convicted of or bound over on criminal charges for the conduct underlying the alleged violation. See generally, *State ex. rel. Flowers v. DHSS*, 81 Wis. 2d 376 (1978). In these cases, probable cause is assumed and a final revocation hearing may best resolve the revocation issue. A guilty plea to charges for

conduct underlying the alleged violation in a foreign state is sufficient for a determination of probable cause for a violation, thus a case review need not be held. *State ex rel. Niederer v. Cady*, 72 Wis. 2d 311 (1976).

Subsection (2) (f) presents the questions the supervisor must address before making a decision. A finding of probable cause is sufficient to recommend revocation, providing the supervisor decides the violation is serious enough to warrant revocation and there are no alternatives to revocation that would better serve correctional objectives. Failure of the client to cooperate or answer questions may result in a recommendation for revocation. *State ex rel. Struzik v. DHSS*, 77 Wis. 2d 216 (1977); *State v. Evans*, 77 Wis. 2d 226 (1977).

A client does not have the right to appeal a supervisor's decision. An appeal would only serve to delay the final revocation hearing which must occur within a reasonable time after the case review.

Subsection (2) (g) provides for a second review if proper notice was not given initially, or if additional information relevant to the alleged violation becomes known after a decision not to recommend revocation. This provides for fairness to both the department and the client. The department has a continuing obligation to provide discovery to the client by sharing information that is exculpatory or other new evidence.

Subsection (3) (a) provides for notice to be sent of a final revocation hearing. The notice complies with existing practice and *Morrissey*. Additional allegations made subsequent to the case review may be included in this notice. *State ex rel. Flowers v. DHSS*, 81 Wis. 2d 376 (1978).

A client may waive his or her right to a final revocation hearing. *Locklear v. State*, 87 Wis. 2d 392 (Ct. App. 1978).

Subsection (3) (c) provides that a final hearing should take place within a reasonable time after a case review. The court in *Morrissey* held that a 2 month delay was not unreasonable. As a rule of thumb, it should be held within 90 days. See, e.g., *Walton v. Wright*, 407 F. Supp. 783 (W.D. Wis. 1976); the *per se* rulings *U.S. ex rel. Hahn v. Revis*, 520 F. 2d 632 (7th Cir. 1975), vacated, 560 F. 2d 264 (7th Cir. 1977), and *Johnson v. Holley*, 528 F. 2d 116 (7th Cir. 1976) have been vacated by *U.S. ex rel. Sims v. Sietaff*, 563 F. 2d 821 (7th Cir. 1977). However, hearings delayed over 90 days should not be lightly approved. The goal of the department is to hold such hearings within 30 to 40 days of the case review.

The requirement for a speedy final hearing is not only designed to satisfy *Morrissey* requirements. It also recognizes the public interest in speedy revocation and fairness to the client. While it may be more convenient for the parties, both the state and the client's attorney, to have long periods of time to prepare for the hearing, there are other interests that require attention. It makes correctional sense to hold a speedy final hearing because a client is usually detained in a county jail pending the outcome of the revocation process. Detaining a client in a county jail has the adverse effects including lack of programs for the client, high cost to the counties and the state, and overcrowding of the county jails.

Subsection (3) (d) provides a hearing examiner with the authority not to call a witness or not to allow the identity of a witness into the written record. Such information shall, however, be maintained in a confidential record. This is consistent with *Morrissey*. An examiner may decide to exercise this authority after receiving an *ex parte* communication requesting such nondisclosure for specific reasons. For example, if a 6 year old child was sexually assaulted by a client, it may be wise not to call the child to testify at the hearing. A child may become confused and frightened during the hearing and may be unable to provide any useful information. Also, the child's presence at the hearing may cause the child needless anxiety and may only serve to complicate the feelings he or she has over the alleged incident. A gentle conversation between the child and the examiner, away from the client and in the comforting presence of the child's parents may be the best way to elicit the necessary information without unduly harming the child. Witnesses should not be called and information about a witness' identity should not be kept from the client or the client's attorney unless the examiner specifically finds that such disclosure would endanger someone. Information, facts, evidence, or testimony obtained by the hearing examiner may be considered as evidence presented at the hearing, and are available to the client and client's attorney.

Subsection (3) (e) presents a general description of what is to occur at the hearing. The hearing examiner should weigh the credibility of the witnesses. *State ex rel. Cresci v. Schmidt*, 62 Wis. 2d 400 (1974). Formal rules of evidence are not applicable at revocation hearings. *State ex rel. Johnson v. Cady*, 50 Wis. 2d 540 (1971); *State v. Gerard*, 57 Wis. 2d 611, appeal dismissed, 414 U.S. 804 (1973). Hearsay evidence is admissible, but hearsay evidence alone is insufficient for revocation. It may be too costly to call every witness to testify and examiners should be particularly able to weigh the value of hearsay. If an examiner is not satisfied after receiving hearsay evidence, the witness may be required to appear.

Subsection (3) (e) 3 provides that evidence gathered pursuant to a search in violation of this chapter or the law may be admitted as evidence in a revocation hearing. There are several reasons for this. First, this encourages the making of adequate administrative rules. If such evidence could not be used, it is likely that there would be an undesirable change in the substance of the rules. This is so because the rules relating to searches are more strict than the requirements of the U.S. Constitution.

Second, this reflects the view that an exclusionary rule is not an effective way of encouraging compliance with the rules. Rather, enforcing the rules should be left to the department. This is a more desirable and effective way of enforcing compliance.

Third, to exclude the evidence is to misplace emphasis. The primary justification for excluding it is to exact compliance. *Elkins v. U.S.*, 384 U.S. 206 (1960). How the evidence was found does not bear on the issue of the guilt or innocence of the possessor of it. The responsibility for enforcement, an extremely important matter, should be addressed independently. Further, if the issue of admissibility were permitted to be litigated, it would likely delay administrative action against the staff member who violated the rule. This is the experience in the police field, where recommendations similar to the ones in these rules were made. American Bar Association's Project on Standards For Criminal Justice, *Standards Relating to the Urban Police Function* (1973), standard 4.4 There is great value in proceeding promptly against such staff members. This is the most effective deterrent to violation of the rules.

Primarily because the exclusion of evidence obtained as the result of an unreasonable search and seizure would not serve to deter future illegal search activity, a majority of jurisdictions take the view that such evidence is admissible in a probation revocation hearing even though it would not be admissible in a criminal prosecution to determine guilt. *U.S. ex rel. Lombardino v. Heyd*, 318 F. Supp. 848 (D.C. La 1970), *aff'd*, 438 F.2d 1027 (5th Cir. 1971), *cert. den.*, 404 U.S. 880 (1971); *Bruno v. State*, 343 So. 2d 1335 (1977); *Owens v. State*, 354 So. 2d 118 (1978); *State v. Spratt*, 386 A.2d 1094 (RI, 1978); *People v. Dowery*, 20 Ill. App. 3d 738, 312 NE 2d 682 (1974), *aff'd* 62 Ill. 2d 200 (1976); *People v. Coleman*, 13 Cal.3d 867, 533 P.2d 1024 (1976). Other than *ex parte* communication allowed under this section, *ex parte* communications should be avoided while the case is pending. *State ex rel. Gibson v. DHSS*, 86 Wis. 2d 346 (Ct. App. 1978); *Ramaker v. State*, 73 Wis. 2d 563 (1976).

Records of the department are admissible at the revocation hearing pursuant to the public records exception to the hearsay rule. S. 908.03 (8), Stats.; *State ex rel. Prellwitz v. Schmidt*, 73 Wis. 2d 36 (1976).

If the client offers a defense to the allegation, the examiner must consider it. *Snajer v. State*, 74 Wis. 2d 303 (1976).

The hearing examiner may take an active role at the hearing. Such a role need not affect neutrality and adds to the likelihood of making an informed decision. The examiner must consider all alternatives to revocation timely presented by the parties. Delays to allow the development of alternatives are not encouraged. A record must be kept of the proceedings. The record must be comprehensive and adequate. *Coleman v. Percy*, 86 Wis. 2d 336 (Ct. App. 1978). The procedure outlined under this subsection is in substantial accord with existing practice, but the hearsay provisions have been altered somewhat.

Subsection (3) (f) provides for a written decision based upon the evidence. See, e.g., *State ex rel. RR v. Schmidt*, 63 Wis. 2d 82 (1974); *Zizzo v. U.S.*, 470 F. 2d 105 (7th cir. 1972), *cert. den.*, 409 U.S. 1012 (1972).

The hearing examiner's decision must be included in an order that must be forwarded within 10 working days after the hearing. Subsection (3) (g). Bench orders are encouraged when they are consistent with sound, informed decision-making.

Subsection (3) (h) 1 provides that an examiner's order shall become effective and final 10 working days after it is issued, unless an appeal is filed within that time. This is advantageous to the client and department in that prolonged delay in implementing the order may be detrimental to continuity of supervision, particularly if the client is in custody. The client or bureau representative may request review of the examiner's decision by appealing to the secretary. The reasons for the request must be stated.

Subsection (3) (k) provides for a decision by the secretary. When a hearing examiner's decision is overruled by the secretary, and a client's probation is revoked, a decision stating the reasons for it based upon the evidence must be provided. *Ramaker v. State*, 73 Wis. 2d 563 (1976).

Subsection (4) provides the procedure for revocation when the client has waived the right to a case review, or a case review and final hearing. A supervisory staff member should assemble all relevant information and documents and forward them for review by the secretary. Experience teaches that the secretary's decision usually results in revocation. The de-

partment is encouraged to ask a client to have the assistance of legal counsel before accepting such waivers. Sometimes, however, this is not possible and uncounseled waivers are permitted.

Subsection (5) provides the supervisor with the authority to terminate revocation proceedings without revocation. For example, if clear evidence arises that the client did not commit the alleged violation, proceedings should be halted.

Subsection (6) provides for concurrent revocation and prosecution proceedings. See 65 *Op. Atty. Gen.* 20 (1976).

Delays in the revocation process may cause undue anxiety for the client, and may cause severe interruptions in supervision. It is in the client's interests to obtain a speedy informed decision regarding revocation.

The few court cases found on the subject of acquittals have taken the position that an acquittal in a criminal proceeding does not preclude revocation of supervision on the same charge because of the differences in nature of the two proceedings and to the different levels of proof involved therein. See, e.g., *Johnson v. State*, 240 Ga. 526, 242 S.E. 2d 53 (1978), *Bernal-Zazueta v. U.S.*, 225 F.2d 60 (1955).

Subsection (7) provides for accurate recordkeeping of revocation actions. See ch. HSS 307, Wis. Adm. Code, for an explanation of the importance of such recordkeeping.

For further information regarding client transport under sub. (8), see HSS 328.23, Wis. Adm. Code.

Subsection (10) provides the procedures for revocation for those clients on probation or parole committed under ss. 161.47 and 971.17, Stats., and ss. 54.04 and 54.07, Stats. (1975). Special revocation procedures for these clients are provided for under ss. 161.47 (1), 971.17 (2) and (3), Stats., and ss. 54.05 and 54.11, Stats. (1976). This subsection is consistent with these statutory provisions and the goals and objectives under this chapter.

This chapter is in substantial accord with the American Correctional Association's *Manual of Standards for Adult Probation and Parole Field Services* (1977), standards 3141-3144 and 3146; the American Correctional Association's *Manual of Standards for Adult Parole Authorities* (1978), standards 1098-1104; the American Bar Association's *Standards Relating to Probation* (Approved Draft, 1970) standards 5.1 and 5.4; and 15 *Cal. Adm. Code*, 2616-2618, 2635, 2636(a) and (b), 2643, 2645-2646, 2665-2667, 2668(a), (b), and (c).