

OPINION SUMMARY

MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS EASTERN DISTRICT

MANUEL BURGESS, Appellant,) No. ED99440
) Appeal from the Circuit Court of
vs.) the City of St. Louis
) Honorable Michael F. Stelzer
STATE OF MISSOURI, Respondent.) Filed: February 25, 2014

Manuel Burgess (Movant) appeals the judgment of the Circuit Court of the City of St. Louis denying without an evidentiary hearing his Rule 24.035 motion for post-conviction relief. Movant contends the motion court clearly erred in denying his claim that his counsel provided ineffective assistance by failing to advise him that, if he pleaded guilty, he would be subject to “lifetime parole supervision with electronic monitoring.”

AFFIRMED.

Division Four Holds: The motion court did not clearly err in denying without an evidentiary hearing Movant’s claim that counsel was ineffective in failing to advise him that he would be subject to lifetime parole supervision with electronic monitoring. Like parole eligibility and registration requirements, electronic monitoring is a collateral consequence of a guilty plea.

Opinion by: Patricia L. Cohen, J.
Lisa S. Van Amburg, P.J., and Philip M. Hess, J., concur.

Attorney for Appellant: Jessica Hathaway

Attorney for Respondent: Evan J. Buchheim

THIS SUMMARY IS NOT PART OF THE OPINION OF THE COURT. IT HAS BEEN PREPARED FOR THE CONVENIENCE OF THE READER AND SHOULD NOT BE QUOTED OR CITED.