

## COA Opinion: For a campus-rioting conviction, a one-year ban on entering a college campus runs either from the imposition of a sentence or from the completion of a term of incarceration.

3. December 2010 By Aaron Lindstrom

Following a riot at the Cedar Street Festival in East Lansing in 2008, Cassandra Thompson pleaded guilty to a misdemeanor offense of disorderly assembly for riot, a violation of an East Lansing city code. The district court sentenced Thompson under [MCL 769.1g\(1\)\(a\)\(ii\)](#) to 14 days in jail and then to a one-year ban from university, public-college, and community-college campuses in Michigan. The circuit court, however, reversed the one-year-ban component of her sentence, concluding that the one-year ban would apply only if the person was not incarcerated.

In an opinion by Judge Fitzgerald in *City of East Lansing v. Thompson*, No. 292239 (Dec. 2, 2010), the Court of Appeals reinstated her one-year ban. The relevant portion of the riot statute provides that “[t]he court may order the individual not to enter upon any public community college, public college, or public university campus in this state . . . for 1 year following the imposition of sentence or, if the person is ordered incarcerated for the violation, the completion of the term of incarceration.” The Court of Appeals rejected the circuit court’s interpretation, noting that the plain language allowed for a ban “for 1 year following [1] the imposition of sentence or . . . [2] the completion of any term of incarceration.” [MCL 769.1g\(1\)\(a\)\(ii\)](#). The ruling relied on the grammar rule of parallelism: both the word “imposition” and the word “completion” were events, so it read the conjunction “or” as dividing those events, rather than as dividing a duration (“for one year following the imposition of a sentence”) and an event (“the completion of any term of incarceration”).