8.4 Felonies and Misdemeanors Initiated in Superior Court

8.4 Felonies and Misdemeanors Initiated in Superior Court

A. Scope of Original Jurisdiction

The superior court has original jurisdiction over all felonies and over misdemeanors joined with felonies. The superior court also has original jurisdiction over misdemeanors initiated by presentment. *See* G.S. 7A-271. Jurisdiction over an offense gives the court jurisdiction over all lesser included offenses of the crime charged. So, where the defendant is indicted for a felony, the superior court can accept a plea of guilty to a lesser included offense that is a misdemeanor, or it can enter judgment on a jury verdict for a lesser included misdemeanor.

B. Types of Pleadings and Related Documents

In superior court, a prosecution must be initiated by indictment or information. *See* G.S. 15A-923(a). A bill of particulars may be used to supplement, but it does not replace an indictment or information. A presentment, described below, is not a formal charging document but may lead to an indictment.

Indictment. An indictment is a written accusation by a grand jury stating that it has found probable cause to believe that the defendant committed a specific crime. A felony prosecution in superior court must be by indictment, although a noncapital defendant may waive the right to an indictment and be tried on an information. Indictments typically charge felonies. Misdemeanors may be charged in an indictment only if the charge is initiated by presentment or if the offense is joined with a charged felony. *See* G.S. 15A-923; G.S. 7A-271.

Information. An information is an accusation drafted by the prosecutor and filed in superior court, charging one or more criminal offenses. It permits the prosecution of a felony without an indictment by grand jury where the defendant and the defendant's attorney sign a waiver of indictment, consenting to have the case tried on the information. *See* AOC Form AOC-CR-123, "Bill of Information" (Jan. 2013). An information may be filed only if the defendant waives indictment. *See State v. Nixon*, 263 N.C. App. 676 (2019) (information that failed to include language expressly waiving indictment was insufficient and failed to confer jurisdiction). Defendants who are unrepresented or who

are charged with capital crimes may not waive indictment. *See* G.S. 15A-642(b). The requirements of G.S. 15A-642 that the defendant, defense counsel, and the prosecutor all sign the bill of information are mandatory and the absence of a required signature fails to confer jurisdiction on the court. *See State v. Futrelle*, ___ N.C. App. ___, 831 S.E.2d 99 (2019) (so holding where defense counsel failed to sign information).

A defendant might agree to waive indictment and proceed on an information to permit immediate disposition of the case. For example, a plea bargain may involve a defendant pleading guilty to an offense for which he or she has not been indicted, thus requiring a waiver of indictment and filing of an information if the case is to be resolved promptly. Where the plea bargain requires the defendant to plead guilty to an offense for which he or she has not been indicted and that is not a lesser included offense of an indicted offense, an information is required to confer jurisdiction on the court to accept the plea to the unindicted offense. An information is not required to plead guilty to a lesser included offense for which the defendant has been indicted.

Presentment. A presentment is a written accusation by the grand jury, filed in superior court, charging a defendant with one or more crimes. A presentment is initiated by the grand jury. It does not commence a criminal proceeding and is not a pleading. The district attorney is statutorily required to investigate the allegations in a presentment and to submit a bill of indictment to the grand jury if appropriate. Where the State submits a presentment to the grand jury, the State still must investigate the allegations following the grand jury's issuance of a presentment. *State v. Baker*, 263 N.C. App. 221 (2018) (presentment and indictment prepared by the district attorney and simultaneously submitted to the grand jury invalid as a matter of law and deprived superior court of jurisdiction; remedy is remand to district court, not dismissal, where misdemeanor was pending in district court before presentment). A misdemeanor prosecution that is not joined to a related felony may not be commenced in superior court except by presentment. *See* G.S. 7A-271(a)(2); G.S. 15A-641(c); G.S. 15A-644; G.S. 15A-922(g); G.S. 15A-923(a). For a further discussion of limitations on presentments, see *supra* § 9.3C, Investigative Function and Presentments.

Bill of particulars. A bill of particulars is prepared by the prosecutor and filed with the court. It is not a pleading, but it supplements an indictment or information by providing the defendant with additional information. *See* G.S. 15A-925. The defendant must file a motion for a bill of particulars before arraignment. *See* G.S. 15A-952. In the motion, the defendant must request specific information and allege that the defendant cannot adequately prepare or conduct his or her defense without such information. *See* G.S. 15A-925(b); *State v. Garcia*, 358 N.C. 382, 389–90 (2004) (trial court did not abuse discretion in denying bill of particulars specifying underlying felony in felony murder prosecution because "the State's legal theories are not 'factual information' subject to inclusion in a bill of particulars"; concurrence finds no error but observes that North Carolina law regarding bill of particulars contains more promise than substance); *State v. Randolph*, 312 N.C. 198 (1984) (trial court must order State to respond to motion for bill of particulars when defendant shows that requested information is necessary to adequately prepare defense; denial of motion is error if lack of timely access to information

significantly impaired defendant's preparation and conduct of case; trial court did not abuse discretion in denying motion in this case); *see also State v. Tunstall*, 334 N.C. 320 (1993) (trial court granted motion for bill of particulars requiring State to provide date, time, and location of murder and certain information about theory of crime).

A bill of particulars does not cure defects or omissions in an indictment or information. *See* subsection C., Sufficiency of Pleadings, below. It does, however, limit the scope of the case against the defendant. The State may not vary in its proof at trial from the allegations stated in a bill of particulars. *See* G.S. 15A-925(e) (so stating but allowing amendment at any time before trial). This limitation applies only if the State files a formal, written bill of particulars. If the State responds to a defendant's request for additional details by orally supplying information in court, such a response is not the same as a bill of particulars, and the State's proof at trial will not have to conform to its earlier in-court representations. *See State v. Stallings*, 107 N.C. App. 241 (1992) (prosecutor's oral statements were not a bill a particulars; statute requires that a bill of particulars be in writing). Counsel should therefore request that the court order the State to file a written bill of particulars in order to "marry" the State to facts that the prosecutor has stated orally.

C. Sufficiency of Pleadings

General Requirements. G.S. 15A-924(a) states the general requirements for criminal pleadings. All superior court pleadings 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;
- the date on which, or time period during which, the offense took place; and
- a statement that the State intends to use certain aggravating factors, with a plain and concise factual statement indicating the factors it intends to use.

The last requirement about aggravating factors applies to felony cases only. *See infra* § 8.7B, Notice and Pleading Requirements after *Blakely*. It does not apply to misdemeanor impaired driving cases; however, in impaired driving cases in superior court, the State must give written notice of its intent to use any aggravating or grossly aggravating factors. G.S. 20-179(a1)(1).

An indictment or information must be sufficient in itself. The State may not rely on allegations in a warrant or bill of particulars to cure defects or omissions. *See State v. Benton*, 275 N.C. 378 (1969) (allegations in warrant may not cure defects in indictment); *State v. Stokes*, 274 N.C. 409 (1968) (allegations in bill of particulars do not cure defects in indictment); *accord State v. Banks*, 263 N.C. 784 (1965). Consent to amendment does

not cure an indictment that lacks an essential element. *State v. De la Sancha Cobos*, 211 N.C. App. 536 (2011) (error to amend indictment by adding amount of the cocaine, an essential element of the offense; indictment may not be amended by consent). Where a separate count in an indictment supplies a missing element for another count in the indictment, a court may be more inclined to find the indictment sufficient. *See State v. Nickens*, 262 N.C. App. 353, 361–62 (2018) (indictment identified officer by his specific law enforcement position in the first count, but only as a "public officer" of North Carolina in the second; "both counts, taken together, provide Defendant with sufficient information to identify and locate the officer" and were not fatally defective).

Some pleading errors may be subject to amendment or not be of consequence. *See, e.g.*, *State v. Jones*, 110 N.C. App. 289 (1993) (incorrect statutory reference was not fatal defect where body of indictment properly charged elements of offense). *But see State v. Blakney*, 156 N.C. App. 671 (2003) (in prosecution for felony, pleading must charge that defendant acted "feloniously" or reference statutory section making crime a felony). *See also* subsection D., Amendment of Indictments, below.

Pleading errors that may affect the ability of the State to proceed are discussed *infra* in § 8.5, Common Pleading Defects in Superior Court. Generally, if a case is dismissed because the indictment is fatally defective, the State is not barred from refiling the charges in an appropriately-worded pleading. In some circumstances, however, refiling may be barred. *See supra* § 8.2E, Timing and Effect of Motions to Dismiss in District Court (effect of dismissal on subsequent charges); *see also infra* § 8.6, Limits on Successive Prosecution (discussing double jeopardy and other limits on successive prosecution).

Short-form indictment. The North Carolina General Assembly has enacted statutes permitting abbreviated forms of indictment for certain offenses, known as "short-form" indictments. Short-form indictments are permitted for murder (G.S. 15-144); forcible rape (G.S. 15-144.1(a)); statutory rape (G.S. 15-144.1(b)); forcible sex offense (G.S. 15-144.2(a)); and statutory sex offense (G.S. 15-144.2(b)). A short-form indictment does not allege the elements that elevate these offenses to the first-degree level. For example, where the State contends that the defendant committed first-degree murder, the indictment need not state that the murder was committed in the course of a felony, after premeditation and deliberation, or in any other manner that would increase the level of the offense. It is sufficient for the indictment to allege that the named defendant, with malice aforethought, murdered the victim. *See* Smith, *Criminal Indictment*, at 16–18, 29–32. Where an indictment for murder or attempted murder fails to allege that the defendant acted with malice, it is insufficient to charge murder but properly charges voluntary manslaughter. *State v. Wilson*, 236 N.C. App. 472 (2014).

North Carolina courts have continued to uphold the adequacy of short-form indictments against constitutional challenges. *See, e.g.*, *State v. Wallace*, 351 N.C. 481 (2000) (upholding short-form indictment for rape and murder); *State v. Avery*, 315 N.C. 1 (1985); *State v. Hasty*, 181 N.C. App. 144 (2007).

Pleading rules for certain offenses. Certain offenses and certain elements of crimes have specific pleading requirements, either as a matter of statute or case law. Counsel should review the pleading requirements for each offense charged. *See* Smith, *Criminal Indictment*, at 16–53.

D. Amendment of Indictments

Generally. G.S. 15A-923(e) states that indictments may not be amended. Despite the literal language of this statute, courts have permitted the amendment of indictments where the amendment does not substantially alter the charge. *See State v. Price*, 310 N.C. 596 (1984). The meaning of "substantially" in this context is ambiguous. Typically, prosecutors have been allowed to amend indictments to change the date or place of an offense or to correct "technical" errors, such as misspellings (although the motion to amend should be denied where time is of the essence to the defense or when the defendant is surprised and prejudiced by the change. *Id.* at 598–99). Amendments that change the name of the defendant, the identity of the victim, or the nature of the offense have not been allowed.

The following cases are a sample of decisions that have ruled on amending pleadings. Counsel should review the pleading requirements for the particular offense with which the defendant is charged.

Decisions permitting amendment of indictment. In the following cases, the court permitted amendment of the indictment:

State v. Hill, 362 N.C. 169 (2008) (per curiam) (trial court did not err by allowing State to correct a statutory citation where indictment incorrectly cited a violation of former G.S. 14-27.7A (sexual offense against a 13, 14, or 15 year old) but body of indictment correctly charged violation of former G.S. 14-27.4 (sexual offense with a victim under 13))

State v. Tucker, 227 N.C. App. 627, 631–32 (2013) (trial court did not err by allowing State to amend embezzlement indictment, where indictment originally stated "the defendant . . . was the employee of MBM Moving Systems, LLC . . . ," to add the words "or agent" after the word "employee"; court rejected defendant's argument that the nature of his relationship to the victim was critical to the charge and held that the terms "employee" and "agent" "are essentially interchangeable" for purposes of this offense)

State v. White, 202 N.C. App. 524 (2010) (trial court did not err in allowing State to amend habitual impaired driving indictment to allege that prior impaired driving convictions, which were accurately identified in indictment, occurred within ten years of the current offense rather than seven years). *Cf. State v. Winslow*, 360 N.C. 161 (2005) (per curiam) (error, under prior version of statute, to allow State to amend habitual impaired driving indictment to correct the date of a prior conviction, thereby bringing it within the seven-year look-back period)

State v. Coltrane, 188 N.C. App. 498 (2008) (no error in allowing State to amend date and county of prior conviction in possession of firearm by felon indictment; time is not an essential element of the crime)

State v. Stephens, 188 N.C. App. 286 (2008) (no error in allowing amendment to indictment for stalking that originally included allegation of prior stalking conviction in same count to separate out the allegation regarding prior conviction that elevated punishment to a felony, as required by G.S. 15A-928)

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. McCallum, 187 N.C. App. 628 (2007) (no error in allowing State to amend indictments to remove allegations concerning the amount of money taken during the robberies because allegations as to value of property were surplusage; amended indictments alleged that defendant took an unspecified amount of U.S. Currency)

State v. Whitman, 179 N.C. App. 657 (2006) (State was entitled to amend the alleged dates for statutory rape and statutory sexual offense of a 13, 14, or 15-year-old from "January 1998 through June 1998" to "July 1998 through December 1998"; victim would have been fifteen under either version of indictment and defendant was on notice that if he wished to present an alibi defense, he was going to have to address all of 1998 because an incest indictment, which was not amended, alleged dates from "January 1998 through June 1999")

State v. Van Trusell, 170 N.C. App. 33 (2005) (no error in allowing amendment from attempted armed robbery to armed robbery; offenses are punished the same)

State v. May, 159 N.C. App. 159 (2003) (no error in allowing State to amend date in false pretenses indictment; time was not an essential element of the crime)

State v. Grady, 136 N.C. App. 394 (2000) (permissible to amend address of dwelling in prosecution for maintaining dwelling for use of controlled substance)

State v. Hyder, 100 N.C. App. 270 (1990) (permissible to change name of county from which grand jury issued indictment)

State v. Marshall, 92 N.C. App. 398 (1988) (permissible to amend name of victim where three of the indictments stated victim's name correctly and victim's last name had been inadvertently left off fourth indictment)

Decisions not permitting amendment of indictment. In the following cases, the court found that amendment was not permissible:

State v. Silas, 360 N.C. 377 (2006) (error for State to amend felony breaking or entering indictment to reflect that defendant broke with intent to commit assault where State had indicted on theory that defendant broke with intent to commit murder)

State v. Winslow, 360 N.C. 161 (2005) (per curiam) (error, under prior version of statute, to allow State to amend habitual impaired driving indictment to correct the date of a prior conviction, thereby bringing it within the seven-year look-back period)

State v. Abraham, 338 N.C. 315 (1994) (error for State to amend felonious assault indictment to change name of victim from Carlose Antoine Latter to Joice Hardin; court notes that error in name of victim may be more serious than error in name of defendant)

State v. Abbott, 217 N.C. App. 614 (2011) (error for State to amend owner of property in indictment alleging larceny by employee by striking the word "Incorporated" from "Cape Fear Carved Signs, Incorporated"; change from corporate entity to sole proprietorship was substantial alteration)

State v. Morris, 185 N.C. App. 481 (2007) (trial court erred in allowing State to amend indictment charging kidnapping to change purpose from facilitating a felony to facilitating inflicting serious injury where amendment was "obviously intended to elevate the crime to the first degree")

State v. Hughes, 118 N.C. App. 573 (1995) (error to change name of alleged victim in embezzlement prosecution from "Mike Frost, President of Petroleum World, Incorporated" to "Petroleum World, Incorporated"; amendment changed ownership from individual to corporation, substantially altering offense)

In re Davis, 114 N.C. App. 253 (1994) (error for court to allow amendment of juvenile petition that alleged unlawful burning of public building to allegation of unlawful burning of personal property within building)

E. Habitual Offender Pleading Requirements

Generally. The following discussion focuses on the pleading requirements in habitual felon cases under G.S. 14-7.1 through G.S. 14-7.6. It does not discuss the substantive requirements for conviction as a habitual felon—for example, the timing of prior convictions. For a further discussion of habitual felon cases, see Jeff Welty, *North Carolina's Habitual Felon, Violent Habitual Felon, and Habitual Breaking and Entering Laws*, ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE BULLETIN No. 2013/07 (UNC School of Government, Aug. 2013) [hereinafter Welty, *Habitual Felon Laws*]; Robert L. Farb, *Habitual Offender Laws* (UNC School of Government, Feb. 2010); Jamie Markham, *Changes to the Habitual Felon Law*, N.C. CRIM. L., UNC SCH. OF GOV'T BLOG (Nov. 10, 2011).

Charging a person as a violent habitual felon is subject to similar pleading requirements. *See* G.S. 14-7.7 through G.S. 14-7.12. The charge of habitual breaking and entering,

enacted in 2011, is likewise subject to similar pleading requirements. *See* G.S. 14-7.25 through G.S. 14-7.31; Jamie Markham, *Habitual Breaking and Entering*, N.C. CRIM. L., UNC SCH. OF GOV'T BLOG (Nov. 22, 2011). The status of armed habitual felon, enacted in 2013 and applicable to a person who commits a firearm-related felony after having previously been convicted of a firearm-related felony as defined in the statutes, is subject to similar pleading requirements. *See* G.S. 14-7.35 through G.S. 14-7.41.

Other enhancements for prior convictions. In addition to the habitual offender cases described above, North Carolina law raises a number of offenses to a higher class, subject to increased punishment, based on the defendant's prior convictions. *See, e.g.*, 14-33.2 (habitual misdemeanor assault); G.S. 14-56.1; (breaking into a coin operated machine); G.S. 14-72(b)(6) (habitual misdemeanor larceny); G.S. 14-72.1 (shoplifting); G.S. 14-107 (worthless check); G.S. 90-95(a)(3) (possession of marijuana). Such offenses are subject to the pleading requirements in G.S. 15A-928, which requires that the pleading allege the prior convictions that subject the accused to the higher penalty. *See also* G.S. 15A-924(a)(5) (requiring that all essential elements of offense be alleged). *See also State v. Miller*, 237 N.C. 427 (1953) (reaching same result before adoption of G.S. Ch. 15A); *State v. Williams*, 21 N.C. App 70 (1974) (to same effect); G.S. 15A-924(a)(5) (requiring that all essential elements of offense be alleged).

For cases in superior court, the prior conviction should be alleged in a separate indictment or other pleading. G.S. 15A-928(b) (indictment and information); G.S. 15A-928(d) (superseding statement of charges for misdemeanors appealed for trial de novo). However, in *State v. Brice*, 370 N.C. 244 (2017), the North Carolina Supreme Court rejected the notion that failure to comply with the separate pleading requirement of G.S. 15A-928 deprived the court of jurisdiction. The defendant in *Brice* did not challenge the indictment at the trial level, and the court held that this type of defect could not be challenged on appeal for the first time. The court left open the possibility that appellate relief may have been forthcoming had the defendant properly preserved the objection. *See also 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).

Felon in possession of firearm. Possession of a firearm by a felon is a criminal offense in its own right. An indictment for possession of a firearm by a felon must be charged in a separate indictment from other charges. G.S. 14-415.1(c); *State v. Wilkins*, 225 N.C. App. 492 (2013) (indictment for felon in possession of a firearm was fatally defective because the charge was included as a separate count in a single indictment charging the defendant with assault with a deadly weapon). This pleading requirement does not necessarily preclude the jury from hearing about a defendant's prior felony conviction even if the defendant stipulates to the prior conviction. *See State v. Alston*, 233 N.C. App. 152 (2014) (holding that G.S. 15A-928, which precludes jury from hearing of prior conviction raising offense to higher grade when defendant stipulates to prior conviction, does not apply to prosecution for possession of firearm by felon); *see also supra* "Key factors" in

§ 6.1C, Severance of Joinable Offenses (discussing possibility of stipulation to prior felony conviction when charge of possession of firearm by felon is joined with other charges).

Other enhancements. In addition to the defendant's prior convictions, there are a number of statutory factors that subject a defendant to higher punishment and must be alleged in the pleading. *See, e.g.*, G.S. 14-72.1(d1) (shoplifting using lead-lined or aluminum-lined bag or clothing); G.S. 15A-1340.16C (wearing or possessing bullet-proof vest during commission of felony). For a discussion of these enhancements, see *infra* "Firearm and Other Enhancements" in § 8.7B, Notice and Pleading Requirements after *Blakely*. *See also supra* "Prior convictions of charged offense and other enhancements" in § 8.2F, Common Pleading Defects in District Court.

Timing of challenge in habitual felon cases. Counsel ordinarily should raise objections to habitual felon charging errors after the trial has commenced on the principal felony or at the commencement of the habitual felon proceedings. If the charging error is raised before attachment of jeopardy on at least the principal felony (when the jury is empaneled and sworn), the State conceivably could dismiss the case altogether and seek new indictments.

If the defendant is challenging the validity of a prior conviction, the basis of the challenge will determine whether the defendant may challenge the conviction in the current case or must file a motion for appropriate relief to vacate the conviction in the original proceeding. Except for a right to counsel violation, prior convictions may not be collaterally attacked in the current case; the proper procedure to challenge prior convictions supporting a habitual felon charge will typically be a motion for appropriate relief in the original case of conviction. *See* Welty, *Habitual Felon Laws*, at 25–26; *see also infra* § 12.2A, Suppressing Prior Uncounseled Conviction (2d ed. 2013).

Pleading requirements in habitual felon cases. Below are the basic requirements for habitual felon pleadings.

1. *State must obtain separate habitual felon charge.* To charge a defendant as a habitual felon, the State should prepare a separate indictment from the indictment for the principal felony being tried. *See* G.S. 14-7.3 (habitual felon); *State v. Patton*, 342 N.C. 633 (1996); Welty, *Habitual Felon Laws*, at 16–17. *But see State v. Young*, 120 N.C. App. 456 (1995) (not error to charge habitual felon status in separate count of indictment for principal felony; if it was error, defendant was not prejudiced). The State is not required to obtain a separate habitual felon indictment for each principal felony; one is sufficient for all pending felony indictments. *See Patton*, 342 N.C. at 635.

2. *State must obtain timely habitual felon indictment.* Three principles limit the timing of a habitual felon indictment.

First, the N.C. courts have held that being a habitual felon is not an offense—it is a status that elevates the punishment for the felony with which the defendant is charged. Consequently, habitual felon charges are necessarily ancillary to a felony charge and may not stand alone. *See State v. Cheek*, 339 N.C. 725, 727 (1995) (habitual felon law does not authorize "an independent proceeding to determine defendant's status as a habitual felon separate from the prosecution of a predicate substantive felony"). Thus, the State may not wait until the defendant is convicted and sentenced for a felony and then obtain a habitual felon indictment. *See State v. Allen*, 292 N.C. 431 (1977); *see also State v. Davis*, 123 N.C. App. 240 (1996) (trial court could not sentence defendant as habitual felon after arresting judgment on all principal felonies). The courts have not been picky, however, about which indictment is obtained first—the habitual felon indictment or the indictment for the principal felony—as long as there is a felony prosecution to which the habitual felon indictment may attach. *See State v. Ross*, 221 N.C. App. 185 (2012) (in reliance on *Flint* [discussed next], court vacates habitual felon plea and remands for sentencing on principal felony because habitual felon indictment was returned before commission of principal felony); *State v. Flint*, 199 N.C. App. 709 (2009) (habitual felon indictment may be returned before, after, or simultaneously with a principal felony indictment, but it is improper if issued before substantive felony occurred; there were other substantive felonies to which the habitual felon indictment attached, however); *State v. Bradley*, 175 N.C. App. 234 (2005) (trial court lacked jurisdiction to sentence defendant as habitual felon for subsequent charges absent new habitual felon indictment where defendant had already pled guilty to original charges to which habitual felon indictment attached, although sentencing was still pending for original charges); *State v. Blakney*, 156 N.C. App. 671 (2003) (habitual felon indictment that predated indictment for principal felony by two weeks was not void where notice and procedural requirements for habitual felon cases were satisfied); *State v. Murray*, 154 N.C. App. 631 (2002) (State obtained felony indictment, then habitual felon indictment, then superseding felony indictment for which defendant was ultimately convicted; court holds that State could proceed on habitual felon indictment even though it predated superseding felony indictment). In cases in which a habitual felon indictment was quashed for technical reasons (and therefore probably could have been amended), the courts have continued the proceedings without entering judgment and have allowed the State to obtain a superseding habitual felon indictment even after the defendant was convicted of the principal felony. *See* paragraph no. 4., below.

Second, the N.C. courts have held that the State may not obtain the initial habitual felon indictment, or obtain a superseding habitual felon indictment that makes substantive changes, once the defendant has entered a plea (guilty or not guilty) to the principal felony. The defendant has entered the plea in reliance on the charges then pending, on the likelihood of the State succeeding on those charges, and on the maximum punishment those charges permit. *See State v. Little*, 126 N.C. App. 262 (1997) (finding that initial habitual felon pleading was valid because it was returned before plea in principal felony case but that superseding habitual felon indictment, which was obtained after conviction of principal felony and alleged different prior convictions, was invalid); *see also* paragraph no. 4., below, regarding amendments. In

State v. Cogdell, 165 N.C. App. 368 (2004), the N.C. Court of Appeals limited the impact of *Little* by holding that *Little* refers to the entry of plea before trial, not to the entry of plea at arraignment. "[T]he critical event that forecloses substantive changes in an habitual felon indictment is the plea entered before the actual trial." *Id.* at 373.

Third, the defendant may not be tried on a habitual felon indictment less than twenty days after the return of the indictment. The defendant may waive this requirement by failing to object at trial. *See* G.S. 14-7.3; *State v. Winstead*, 78 N.C. App. 180 (1985) (defendant did not object at trial and waived the 20-day period, but court considered defendant's appeal due to statutory ambiguity; the 20-day period runs from the time the grand jury returns an indictment on the habitual felon charge).

3. *State must properly plead habitual felon charge.* A habitual felon indictment must state: (i) the dates the prior felonies were committed; (ii) the name of the state or sovereign against whom the prior felonies were committed; (iii) the dates of the prior convictions; and (iv) the court where the convictions were obtained. *See* G.S. 14-7.3; *State v. McIlwaine*, 169 N.C. App. 397 (2005) (habitual felon indictment was sufficient even though it did not allege controlled substance involved in defendant's prior drug felony conviction); *State v. Briggs*, 137 N.C. App. 125 (2000) (habitual felon indictment contained adequate description of prior crimes without alleging elements of prior offenses). Some errors may be considered technical and either subject to amendment or not of consequence. *See* paragraph no. 4., below.

   The habitual felon indictment does not need to identify or contain a description of the principal felony to which the habitual felon indictment is ancillary. *See State v. Cheek*, 339 N.C. 725 (1995); *State v. Smith*, 160 N.C. App. 107 (2003). If the habitual felon indictment incorrectly refers to the principal felony, it may be treated as surplusage. *See State v. Bowens*, 140 N.C. App. 217 (2000) (habitual felon indictment referenced one of the three principal felonies charged, felonious possession of marijuana, which was dismissed; court treated the reference as surplusage); *cf. State v. Lee*, 150 N.C. App. 701 (2002) (habitual felon indictment alleged five prior convictions rather than required three convictions; none of convictions used to establish habitual felon status could be used to calculate prior record level under structured sentencing).

   Since the habitual felon charge is ancillary to the principal felony charge, it fails if either the habitual felon indictment *or* the indictment for the principal felony is insufficient and not subject to amendment to cure the defect. *See State v. Winstead*, 78 N.C. App. 180 (1985).

4. *State may not make substantive amendments to habitual felon indictment; alleging additional or different prior convictions is an impermissible substantive amendment.* A habitual felon indictment may be amended if the amendment does not make a substantive change. Rather than amending the habitual felon indictment, some prosecutors will seek a superseding indictment to correct a defect. For example, in some cases in which the defendant has raised the defect after trial of the principal

felony, the State has asked the court to continue the proceedings while it obtained a superseding indictment. As long as the change, whether by amendment or superseding indictment, does not make a substantive change, either procedure is probably permissible. *See, e.g.*, *State v. Langley*, 371 N.C. 389 (2018) (habitual felon indictment that alleged greater offenses of armed robbery as defendant's prior charges, but the lesser-included offenses of common law robbery as the prior convictions, provided proper notice and was sufficient); *State v. May*, 159 N.C. App. 159, 163 (2003) ("The date of the felony offense accompanying a habitual felon indictment is not an essential element of establishing habitual felon status."); *State v. Coltrane*, 188 N.C. App. 498 (2008) (permissible for State to amend date and county of prior conviction); *State v. Lewis*, 162 N.C. App. 277 (2004) (amendment to correct dates of prior convictions was permissible; change was not substantial); *State v. Hargett*, 148 N.C. App. 688 (2002) (same); *State v. Mewborn*, 131 N.C. App. 495 (1998) (permitting superseding indictment after trial of principal felony that made technical changes only, to wit, identifying the state where the prior felonies were committed); *State v. Oakes*, 113 N.C. App. 332 (1994) (permitting superseding indictment after trial of principal felony that made technical changes only); *see also State v. Hodge*, ___ N.C. App. ___, 840 S.E.2d 285 (Feb 18, 2020) (where original habitual felon indictment was marked "no true bill," trial court did not err in continuing judgment following adjudication of underlying charges to allow the State to seek an additional habitual felon indictment).

In contrast, the State may not amend a habitual felon indictment that makes a substantive change. Thus, the State may not amend a habitual felon indictment to allege different prior felonies. It is reversible error for the trial judge to instruct the jury on a prior felony conviction in support of habitual status that was not alleged in the indictment. *State v. Jefferies*, 243 N.C. App. 455 (2015). The State may obtain a superseding habitual felon indictment alleging different prior felonies; however, under *State v. Little*, 126 N.C. App. 262 (1997) and *State v. Cogdell*, 165 N.C. App. 368 (2004), the State may not obtain a superseding indictment alleging different prior felonies after the defendant has entered a plea (*see* paragraph no. 2., above).