
8.2 Misdemeanors Tried in District Court

A. Process as Pleading

The criminal process issued to the defendant—that is, the citation, criminal summons, magistrate's order, or arrest warrant—usually doubles as the criminal pleading in a misdemeanor case in district court. *See* G.S. 15A-922(a) (listing types of process that may serve as pleading in misdemeanor case); Official Commentary to G.S. Ch. 15A, Article 49.

An order for arrest is the one form of criminal process not considered a criminal pleading. An order for arrest can be issued in conjunction with a criminal pleading. By itself, however, it does not charge a crime. *See infra* § 8.2C, Types of Misdemeanor Pleadings.

B. Requirements for Misdemeanor Pleadings

Generally. Misdemeanor pleadings are generally subject to the requirements for valid pleadings in G.S. 15A-924(a), which states that a pleading must contain:

- a plain and concise factual statement supporting every element of the offense charged;
- a separate count addressed to each offense charged;
- a reference to the statute or other provision of law that the defendant allegedly violated;
- the name or other identification of the defendant;
- the county where the offense took place; and
- the date on which, or time period during which, the offense took place.

G.S. 15A-924(a) also requires in felony cases that the State allege in the pleading certain aggravating factors if it intends to use them. *See infra* § 8.7B, Notice and Pleading Requirements after *Blakely*. This requirement does not apply to misdemeanor impaired driving cases tried in district court; however, if the defendant is tried for an impaired driving offense in superior court, including in a trial de novo following appeal of a district court conviction, the State must give written notice of its intent to use any aggravating or grossly aggravating factors. G.S. 20-179(a1)(1).

Unlike other misdemeanor pleadings, citations are not subject to the requirements of G.S. 15A-924 but are instead governed by the more relaxed requirements of G.S. 15A-302. *State v. Jones*, 371 N.C. 548 (2018) (citation that omitted several elements valid to confer jurisdiction; citations not subject to G.S. 15A-924). Courts may also be more lenient in permitting amendments or tolerating technical mistakes in misdemeanor pleadings than in superior court pleadings. (For a discussion of application of these requirements in superior court, see *infra* § 8.4C, Sufficiency of Pleadings.) Nevertheless, every pleading must be sufficient to serve the basic purposes listed at the beginning of this chapter, and pleadings that fail to do so may be challenged on statutory and constitutional grounds. Common errors in district court are addressed *infra* in § 8.2F, Common Pleading Defects in District Court; errors in superior court are addressed *infra* in § 8.5, Common Pleading Defects in Superior Court.

Pleading rules for certain offenses. There are specific statutory pleading requirements for some offenses, such as larceny, forgery, and receiving stolen goods. *See* G.S. 15-148 through G.S. 15-151. Some examples are discussed *infra* in § 8.2F, Common Pleading Defects in District Court and § 8.5C, Pleading Does Not State Required Elements of Crime.

Short-form pleadings. The North Carolina General Assembly has enacted statutes permitting abbreviated forms of pleadings for some misdemeanors. *See* G.S. 20-138.1(c) (pleading requirements for impaired driving); G.S. 20-138.2(c) (pleading requirements for commercial impaired driving); *see also* G.S 20-179(a1)(1) (requiring State to file written notice of intent to use aggravating factors in impaired driving cases in superior court). For a discussion of pleading requirements for aggravating factors in implied consent cases, see *infra* "Misdemeanors, including impaired driving offenses" in § 8.7B, Notice and Pleading Requirements after *Blakely*.

Probable cause. A criminal charge must be supported by probable cause that a crime was committed and that the person in question committed the crime. Probable cause must exist to support each element of the offense and must be established by an affidavit or by oral testimony under oath or affirmation. JESSICA SMITH, CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS BEFORE MAGISTRATES at 9 (UNC School of Government, 2014).

C. Types of Misdemeanor Pleadings

Citation. A citation is a written charge issued by a law enforcement officer. A principal difference between a citation and other forms of process is that a law enforcement officer rather than a judicial official issues it. An officer may issue a citation for any misdemeanor or infraction for which the officer has probable cause. *See* G.S. 15A-302(b). An officer may arrest a person for a misdemeanor if grounds exist for a warrantless arrest under G.S. 15A-401(b) but has no authority to arrest for an infraction. *See* G.S. 15A-1113; ROBERT L. FARB, ARREST, SEARCH, AND INVESTIGATION IN NORTH CAROLINA 88 (5th ed. 2016). A person arrested without a warrant must be taken before a magistrate. If the magistrate finds probable cause that a crime has been committed, the magistrate may issue a magistrate's order, discussed below. If a magistrate issues a

magistrate's order by signing a citation or issuing a separate magistrate's order for the offense alleged in the citation, the special rules for citations discussed here do not apply.

The North Carolina courts have held that because a citation is typically prepared by an officer on the scene, citations are not subject to the pleading requirements of G.S. 15A-924 but are instead governed by the lesser requirements of G.S. 15A-302. *State v. Jones*, 371 N.C. 548 (2018). Under G.S. 15A-302(c), the citation must:

- identify the crime charged, including the date and, where material, the property and other people involved;
- list the name and address of the person cited or provide other identification if that information cannot be determined;
- identify the officer issuing the citation; and
- direct the person cited to appear in a designated court at a designated time and date.

Unlike the requirements of G.S. 15A-924(a), citations need only "identify" the crime charged and need not recite each element of the offense. In *Jones*, the court found a citation sufficient that alleged that a motorist violated G.S. 20-138.7(a) by having an open container after drinking. The court found that the citation adequately put the defendant on notice of the crime charged even though it did not allege every element of the offense (operating a motor vehicle when having an open container of alcohol while alcohol remained in the driver's system).

Under G.S. 15A-922(c), the defendant has the right to object to being tried on a citation. Upon the defendant's objection, the prosecution must prepare a separate pleading. Usually the new pleading is a statement of charges, discussed below. Objecting to trial on a citation may not be advisable because the objection gives the prosecution an opportunity before trial to correct errors or add new charges in a statement of charges. If the defendant wishes to object to being tried on a citation, he or she must do so in district court; the objection may not be raised for the first time in superior court on a trial de novo. *See State v. Jones*, 371 N.C. 548 (2018); *State v. Monroe*, 57 N.C. App. 597 (1982).

If a person fails to appear in court on an *infraction* charged in a citation, the person may not be arrested for failing to appear or for criminal contempt; instead, the court must issue a criminal summons. *See* G.S. 15A-1116(b); *see also* G.S. 15A-302 Official Commentary (since citation is issued by officer and not judicial official, failure to appear is not contempt of court). G.S. 15A-305(b)(3), however, permits the court to issue an order for arrest if a person fails to appear for a *misdemeanor* charged in a citation.

Magistrate's order. A magistrate's order is used when a person has been arrested without a warrant. A magistrate may issue an order for any criminal offense (felony or misdemeanor) for which the magistrate finds probable cause. *See* G.S. 15A-511(c) (describing procedures magistrate must follow). If an officer issues a citation for a misdemeanor and arrests the person, the magistrate may convert the citation into a magistrate's order by signing the citation, or he or she may prepare a separate

magistrate's order on a form similar to an arrest warrant. A magistrate sometimes will issue an arrest warrant instead of a magistrate's order when a person has been arrested without a warrant. Although technically improper (since the person already is under arrest), the error is probably inconsequential. *See generally State v. Matthews*, 40 N.C. App. 41 (1979) (failure of magistrate to issue magistrate's order after defendant was cited and arrested for traffic offenses did not render arrest unlawful).

Criminal summons. A judicial official may issue a criminal summons for any criminal offense or infraction for which probable cause exists. *See* G.S. 15A-303. A summons may charge a felony, but it typically has been used for misdemeanors only. If a summons is issued, the person is not taken into custody or placed under pretrial release conditions; he or she is only directed to appear in court. A criminal summons must contain a statement of the crime or infraction charged and must inform the defendant that he or she may be held in contempt of court for failure to appear as directed. A court date must be set within one month of issuance of the summons unless the judicial official notes cause in the summons for setting a later court date. *Id.*

North Carolina law expresses a preference for the use of a criminal summons over an arrest warrant. *See* G.S. 15A-304(b)(1); Official Commentary to G.S. 15A-303, G.S. 15A-304 (expressing preference for summons when circumstances do not necessitate taking person into custody). Further, the law ordinarily requires a summons instead of a warrant for citizen-initiated charges. G.S. 15A-304(b)(3) states that where the information supporting probable cause is supplied by someone other than a sworn law enforcement officer, the judicial official must issue a criminal summons instead of an arrest warrant except where: (1) there is corroborating evidence from a law enforcement officer or at least one other disinterested witness; (2) the judicial official determines that having the complainant obtain investigative services from law enforcement would constitute a substantial burden to the complainant; or (3) there is substantial evidence that the accused should be taken into custody based on the factors in G.S. 15A-304(b)(1).

Legislative note: Effective December 1, 2017, G.S. 15A-304 was amended for citizen-initiated charges to require a written affidavit in support of probable cause where the complainant is not a law enforcement officer. 2017 N.C. Sess. Laws Ch. 176 (S 384). Effective October 1, 2018, the requirement of a written affidavit from a citizen complainant was repealed. 2018 N.C. Sess. Laws 40 (S 168). Some districts may still require written affidavits for citizen-initiated charges. Required or not, affidavits are often used in citizen-initiated cases as a matter of practice. The affidavit will normally be placed in the court file and thus available for review. Because affidavits contain sworn statements of the complainant or witnesses, it is important for defense counsel to obtain and review any affidavits in the file before trial or plea negotiations.

Arrest warrant. A judicial official may issue an arrest warrant for any criminal offense supported by probable cause when the person has not been taken into custody previously for the charge. *See* G.S. 15A-304. The warrant must include a statement of the crime charged. *Id.* The law expresses a preference for the use of a criminal summons, discussed above, but many counties continue to rely heavily on arrest warrants.

Statement of charges. A misdemeanor statement of charges is a criminal pleading prepared by the prosecutor, charging a misdemeanor. A statement of charges supersedes all previous pleadings in the case. Only those charges alleged in the statement of charges (not those in the original warrant or other process) may proceed to trial. *See* G.S. 15A-922(a).

Before arraignment in district court, a prosecutor may file a statement of charges adding new charges or amending charges that are insufficient. *See* G.S. 15A-922(d); *State v. Madry*, 140 N.C. App. 600 (2000). If a prosecutor files a statement of charges before arraignment in district court, the defendant is entitled to a continuance of at least three working days unless the judge finds that the statement of charges does not materially change the pleadings and that no additional time is necessary. *See* G.S. 15A-922(b)(2).

After arraignment in district court, the prosecutor may file a statement of charges only if the defendant objects to the sufficiency of the pleading (for example, an arrest warrant), the judge finds the pleading insufficient, and the statement of charges does not change the nature of the offense. *See* G.S. 15A-922(e); *State v. Capps*, ___ N.C. App. ___, 828 S.E.2d 733, *rev. granted*, 372 N.C. 358 (2019); *State v. Wall*, 235 N.C. App. 196 (2014). In other words, without an objection from the defendant, the prosecution has no authority to issue a statement of charges after arraignment in district court (although the prosecution may be allowed to amend the existing pleading under G.S. 15A-922(f) if the amendment does not change the nature of the offense, discussed in D, below). For more information on the use of statements of charges, see Jeff Welty, *Court of Appeals "Capps" Prosecutors' Use of Statements of Charges in Superior Court*, N.C. CRIM. L., UNC SCH. OF GOV'T BLOG (June 3, 2019). [The North Carolina Supreme Court reversed the Court of Appeals' decision in *Capps* on June 5, 2020, after this chapter was completed.]

A judge's order finding a pleading insufficient must set a time limit on filing a statement of charges—ordinarily, three working days unless the judge determines that a longer period is justified. The order also must provide that if a statement of charges is not filed within the time allowed, the charges must be dismissed. *See* G.S. 15A-922(b)(3). If the prosecutor files a statement of charges, the defendant is entitled to a continuance of at least three working days unless the judge finds that a continuance is not required. *See* G.S. 15A-922(b)(2).

If permissible, a statement of charges adding new offenses or amending charges that are insufficient must be filed within the statute of limitations, ordinarily two years from the date of offense. *See State v. Madry*, 140 N.C. App. 600 (2000); *State v. Caudill*, 68 N.C. App. 268 (1984). Under the former version of G.S. 15-1, dismissal of a fatally defective misdemeanor pleading after two years from the date of offense barred the State from proceeding on a new pleading. Current G.S 15-1 allows the State one additional year after dismissal of a misdemeanor pleading for a fatal defect in which to recharge the defendant with the same offense. For more information on the statute of limitations, see *supra* § 7.1A, Statute of Limitations for Misdemeanors. *See also* G.S. 15-1(b) (establishing ten-

year statute of limitations for certain misdemeanors against children committed on or after December 1, 2019).

Order for arrest. An order for arrest is an order issued by a judicial official directing law enforcement to take the named person into custody. *See* G.S. 15A-305. An order for arrest is the one form of criminal process that is not considered a criminal pleading. An order for arrest is often issued for a defendant's failure to appear in court after a pleading has been issued, but it may be issued in conjunction with a pleading, as when a judge issues an order for arrest after a grand jury returns a true bill of indictment. *See* G.S. 15A-305(b) (listing circumstances in which an order for arrest may be issued). The order for arrest standing alone does not charge a crime, however.

D. Amendment of Misdemeanor Pleadings

A prosecutor may not amend a warrant or other process if the amendment changes the nature of the offense charged. *See* G.S. 15A-922(f); *see also infra* § 8.4D, Amendment of Indictments (discussing restrictions on amendments to superior court indictments). *But cf. infra* § 8.3B, Required Pleadings in Superior Court (discussing statute allowing amendment of warrant in superior court to change name of rightful owner of property). Thus, even before trial the prosecution may not amend a warrant if the amendment changes the nature of the charged offense. *See State v. Madry*, 140 N.C. App. 600 (2000). Any amendment must be in writing; otherwise, it is not effective. *See State v. Powell*, 10 N.C. App. 443 (1971).

A prosecutor may prepare a statement of charges that changes the nature of the offense alleged in a warrant or other process, but only before arraignment and as permitted by the applicable statute of limitations. *See* G.S. 15A-922(d); *State v. Bryant*, ___ N.C. App. ___, 833 S.E.2d 641 (2019); Shea Denning, *Changing Charges after State v. Bryant*, N.C. CRIM. L., UNC SCH. OF GOV'T BLOG (Oct. 9, 2019); *see also supra* § 8.2C, Types of Misdemeanor Pleadings.

E. Timing and Effect of Motions to Dismiss in District Court

There are two basic grounds for moving to dismiss based on the pleadings: (1) the pleading fails to charge an offense properly—in other words, the pleading is fatally defective; and (2) the proof does not support the allegations in the pleading—in other words, there is a fatal variance between the pleading and proof.

Motion to dismiss for defective pleading. The remedy for a defective pleading is a motion to dismiss under G.S. 15A-952. *See* G.S. 15A-924(e). A motion to dismiss is the equivalent of a motion to quash under pre-15A practice. *See State v. Brown*, 81 N.C. App. 281 (1986). Some defects, including the failure to include an element of the offense or the misidentification of the victim, may strip the district court of jurisdiction over the offense. A defendant may move to dismiss for a jurisdictional defect "at any time." *See* G.S. 15A-952(d); G.S. 15A-954(c); *see also State v. Wallace*, 351 N.C. 481, 503 (2000) ("where an indictment is alleged to be invalid on its face, thereby depriving the trial court

of its jurisdiction, a challenge to that indictment may be made at any time, even if it was not contested in the trial court").

Generally, defense counsel should move to dismiss for a defective pleading at or after arraignment in district court. Thus, when the judge or prosecutor calls the case and asks the defendant how he or she pleads, counsel may say, "Mr. Jones pleads not guilty and moves to dismiss the pleading as fatally defective because [state ground]." Unless the defect concerns a matter on which an amendment is allowable, the court "must" dismiss. *See* G.S. 15A-924(e). If the motion to dismiss is made before arraignment, the State can correct the error by filing a statement of charges. *See supra* § 8.2C, Types of Misdemeanor Pleadings. If counsel does not move to dismiss until after the State has presented its evidence, the judge may be less receptive to the motion; the judge may be more invested in the case, having spent time on it and heard evidence of guilt. Ordinarily, a fatally defective pleading that fails to confer jurisdiction on the court does not implicate double jeopardy concerns—because the court never had jurisdiction, the defendant was never placed in jeopardy. The defendant may therefore be retried on a new pleading (as long as the new pleading issues within the statute of limitations), regardless of whether the matter was dismissed before, during, or after trial. *See infra* "Effect of dismissal on subsequent charges" in this subsection E (discussing circumstances in which double jeopardy may apply).

If the pleading error involves "duplicity"—that is, the pleading alleges more than one offense in a single count—counsel may make a motion to require the State to elect (in effect, a motion to require the State to dismiss all but one of the offenses alleged in the particular count). *See* G.S. 15A-924(b); *see also infra* § 8.2F, Common Pleading Defects in District Court.

Motion to dismiss for variance. Even if the pleading properly charges a crime, the proof may vary from the pleading. "The State's proof must conform to the specific allegations contained in the indictment [or other pleading]. If the evidence fails to do so, it is insufficient to convict the defendant." *State v. Pulliam*, 78 N.C. App. 129, 132 (1985); *see also State v. Miller*, 137 N.C. App. 450 (2000) (Due Process precludes convicting defendant of offense not alleged in warrant or indictment); *State v. Bruce*, 90 N.C. App. 547, 550 (1988) ("defendant must be convicted, if he is convicted at all, of the particular offense with which he has been charged in the bill of indictment").

A challenge to a variance between pleading and proof should be raised by a motion to dismiss for insufficient evidence at the close of the State's evidence and at the close of all of the evidence. *State v. Faircloth*, 297 N.C. 100, 107 (1979) (explaining that a fatal variance between the indictment and the proof is properly raised by a motion to dismiss). When moving to dismiss, counsel should specifically allege a fatal variance between the pleading and proof as to each charge to alert the judge to the nature of the problem. For example, if the pleading charges assault on an officer, and the proof shows resisting an officer but not an assault, move to dismiss for insufficient evidence of assault and for fatal variance between the crime alleged in the charging instrument and the State's evidence. In superior court, the failure to specifically assert fatal variance when moving

to dismiss waives the error on appeal. *See State v. Mason*, 222 N.C. App. 223 (2012) (by failing to assert fatal variance as a basis for his motion to dismiss in superior court, defendant failed to preserve the argument for appellate review).

A related problem arises when the pleading charges one offense and the prosecution seeks conviction of a greater offense—for example, the pleading charges simple assault and the prosecution seeks to prove assault with a deadly weapon. The prosecution is bound by its pleading, and defense counsel should object to judgment on the greater offense. *See, e.g.*, *State v. Moses*, 154 N.C. App. 332 (2002) (State could not amend indictment alleging misdemeanor eluding arrest to add allegation of aggravating factor and charge felony eluding arrest; amendment substantially altered charge).

Effect of dismissal on subsequent charges. When the court dismisses a charge on the ground that the pleading is defective, double jeopardy ordinarily does not bar a second trial of the offense based on a proper pleading. *See, e.g.*, *State v. Goforth*, 65 N.C. App. 302, 306 (1983) (where indictment failed to allege element of offense, court arrested judgment but noted that "[t]he State may proceed against the defendants if it so desires, upon new and sufficient bills of indictment"). In some instances, however, jeopardy may be a bar. *See, e.g.*, *Moses*, 154 N.C. App. 332 (indictment charging assault with deadly weapon inflicting serious injury failed to identify weapon and so was insufficient; but, indictment adequately alleged and evidence supported lesser offense of assault inflicting serious injury, and court remanded for entry of judgment for that offense). Double jeopardy is discussed further *infra* in § 8.6A, Double Jeopardy.

When the court dismisses a charge on the ground that there was a fatal variance between pleading and proof, double jeopardy bars a second trial on the charge alleged in the pleading but does not necessarily bar a subsequent prosecution on offenses that were proven but not pled. *See, e.g.*, *State v. Stinson*, 263 N.C. 283 (1965) (no bar to subsequent prosecution where indictment charged defendant with breaking and entering with intent to steal property of shop's corporate owner, but evidence showed the property was owned by an individual instead); *State v. Wall*, 96 N.C. App. 45 (1989) (no bar to subsequent prosecution for sale and delivery to intermediary when there was fatal variance between indictment charging defendant with sale and delivery to undercover officer and evidence showing sale and delivery to intermediary). Jeopardy may bar a subsequent prosecution, however, if the new charge is a greater offense of the charge that was properly pled. *See infra* § 8.6A, Double Jeopardy.

As a practical matter, a successful motion to dismiss may end a misdemeanor prosecution whether or not Double Jeopardy would constitute a bar.

Effect of statute of limitations. There is a two-year statute of limitations for most misdemeanors. *See* G.S. 15-1; *see also supra* § 7.1A, Statute of Limitations for Misdemeanors. When a misdemeanor pleading is defective, or the offense proven at trial was not the offense alleged in the pleading, the statute of limitations is not tolled. It continues to run. *See State v. Hundley*, 272 N.C. 491 (1968) (statute of limitations not tolled by issuance of void warrant). Even though it is permissible as a matter of pleading

practice for a prosecutor to issue a statement of charges in place of a void warrant, such a statement of charges is barred if it is issued after the statute of limitations has expired. *See State v. Madry*, 140 N.C. App. 600 (2000).

G.S. 15-1 provides a one-year grace period for refiling when a pleading is dismissed as fatally defective. Former G.S. 15-1 provided that if an indictment obtained within the statute of limitations period was found to be defective, the State had one year from the time it abandoned the indictment to correct the error and re-indict the defendant. This provision applied only to defective indictments; it did not apply to defective warrants or other pleadings. *Madry*, 140 N.C. App. at 603. Under the current version of G.S. 15-1, if any pleading is found defective, so that no judgment may be entered on it, the State has one year from the time of the dismissal of the flawed pleading to recharge the defendant with the same offense in a new pleading.

F. Common Pleading Defects in District Court

Below are common pleading problems you may see in district court. Similar problems may arise in indictments in superior court. *See infra* § 8.5, Common Pleading Defects in Superior Court. As discussed in the preceding section, if the pleading is defective you should file a motion to dismiss at or after arraignment. If the problem is a variance, move to dismiss on the ground of variance and insufficiency of the evidence at the close of the State's evidence and at the close of all the evidence.

Failure to charge offense or element of offense. Like other pleadings, most misdemeanor pleadings must state all essential elements of the crime. *See* G.S. 15A-924(a)(5); *State v. Palmer*, 293 N.C. 633, 639 (1977) (both indictments and warrants must "allege lucidly and accurately all the essential elements of the offense endeavored to be charged" (citation omitted)); *State v. Camp*, 59 N.C. App. 38 (1982) (stating these requirements for warrants); *see also State v. Cook*, 272 N.C. 728 (1968) (reference to statute allegedly violated was insufficient to cure failure of warrant to allege element of offense of driving without a license, namely, that the offense was committed on a public highway). *But cf. State v. Martin*, 13 N.C. App. 613 (1972) (warrant was not fatally defective where it failed to allege highway was a "public" highway). In *State v. Jones*, 371 N.C. 548 (2018), the Supreme Court found an exception to the general rule that a pleading must state all essential elements of the crime for offenses charged by citation, holding that a citation is sufficient if it identifies and puts the defendant on sufficient notice of the crime charged. *See supra* "Citation" in § 8.2C, Types of Misdemeanor Pleadings.

If an essential element is missing, or if the charging language is too vague to identify an offense clearly, the defendant should move to dismiss. Any attempt to revise the charge may constitute a change in the nature of the offense and therefore be impermissible. *See State v. Moore*, 162 N.C. App. 268 (2004) (in pleading for possession of drug paraphernalia, State must apprise defendant of item State contends was drug paraphernalia; State could not amend indictment to change alleged item, which would constitute substantial alteration of charge); *State v. Madry*, 140 N.C. App. 600 (2000)

(warrant that charged "taking bears with bait" too vague to charge offense where statute prohibited possessing, selling, buying, or transporting bears); *State v. Wells*, 59 N.C. App. 682 (1982) (citation that charged resisting arrest was fatally defective for omitting duty that officer was performing); *State v. Wallace*, 49 N.C. App. 475 (1980) (citation that charged unlawfully operating vehicle for purpose of hunting deer with dogs did not clearly and properly charge violation of deer hunting statute); *State v. Powell*, 10 N.C. App. 443 (1971) (the words "resist arrest" in citation were insufficient to charge offense). *But see State v. Hill*, 262 N.C. App. 113 (2018) (indictment for assault that omitted the word "assault" from the allegation was sufficient where the pleading identified the correct offense and statute and alleged willful injury of the victim by the defendant); *State v. Mather*, 221 N.C. App. 593 (2012) (when charging carrying a concealed gun under G.S. 14-269, the exception in G.S. 14-269(a1)(2) (having a permit) is a defense, not an essential element, and need not be alleged in the indictment); *State v. Ballance*, 218 N.C. App. 202, (2012) (statute governing the taking of black bears with bait does not create a separate offense for each type of bait listed; the crime may be established by evidence showing any one of various alternative elements); *State v. Bollinger*, 192 N.C. App. 241 (2008) (description of weapon in pleading for carrying concealed weapon was surplusage), *aff'd per curiam*, 363 N.C. 251 (2009). For further discussion of these principles, see Jonathan Holbrook, *Not Quite Defective Indictments*, N.C. CRIM. L., UNC SCH. OF GOV'T BLOG (Nov. 13, 2018).

Misidentification of victim. A pleading must correctly identify the victim of the alleged offense. Failure to identify the victim constitutes grounds to dismiss. *See State v. Powell*, 10 N.C. App. 443 (1971) (failure to name officer who was victim of assault on officer rendered warrant invalid); *see also State v. Banks*, 263 N.C. 784 (1965) (warrant charging peeping into room occupied by female was fatally defective because it failed to name female); *State v. Schuler*, 263 N.C. App. 366 (2018) (indictment that used "Victim #1" to identify victim fatally defective); *In re M.S.*, 199 N.C. App. 260 (2009) (juvenile petitions alleging first-degree sexual offense that did not name the victim or give the victim's initials, but simply stated "a child under the age of 13 years," were fatally defective and deprived the court of jurisdiction to accept the juvenile's admission of delinquency); *State v. McKoy*, 196 N.C. App. 650 (2009) (use of initials "RTB" with no periods to identify victim upheld in second-degree rape and sexual offense case).

Sometimes the pleading will name a victim but misidentify him or her, which will not become apparent until the State puts on its evidence. If the State's proof of the identity of the victim varies from the allegation in the pleading, the variance constitutes grounds to dismiss the charge. *See State v. Call*, 349 N.C. 382 (1998) (judgment arrested on court's own motion because of fatal variance between name of victim alleged in indictment—Gabriel Hernandez Gervacio—and victim's actual name—Gabriel Gonzalez); *State v. Abraham*, 338 N.C. 315 (1994) (error to allow State to amend assault indictment to change name of victim from Carlose Antoine Latter to Joice Hardin, which fundamentally altered nature of charge).

A misspelling or incorrect order in the victim's name, if it does not mislead the defendant as to the identity of the victim, will not provide grounds for dismissal. *See, e.g., State v.*

Williams, 269 N.C. 376 (1967) (indictment sufficient where victim's name "Madeleine" was stated in indictment as "Mateleane"); *State v. Hewson*, 182 N.C. App. 196 (2007) (no error in allowing State to amend murder indictment to change victim's name from "Gail Hewson Tice" to "Gail Tice Hewson"; no indication defendant was surprised or confused about identity of victim); *State v. McNair*, 146 N.C. App. 674 (2001) (no error where State was allowed to change "Donald" to "Ronald" on two of seven indictments; defendant could not have been surprised or misled); *State v. Wilson*, 135 N.C. App. 504 (1999) (no fatal variance between indictment naming victim "Peter M. Thompson" and evidence at trial indicating victim's name was "Peter Thomas" where defendant's testimony revealed that he was aware of the identity of the victim); *State v. Isom*, 65 N.C. App. 223 (1983) (indictment adequate that named victim as "Eldred Allison" when actual name was "Elton Allison"; names were sufficiently similar to fall within doctrine of *idem sonans*, which means sounds the same).

For a further discussion of these principles, see Smith, *Criminal Indictment*, at 9–12; Shea Denning, *Naming the Victim of a Sexual Assault*, N.C. CRIM. L., UNC SCH. OF GOV'T BLOG (June 12, 2019); Jessica Smith, *What's in a Name?*, N.C. CRIM. L., UNC SCH. OF GOV'T BLOG (Jan. 17, 2012); Jeff Welty, *Use of Initials in Charging Documents*, N.C. CRIM. L., UNC SCH. OF GOV'T BLOG (Jan. 23, 2009).

Allegation of ownership of property for larceny and related offenses. Generally, a pleading for theft offenses must correctly name the owner of the stolen property. *See State v. Greene*, 289 N.C. 578 (1976) (indictment in larceny case must allege person who has property interest in property stolen, and State must prove that alleged person is owner); *State v. Biller*, 252 N.C. 783 (1960) (judgment arrested where superior court judge denied defendants' motion to quash warrants that did not sufficiently name owner of stolen property) (per curiam); *State v. Thompson*, 6 N.C. App. 64 (1969) (warrant charging theft from "Belk's Department Store" was fatally defective for failure to allege owner of property was either a natural person or a legal entity capable of owning property). *But see State v. Brawley*, 370 N.C. 626 (2018) (indictment alleged victim as "Belk's Department Stores, an entity capable of owning property"; State need not identify specific form of legal entity as long as there is some allegation that names the entity and identifies it as an entity capable of owning property). The requirement that the property owner be correctly identified does not apply in shoplifting cases. *See State v. Wooten*, 18 N.C. App. 652 (1973) (State need not allege corporate status of store in shoplifting prosecution).

The failure to identify the owner, or to identify an entity capable of owning property, can make the pleading defective and subject to dismissal. *See, e.g., State v. Woody*, 132 N.C. App. 788 (1999) (indictment alleging conversion was fatally defective and could not support conviction because it failed to allege that victim, P & R Unlimited, was a legal entity capable of owning property); *State v. Hughes*, 118 N.C. App. 573 (1995) (error to allow amendment to indictment that changed alleged victim of embezzlement from individual, "Mike Frost, President of Petroleum World, Inc.," to corporation, "Petroleum World, Inc."). *But see State v. Campbell*, 368 N.C. 83 (2015) (indictment identifying property owner as "Manna Baptist Church" was sufficient to plead an entity capable of

ownership; the word "church" sufficiently pleads an entity capable of ownership, overruling previous cases holding otherwise); *State v. Ellis*, 368 N.C. 342 (2015) (public universities are authorized by statute to hold property in North Carolina; injury to personal property indictment that alleged North Carolina State University and NCSU High Voltage Distribution as victims was sufficient); *State v. Wooten*, 18 N.C. App. 652 (1973) (State need not allege corporate status of store in shoplifting prosecution).

Misidentification of the rightful owner is grounds for dismissal if the State's evidence on ownership varies from the allegations in the pleading. *See State v. Eppley*, 282 N.C. 249 (1972) (fatal variance when person named in indictment as owner of shotgun testified that gun was property of his father). *But cf. State v. Warren*, 225 N.C. App. 791 (2013) (no fatal variance in embezzlement case where indictment named Smokey Park Hospitality, Inc., d/b/a Comfort Inn; while evidence showed Smokey Park Hospitality never owned the hotel, it acted as a management company and ran the business and thus had a special property interest in the embezzled money); *State v. Holley*, 35 N.C. App. 64 (1978) (no fatal variance where larceny indictment named owner of gun and lawful possessor while evidence was presented only as to identity of lawful possessor); *State v. Robinette*, 33 N.C. App. 42 (1977) (no fatal variance where indictment alleged ownership of stolen property in father, but evidence showed that it belonged to his minor child and was kept in the father's residence where father had custody and control of minor child's property).

Some offenses involving theft do not require that the owner of the property be alleged. *See State v. Thompson*, 359 N.C. 77 (2004) (indictment for armed robbery need not name subject of robbery); *State v. Jones*, 151 N.C. App. 317 (2002) (not necessary to allege name of owner of goods in prosecution for possession of stolen goods); *State v. Burroughs*, 147 N.C. App. 693 (2001) (indictment for robbery need not name actual legal owner of property); *State v. Willis*, 127 N.C. App. 549 (1997) (evidence of ownership not required for armed robbery prosecution; State need only show the property was taken from the presence of the victim); *see also State v. Spivey*, 368 N.C. 739 (2016) (indictment for injury to real property need not state name of owner but instead need only identify the real property at issue); *State v. Wooten*, 18 N.C. App. 652 (1973) (State need not allege corporate status of store in shoplifting prosecution).

A statutory exception allows the State to amend a warrant in superior court to change the name of the rightful owner of property if the amendment does not prejudice the defendant. *See* G.S. 15-24.1; *State v. Reeves*, 62 N.C. App. 219 (1983).

For a further discussion of alleging ownership in larceny and other cases, see Smith, *Criminal Indictment*, at 32–38; *see also* Shea Denning, *Brawley, Belk's, and Charging Crime in Modern, Southern Style*, N.C. CRIM. L., UNC SCH. OF GOV'T BLOG, (May 9, 2018).

Misidentification of defendant. All criminal pleadings must name or otherwise identify the defendant. *See* G.S. 15A-924(a)(1). Omission of the defendant's name constitutes grounds to dismiss. *See State v. Simpson*, 302 N.C. 613 (1981) (failure to name or otherwise identify defendant was fatal defect in indictment). A criminal pleading that

identifies the defendant by a nickname or street name may be acceptable. *See State v. Spooner*, 28 N.C. App. 203 (1975) (pleading that named Michael Spooner as "Mike Spooner" acceptable); *State v. Taylor*, 61 N.C. App. 589 (1983) (warrant that included only defendant's street name "Blood" was not invalid; warrant had correct address, and State knew defendant's street name only); *see also State v. Young*, 54 N.C. App. 366 (1981) (in superior court, defendant waived objection to misnomer regarding his name by entering plea and going to trial without making objection), *aff'd*, 305 N.C. 391 (1982).

Date, time, and place of offense. A pleading must allege the time and place of an offense with enough specificity to enable the defendant to defend against the charge. *See* G.S. 15A-924(a)(3), (a)(4); *see also State v. Smith*, 267 N.C. 755 (1966) (per curiam) (pleading alleging breaking and entering was fatally defective where it did not identify building with particularity). *But see State v. McCormick*, 204 N.C. App. 105 (2010) (no fatal variance where burglary indictment alleged defendant broke and entered house located at 407 Ward's Branch Road, Sugar Grove Watauga County" but evidence at trial was house number was 317).

A defendant who objects to the lack of specificity in the date of a pleading must demonstrate that the vagueness impaired his or her defense. *See* G.S. 15A-924(a)(4) ("Error as to a date or its omission is not ground for dismissal of the charges or for reversal of a conviction if time was not of the essence with respect to the charge and the error or omission did not mislead the defendant to his prejudice."); G.S. 15-155 ("No judgment upon any indictment . . . shall be stayed or reversed . . . for omitting to state the time at which the offense was committed in any case where time is not of the essence of the offense, nor for stating the time imperfectly . . . .").

The N.C. Supreme Court has stated that the requirement of temporal specificity diminishes in cases of sexual offenses on children; it remains a requirement, however. *See State v. Everett*, 328 N.C. 72 (1991) (child sex offense indictment where date could have been February or March was not too vague to support conviction); *State v. Custis*, 162 N.C. App. 715 (2004) (explaining that a variance as to time, even in child sexual abuse cases, is material and of the essence if the variance deprives the defendant the opportunity to adequately present a defense).

The North Carolina courts have often permitted amendments of pleadings to correct errors in the date or place of an offense. *See, e.g., State v. Grady*, 136 N.C. App. 394 (2000) (allowing amendment of indictment to change address of dwelling where controlled substance was used); *State v. Campbell*, 133 N.C. App. 531(1999) (allowing amendment of dates alleged in indictment where defendant was not misled as to nature of charges).

However, variance between the State's proof as to the date or time of an offense and the date and time alleged in the pleading is material, and grounds for dismissal of the charge, when it deprives the defendant of an opportunity to present his or her defense, such as when the defendant relies on an alibi defense. *See State v. Stewart*, 353 N.C. 516 (2001) (where defendant presented alibi evidence for the entire period of time alleged in the

indictment and the State's evidence showed no specific conduct during that date range, defendant was prejudiced and the motion to dismiss should have been allowed); *State v. Christopher*, 307 N.C. 645 (1983) (fatal variance where defendant prepared alibi defense based on conspiracy to commit larceny indictment alleging a specific date, but State offered evidence showing crime might have occurred over a three-month period); *State v. Avent*, 222 N.C. App. 147 (2012) (no error to allow State to amend date of offense from December 28, 2009, to December 27, 2009 in first-degree murder indictment; defendant was not deprived of his opportunity to present alibi defense because alibi testimony covered Dec. 27, and other pieces of State's evidence cited Dec. 27 date).

Ordinance violations. Generally, the failure to cite the statute violated is not grounds for dismissal. *See* G.S. 15A-924(a)(6). For violations of city or county ordinances, however, the rule appears to be different. *See* G.S. 160A-79(a) (requiring for city ordinance violations that codified ordinance be identified in pleading by section number and caption, that uncodified ordinance be identified by caption, and that uncodified ordinance without caption be set forth in pleading); G.S. 153A-50 (requiring same for county ordinance violations); *State v. Pallet*, 283 N.C. 705, 714 (1973) ("In a criminal prosecution for violation of a rule or regulation of a government board or commission, the indictment should set forth such rule or regulation or refer specifically to a permanent public record where it is recorded and available for inspection"; State failed to plead and prove contents of ordinance that had no section number or caption, and warrant therefore failed to allege facts sufficient to identify crime with which defendant was charged); *In re Jacobs*, 33 N.C. App. 195 (1977) (motion to quash juvenile petition granted where pleading did not allege caption of ordinance or set forth ordinance itself).

Resist, obstruct, or delay. "A warrant or bill of indictment charging a violation of G.S. 14-223 must identify the officer by name and indicate the official duty he was discharging or attempting to discharge, and should point out, in a general way at least, the manner in which the defendant is charged with having resisted, delayed, or obstructed such officer." *State v. Smith*, 262 N.C. 472, 474 (1964); *see also State v. Wells*, 59 N.C. App. 682 (1982) (citation that charged resisting arrest was fatally defective for omission of duty officer was performing); *State v. Powell*, 10 N.C. App. 443 (1971) (the words "resist arrest" in citation were insufficient to charge offense).

Assault on officer. In contrast with a prosecution for resisting arrest, in a prosecution for assault on an officer under G.S. 14-33(c)(4) it is not necessary to allege the specific duty being performed by the officer at the time of the assault. *See State v. Noel***,** 202 N.C. App. 715 (2010) (indictments alleging malicious conduct by a prisoner and assault on a governmental official do not have to allege the duty officer was performing; where the duty was alleged it was surplusage and variance between allegations and proof was not material); *State v. Bethea*, 71 N.C. App. 125 (1984) (sufficient to state that officer was performing a duty of his or her office when the assault occurred; not necessary to allege the particular duty in the indictment).

As in other assault cases, however, the victim must be identified correctly. *See State v. Powell*, 10 N.C. App. 443 (1971) (the words "assault on an officer" were insufficient

because the victim—that is, the officer allegedly assaulted—was not identified); *see also State v. Thomas*, 153 N.C. App. 326 (2002) (indictment did not need to allege that defendant knew or had reasonable grounds to believe that named victim was officer where indictment alleged defendant "willfully" committed assault on law enforcement officer). For a further discussion of this issue, see *supra* "Misidentification of Victim" in this subsection F.

Other assaults. *See, e.g.*, *State v. Palmer*, 293 N.C. 633 (1977) (not necessary for indictment to describe size, weight, or particular use of potentially deadly weapon, but it must (i) name weapon, and (ii) state that weapon was used as "deadly weapon" or allege facts demonstrating deadly character of weapon); *State v. Moses*, 154 N.C. App. 332 (2002) (indictment failed to allege assault inflicting serious injury with deadly weapon because it did not name weapon); *State v. Garcia*, 146 N.C. App. 745 (2001) (arrest warrant charging assault by show of violence was insufficient where it omitted facts showing reasonable apprehension of immediate bodily harm on part of victim). *See also supra* "Misidentification of Victim" in this subsection F (fatal variance results from failure to correctly identify victim in pleading).

Duplicity. Each separate offense charged against a defendant must be pled in a separate pleading or a separate count within a single pleading. *See* G.S. 15A-924(a)(2). A pleading may be challenged for duplicity if it contains more than one charge in a single count. When a pleading is challenged on this ground, the State must elect between the offenses charged; if the State fails to elect, the court may dismiss the entire count. *See* G.S. 15A-924(b); *State v. Rogers*, 68 N.C. App. 358 (1984) (with leave of court, prosecutor may amend indictment to state in separate counts charges that were initially alleged in single count); *State v. Beaver*, 14 N.C. App. 459 (1972) (stating same principle but finding that in circumstances presented defendant was entitled to have prosecutor elect). The problem of duplicity often arises where the initial pleading is a Uniform Citation. (Sometimes a magistrate will sign the citation, converting it to a magistrate's order). A Uniform Citation, AOC-CR-500, contains two counts *only*. The first count (numbers 1 through 16 on the citation) may be used to charge one offense only; and the second count (number 17) likewise may charge one offense only. If the citation charges more than one offense in either count, the defendant may move to require the State to elect a single offense alleged in the particular count.

Ordinarily in district court, defendants may make motions addressed to the pleadings at or after arraignment. *See* G.S. 15A-953 (motions in district court ordinarily should be made upon arraignment or during trial); *see also supra* § 8.2E, Timing and Effect of Motions to Dismiss in District Court. To be safe, however, counsel should make a duplicity motion before the defendant enters a plea. *See* G.S. 15A-924(b) (duplicity motion must be "timely"); *cf.* G.S. 15A-952(b)(6) (in superior court, certain motions addressed to pleadings must be made before arraignment); *State v. Williamson*, 250 N.C. 204 (1959) (in pre-15A case involving appeal for trial de novo in superior court, court states that motion to quash for duplicity is waived if not made before defendant enters plea).

Prior convictions of charged offense and other enhancements. North Carolina law raises a number of offenses to a higher class, subject to increased punishment, based on the defendant's prior convictions of the charged offense. *See, e.g.*, G.S. 14-72(b)(6) (habitual misdemeanor larceny); G.S. 14-33.2 (habitual misdemeanor assault); G.S. 14-72.1 (shoplifting); G.S. 14-107 (worthless check); G.S. 14-56.1 (breaking into a coin operated machine); G.S. 90-95(a)(3) (possession of marijuana). To subject the accused to the higher penalty, North Carolina law requires generally that pleadings allege all essential elements of an offense (G.S. 15A-924(a)(5)) and requires specifically that prior convictions raising an offense to a higher class be alleged. *See* G.S. 15A-928; *State v. Miller*, 237 N.C. 427 (1953); *State v. Williams*, 21 N.C. App 70 (1974). *But cf. State v. Alston*, 233 N.C. App. 152 (2014) (requirements of G.S. 15A-928 do not apply to prosecutions for possession of firearm by felon).

Practice note: G.S. 15A-928 contains procedures specific to superior court for alleging and proving prior convictions that increase an offense to a higher class. Essentially, the statute requires that prior convictions be alleged in a separate indictment or other pleading to limit disclosure of the information to the jury during a trial of the current offense. The requirement of a separate pleading does not apply to cases tried in district court. The North Carolina Supreme Court also has held that that the requirements of G.S. 15A-928 calling for a separate pleading or count are not jurisdictional even in superior court, and the failure to follow those requirements is not a fatal defect. *See State v. Brice*, 370 N.C. 244 (2017); *cf. State v. Stephens*, 188 N.C. App. 286 (2008) (charge against defendant was not substantially altered where State amended indictment for stalking by striking the allegation of the prior conviction, which was included in single count of indictment with current offense, and making allegation into separate count in indictment in compliance with the requirements of G.S. 15A-928).

The pleading, whether in a district court or superior court case, still must allege any prior convictions that raises an offense to a higher class because North Carolina law requires generally that offense elements be alleged and G.S. 15A-928 requires specifically that such convictions be alleged. G.S. 15A-928(d) implicitly recognizes this basic pleading requirement in cases tried in district court, stating that on appeal for a trial de novo the State must replace the district court pleading with superseding statements of charges alleging separately the current offense and any prior convictions.

In addition to the defendant's prior convictions, there are several statutory factors that may subject a defendant to higher punishment. These factors are elements of the offense carrying the higher punishment and must be alleged in the pleading. *See* G.S. 15A-924(a)(5); *see also supra* "Failure to charge offense or element of offense" in this subsection F., and *infra* § 8.7, *Apprendi* and *Blakely* Issues. Examples of such enhancements for misdemeanors include: G.S. 14-72.1(d1) (shoplifting using lead-lined or aluminum-lined bag or clothing); G.S. 14-50.22 (committing misdemeanor at direction of, for benefit of, or in association with criminal street gang); G.S. 14-3(c) (committing misdemeanor because of victim's race, color, religion, nationality, or country of origin); G.S. 14-3(b) (committing certain misdemeanors in secrecy, with malice, or with deceit and intent to defraud); *see also State v. Bell*, 121 N.C. App. 700 (1996) (superior court

had no jurisdiction over misdemeanor that State wanted to elevate to a felony under G.S. 14-3(b) where indictment failed to charge that offense was "infamous," "done in secrecy and malice," or done "with deceit and intent to defraud").