

imprisonment, to run consecutively, as well as 3 years of mandatory supervised release.

¶ 5 Defendant filed a *pro se* motion to withdraw his guilty plea in which he argued that there was no factual basis to support the plea and that he received ineffective assistance of counsel. Defense counsel then filed a motion to withdraw defendant's guilty plea and a motion to reduce his sentence. Due to the allegations of ineffective assistance of counsel in defendant's *pro se* motion, the court ordered new counsel to be appointed to defendant. Defendant's new counsel did not file an amended motion, but did file a Rule 604(d) certificate, which stated that (1) counsel had spoken with the defendant over the telephone to ascertain the defendant's contentions of error in his plea of guilty and (2) that counsel had reviewed the transcripts of both the plea of guilty and the sentencing proceedings. Subsequently, the court denied the motion. This appeal followed.

¶ 6

ANALYSIS

¶ 7 We review *de novo* circuit court compliance with supreme court rules. *People v. Dismuke*, 355 Ill. App. 3d 606, 608 (2005). Rule 604(d) requires that a defendant's attorney file a certificate with the trial court that certifies that he has (1) consulted with the defendant either by mail or in person to ascertain the defendant's contentions of error in the sentence or in the guilty plea, (2) examined the trial court file and report of the proceedings of the guilty plea, and (3) made any amendments to the motion necessary for adequate presentation of any defects in those proceedings. Defense counsel must strictly comply with the requirements of Rule 604(d). *People v. Dryden*, 2012 IL App (2d) 110646, ¶ 4. Failure to comply with the requirements of Rule 604(d) results in a deficient certificate. *Dismuke*, 355 Ill. App. 3d at 609. The remedy for failing to strictly comply with Rule 604(d) is to remand the matter to the circuit court for (1) filing a proper Rule 604(d) certificate, (2) the opportunity to file a new motion to withdraw the defendant's guilty plea and/or reconsider sentence, if counsel determines that new motion is necessary, and (3) a new motion hearing.

People v. Lindsay, 239 Ill. 2d 522, 531 (2011).

¶ 8 Here, defense counsel filed a certificate that complied with only two of the three requirements of Rule 604(d). Counsel failed to include the third requirement, which states that counsel "has made any amendments to the motion necessary for adequate presentation of any defects in those proceedings." Ill. S. Ct. R. 604(d) (eff. Feb. 6, 2013). Thus, defense counsel did not strictly comply with Rule 604(d), and we must vacate the circuit court's order and remand the cause.

¶ 9 **CONCLUSION**

¶ 10 For the foregoing reasons, the judgment of the circuit court of St. Clair County is vacated and the cause remanded.

¶ 11 Vacated and remanded.