IN THE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS OF TENNESSEE

AT KNOXVILLE

APRIL SESSION, 1997



June 12, 1997

STATE OF TENNESSEE,)	Cecil Crowson, Jr. C.C.A. NO. 03C01-9612-CR-00459 Court Clerk
Appellee,)	
1/0)	JOHNSON COUNTY
VS.)	HON. LYNN W. BROWN
MIKE BOOHER,	į	JUDGE
Appellant.)	(Direct Appeal)

FOR THE APPELLANT:

ROBERT Y. OAKS

Office of the Public Defender

First Judicial District Main Courthouse

Elizabethton, TN 37643

GERALD L. GULLEY, JR. Contract Appellant Defender P. O. Box 1708 Knoxville, TN 37901-1708

JERRY L. SMITH, JUDGE

FOR THE APPELLEE:

CHARLES W. BURSON

Attorney General and Reporter

PETER M. COUGHLAN Assistant Attorney General 450 James Robertson Parkway

Nashville, TN 37243

DAVID CROCKETT
District Attorney General

LISA NIDIFFER RICE Assistant District Attorney First Judicial District Mountain City, TN 37683

OPINION FILED	
AFFIRMED PURSUANT TO RULE 20	

ORDER

A Johnson County Criminal Court jury found Appellant Mike Booher guilty of possession of a controlled substance in a penal institution. As a Range II multiple offender, he received a sentence of seven years and six months in the Tennessee Department of Correction. The trial court ordered the sentence served consecutively to his prior convictions. In this appeal, Appellant presents the following issues for review:

- (1) whether the trial court erred in refusing to dismiss the charge on the grounds of double jeopardy; and
- (2) whether the trial court erred in refusing to dismiss the charge on the grounds of selective prosecution.

After a review of the re∞rd, we affirm the judgment of the trial court pursuant to Court of Criminal Appeals Rule 20.

On May 24, 1994, while Appellant was incarcerated at the Northeast

Correctional Center in Johnson County, prison officials found marijuana in his
possession. The prison disciplinary board placed Appellant in punitive segregation
for a period of ten days and referred his case to the district attorney's office.

Appellant was subsequently convicted of possession of a controlled substance in a penal institution.

With respect to Appellant's first issue, the law is well settled. Double jeopardy principles do not prohibit both remedial action by prison officials and prosecution by the district attorney's office. See Ray v. State, 577 S.W.2d 681, 682 (Tenn. Crim. App. 1978); see also State v. Moore, No. 03C01-9604-CC-00163,

1997 WL 206796, at *1 (Tenn. Crim. App. Apr. 29, 1997); State v. Bennett, No. 03C01-9607-CR-00250, 1997 WL 80965, at *2 (Tenn. Crim. App. Feb. 27, 1997).

With respect to Appellant's second issue, the law is equally well settled. Selective enforcement violates equal protection principles only when the selection is "deliberately based upon an unjustifiable standard such as race, religion, or other arbitrary classification." Oyler v. Boles, 368 U.S. 448, 456 (1962). Absent such an arbitrary classification, which Appellant fails to even allege, state officials enjoy broad prosecutorial discretion. Cooper v. State, 847 S.W.2d 521, 536 (Tenn. Crim. App. 1992).

Accordingly, we affirm the trial court's judgment pursuant to Court of Criminal Appeals Rule 20.

	JERRY L. SMITH, JUDGE	
CONCUR:		
JOE G. RILEY, JUDGE		
CHRIS CRAFT, SPECIAL JU	JDGE	