

# Drunk Driving: Beyond the Basics



**Robert H. Humphrey, Esq.**  
Law Offices of Robert H.  
Humphrey

*As a result of extensive police officer training at the state and municipal level and the emphasis placed on the apprehension and prosecution of suspected drunk drivers, the successful defense of DUI cases needs to move beyond the basic case components.*

In every drunk driving (DUI) case, the prosecution and defense are concerned with five basic components of the case:

1. Can the prosecution establish the requisite reasonable suspicion to stop the suspect's vehicle;
2. Can the prosecution prove the suspect's operation of the vehicle;
3. Can the prosecution demonstrate the necessary probable cause to arrest the suspect;
4. Can the prosecution prove the suspect was under the influence of intoxicating liquor and/or drugs to a degree that rendered him/her incapable of safely operating the vehicle; and
5. Can the prosecution prove compliance with R.I. Gen. Laws 31-27-3 (the suspect's right to an independent physical examination by a physician of his/her own choosing)?<sup>1</sup>

As a result of extensive police officer training at the state and municipal level and the emphasis placed on the apprehension and prosecution of suspected drunk drivers, the successful defense of DUI cases needs to move beyond the basic case components. This article focuses on recent Rhode Island Superior Court cases prosecutors and defense attorneys should consider when handling a DUI case.

## **I. PBT Refusal Precludes Subsequent Chemical Tests**

In *State v. Cote*,<sup>2</sup> a suspected drunk driver was stopped by the Jamestown Police and refused the Officer's request that she submit to a preliminary breath test (PBT). However, at the Jamestown Police station, the suspect did submit to a breathalyzer test at the request of the Officer which resulted in readings of .127 and .125 blood alcohol content (BAC).

In granting the defendant's motion to suppress the breathalyzer test results, the Court, relying on *State v. DiStefano*,<sup>3</sup> held the following: Even if a law enforcement officer is armed with a search warrant, the *DiStefano* holding mandates that no test shall be given to any suspect refusing a chemical test. Upon such refusal, the "plain and unambiguous" language, "none shall be given... becomes

operative" and precludes further testing. *DiStefano*, 764 A.2d at 1163. Thus, Defendant Cote's refusal extinguished the right of the officer to request and/or administer any further tests. The officer did have the right to cite the Defendant's refusal and subject her to the penalties of § 31-4.1-4, but the officer did not opt to do this.

Accordingly, Defendant Kathryn Cote's Motion to Suppress the breathalyzer results is granted.<sup>4</sup>

So, in accordance with the *Cote* decision, if a suspected drunk driver refuses to submit to a preliminary breath test on the side of the road the arresting Officer may not request the suspect to submit to a breathalyzer test at the station or the results of that breathalyzer test will be suppressed.

## **II. Lack of Release**

In a DUI case, the prosecution has the burden of proving a suspected drunk driver was advised of his/her right to be examined at his/her own expense immediately after his/her arrest by a physician selected by the suspected drunk driver. This is why the Rights for Use at Scene card is read to the suspected drunk driver at the time of his/her arrest and why the Rights card is entered as a state's exhibit at trial.

Rhode Island General Law 31-27-3 states the following:

### **Right of person charged with operating under influence to physical examination.**

A person arrested and charged with operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of narcotic drugs or intoxicating liquor, whatever its alcoholic content, shall have the right to be examined at his or her own expense immediately after the person's arrest by a physician selected by the person, and the officer so arresting or so charging the person shall immediately inform the person of this right and afford the person a reasonable opportunity to exercise the right, and at the trial of the person the prosecution must prove that he or she was so informed and was afforded that opportunity.

Article I Section 9 of the Rhode Island

