

FILED
Nov 19 2014
Court of Appeals
Division I
State of Washington

STATEMENT OF ADDITIONAL
GROUNDS FOR REVIEW

STATE OF WASHINGTON)
)
 Respondent,)
)
 v.)
)
 DAVID HAILEY JR)
 (your name))
)
 Appellant.)

No. 71564-0-1
STATEMENT OF ADDITIONAL
GROUNDS FOR REVIEW

I, DAVID HAILEY JR, have received and reviewed the opening brief prepared by my attorney. Summarized below are the additional grounds for review that are not addressed in that brief. I understand the Court will review this Statement of Additional Grounds for Review when my appeal is considered on the merits.

Additional Ground 1

On Pages # 1 Through Page # 10, HEREIN THESE
STATEMENTS, LAWS AND TRUTH BEING STATED !!!

Additional Ground 2

On Page # 10 Through Page # 16, HEREIN THESE STATEMENTS,
LAWS AND ALL TRUTH BY CONSTITUTIONAL LAW BEING STATED.

Additional Grounds 3

Page # 16 Through Page # 21, UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT LAWS,

If there are additional grounds, a brief summary is attached to this statement.

Date: November, 14, 2014

Signature: David Hailey

DAVID HAILEY
DOC# 844128 N-BYLE^u
Airway Heights correction center

Additional Grounds 1

A. ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR

1. THE STATES USE OF MR. HAILEY'S STATEMENTS TO THE INVESTIGATIVE OFFICER in it's CASE IN CHIEF VIOLATED HIS RIGHTS UNDER THE FIFTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS,

B. ISSUES

1. THE INVESTIGATIVE OFFICER did not pick a CERTAIN DATE OR TIME OR PLACE AND CIRCUMSTANCES FOR INTERVIEWING MR. HAILEY'S A CITIZEN WHO WAS ONLY A SUSPECT OF FILING CHARGES, ABSENT EVIDENCE, THE OFFICER ADVISED THE SUSPECT OF HIS RIGHT TO REMAIN SILENT AND TOLD HIM NO MORE THAN THIS AND QUESTIONED HIM AT THIS MOMENT IN THE POLICE CAR. CAN AND DID THIS SHOW CIRCUMSTANCES THAT THE SUSPECTS STATEMENTS WERE INVOLUNTARY?

2. IS THE ADMISSION INTO EVIDENCE OF THE SUSPECTS INVOLUNTARY STATEMENTS TO LAW

ENFORCEMENT MANIFEST CONSTITUTIONAL ERROR
THAT REQUIRES REVERSAL.

C. STATEMENT OF CASE

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE
OF WASHINGTON, DIVISION ONE.

STATE OF WASHINGTON V. DAVID HAILEY JR.
ON APPEAL FROM THE SUPERIOR COURT OF
THE STATE OF WASHINGTON FOR SNOHOMISH
COUNTY, CASE # NO. 13-1-00939-5, COA # NO. 71564-0-1,

HONORABLE MICHAEL T. DOWNES, JUDGE

HONORABLE DAVID A. KURTZ, JUDGE

BRIEF OF APPELLANT

STATEMENT OF THE CASE, PAGE #1

D. ARGUMENT

1. THE LAW OFFICER TESTIMONY RELATING
MR. HAILEY'S STATEMENTS TO LAW OFFICER
VIOLATED HIS RIGHTS TO REMAIN SILENT
AND HIS RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS.

THE FIFTH AMENDMENT TO THE UNITED STATES

CONSTITUTION GUARANTEES THAT "NO PERSON"

SHALL BE COMPELLED IN ANY CRIMINAL CASE TO

BE WITNESS AGAINST HIMSELF" GRIFFIN V.

CALIFORNIA, 380 U.S. 609, 619, 85 S. CT. 1229,

14 L. Ed. 106 (1995). "THE RIGHT AGAINST SELF-
INCRIMINATION IS LITERALLY CONSTRAINED." STATE
V. EASTER 130 W.A. 2d. 728, 236, 922 P. 2d. 1285

(1996). DUE PROCESS REQUIRES THAT A CONFESSION
BE VOLUNTARY AND NOT THE PRODUCT OF POLICE
COERSION. STATE V. RUEBER, 62 W.A. App. 620,
624, 814 P. 2d. 1177 (1991).

THE QUESTION OF VOLUNTARINESS IS ONE
FACT, TO BE DETERMINED BY THE TRIAL COURT
FROM THE TOTALITY OF ALL CIRCUMSTANCES.

SCHNEEKLOTH V. BUSTAMANTE, 412 U.S. 218,
227, 93 S. Ct. 2041, 36 L. Ed. 2d. 854. (1973).

"THE TEST FOR VOLUNTARINESS IS WHETHER
"THE CONFESSION [IS] THE PRODUCT OF AN
ESSENTIALLY FREE AND UNCONSTRAINED CHOICE
BY ITS MAKER." STATE V. THOMPSON, 73 W.A.

App. 122, 867 P.2d. 691 (1994).

a. THE STATEMENTS WERE NOT VOLUNTARY
THE STATE MAY NOT USE CUSTODIAL STATEMENTS

OF A DEFENDANT AT TRIAL PROVE THE DEFENDANTS
PRIVILEGE AGAINST SELF-INCRIMINATION WAS
ADEQUATELY PROTECTED BY WARNINGS SET OUT

IN MIRANDA V. ARIZONA 384 U.S. 436, 86 S.

CT. 1602, 16 L. ED. 2D. 694 (1966). "[5] SELF-

INCRIMINATING STATEMENTS OBTAINED FROM AN
INDIVIDUAL IN CUSTODY ARE PRESUMED TO BE

INVOLUNTARY, AND TO VIOLATE THE FIFTH AMENDMENT,

UNLESS THE STATE THAT THEY WERE PRECEDED
BY A KNOWING AND VOLUNTARY WAIVER OF THE

PRIVILEGE. STATE V. SARGENT, 111 Wn. 2d. 641,

648, 462 P.2d. 1127, 1131 (1988).

A STATEMENT IS CUSTODIAL FOR MIRANDA
PURPOSES NOT ONLY WHEN THERE HAS BEEN AN

ARREST, BUT WHENEVER A PERSON'S FREEDOM OF MOVEMENT HAS BEEN SIGNIFICANTLY RESTRAINED.

UNITED STATES V. BERKEMEYER, 468 U.S. 4120, 441,

82 L. Ed. 2d 317, 104 S. Ct. 3138 (1984). WARNINGS

MUST BE GIVEN WHENEVER A PERSON HAS BEEN DEPRIVED OF HIS FREEDOM IN ANY SIGNIFICANT

WAY. MIRANDA 324 U.S. at 444.

A CUSTODIAL INTERROGATION OCCURS WHEN POLICE ASK QUESTIONS THEY "SHOULD KNOW ARE REASONABLE LIKELY TO ELICIT AN INCRIMINATING RESPONSE". STATE V. SARGENT, III, 70 N.J. 2d 476, 70 A.2d 650,

THE FOCUS IS ON "THE PERCEPTION OF THE SUSPECT, RATHER THAN THE INTENT OF THE POLICE". Shocks

Island v. Tuis, 446 U.S. 791, 301, 100 S. Ct. 1682, 64 L. Ed. 2d 297 (1980);

WHETHER A PERSON IS IN CUSTODY DEPENDS

ON WHETHER, THE SUSPECT REASONABLY SUPPOSED
HIS FREEDOM OF ACTION WAS CURTAILED." STATE
V. C. G., 84 Wn. App. 832, 836, 930 P.2d. 350,
REVIEW DENIED, 132 Wn. 2d. 1015 (1997), CITING
STATE V. SHORT, 113 Wn. 2d. 35, 41, 445 P. 3d.
458, (1989). (T)HE ONLY RELEVANT INQUIRY IS
HOW A REASONABLE PERSON IN THE SUSPECTS
POSITION WOULD HAVE UNDERSTOOD HIS SITUATION."
BERKMAN, 486 U.S. at 442.

POLICEMAN DILL PROVIDED A LIMITED
DESCRIPTION OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF MR. HAILEY
ON DATE JANUARY 15, 2013. AT NIGHT IN A
NISSAN MAKING A LEFT HAND TURN CANNOT SEE WHO
IS IN CAR, ONLY THAT THE PERSON HAD A BOXY HEAD ^{PAGE #196} AND
COULD NOT IDENTIFY PASSENGER MAN OR WOMAN ONLY
THAT PERSON HAD LONG HAIR! PAGE 197-198 TRANSCRIPT.

PASSENGER COULD HAVE BEEN A "DUMMY WITH LONG HAIR?" NEVER ARRESTED PASSENGER IN NISSAN, NEVER MET PASSENGER. HOW CAN YOU CHARGE A PERSON, THE SUSPECT ON "ENDANGERING ANOTHER PERSON'S LIFE" AND DID NOT EVER MEET PASSENGER IN NISSAN? HOW DO YOU ENDANGER A DUMMY'S LIFE?

MR. HAILEY'S STATEMENT TO OFFICER WHEN "HE" WAS CAUGHT THAT "HE" SAID "I KNOW. I'VE BEEN STUPID AGAIN LATELY!" PAGE #191. AS I HAVE NOW STATED IN PAGES #2-#4, OF THIS ADDITIONAL BOUND #1, THIS WAS AGAINST WASHINGTON STATE LAWS, WASHINGTON SUPREME COURT LAWS, WASHINGTON CONSTITUTIONAL LAWS AND SUPREME COURT OF UNITED STATES LAWS. ALL STATED HEREIN! INCLUDING U.S. STATES CONSTITUTION FIFTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS. THE POLICEMAN DID NOT TESTIFY THAT MR. HAILEY, THAT HE WAS REQUIRED TO ANSWER HIS

QUESTIONS. THE EVIDENCE BEFORE THE COURT
SHOWED THIS TO BE A CUSTODIAL INTERROGATION FOR
PURPOSE OF MR. HAILEY'S STATEMENTS TO THE
POLICEMAN WERE NOT VOLUNTARY. CERTAINLY HIS
ANSWERS DO NOT APPEAR TO BE "THE PRODUCT OF
AN ESSENTIALLY FREE AND UNCONSTRAINED CHOICE."

SCHNECKLOFF, 412 U.S. AT 225

THE STATE'S INTRODUCTION OF EVIDENCE INTO
MR. HAILEY'S ALLEGED STATEMENTS TO OFFICER VIOLATED
HIS RIGHTS UNDER THE FIFTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS.

THE STATE'S USE OF OFFICER DILL TESTIMONY
RELATING HIS INTERVIEW WITH MR. HAILEY WAS A
MANIFEST VIOLATION OF HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS.

STATE V. GREEN, 91 WASH. 2D 431, 588 P. 2D.

1340 (1979). OUR RULING THAT A STATEMENT MADE
BY APPELLANT WAS NOT THE PRODUCT OF CUSTODIAL

INTERROGATION in violation of MIRANDA v. ARIZONA,
384 U.S. 436, 86 S.Ct. 1602, 16 L.Ed. 694, 10 A.L.R.
3d, 974 (1966) (2) One Ruling that the STATE did
NOT possess UNFETTERED discretion under [94 Wn.
2d. 219] RCW 9A.32.045 (2), [ENI] And. 050(1)(c)
(2) and (5) to SEEK VARYING DEGREES OF Punishment
FOR DIFFERENT PERSONS who commit IDENTICAL
CRIMES, This VIOLATING EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAW,

Additional Ground 2

MR. HALEY,
WAS NOT GIVEN 3.5 HEARING BECAUSE HIS
LAWYER AT THAT TIME, MS. TIFFANY MECCA, TOLD
MR. HALEY, THAT 3.5 HEARING WAS NOT NEEDED AND
IF THEY DID HAVE A 3.5 HEARING, IT WOULD NOT MAKE
ANY DIFFERENCE IN TRIAL BECAUSE IT COULD ALL
BE USED AGAIN. MR. HALEY WAS LIED TO BY THIS
LAWYER, WHO LATER WAS EXCUSED FROM MA,

Hailey's Trial and Mr. Philip Sawyer was brought forth to be his lawyer in court, also Ms. Mecca without any talking or advising Mr. Hailey, she changed the judges before his trial got started, no apparent reason given to defendant Mr. Hailey, only one day he had one judge for trial and the next time in court he had a different judge for his court trial,

STATE V. GREEN, 91 WASH. 2D 431, 588 P.2D 1370 (1979). NECESSITY OF REQUESTS, DEFENDANT WAS NOT WITHOUT STANDING TO RAISE ISSUE WITH RESPECT TO PROPRIETY OF INSTRUCTIONS BY REASON OF HIS FAILURE TO REQUEST SUCH INSTRUCTIONS OR TO ASSIGN SUCH FAILURE AS ERROR WHERE IT WAS CLEAR THAT FAILURE TO GIVE INSTRUCTIONS VIOLATED A FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT TO DEFENDANT,

THE SUPREME COURT, 91 WASH. 2D. 431, 588 P.2D.

1340, (1979) AFFIRMED JUDGEMENT, BUT REMANDED

CAUSE FOR REIMPOSITION OF APPROPRIATE SENTENCE

(1) ELEMENTS WERE NOT ESTABLISHED EITHER BY RULE OF SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE OR BY RULE OF REASONABLE DOUBT IN ABSENCE OF EVIDENCE OF RESTRAINT BY MEANS OF SECRETION OF THE VICTIM, RESTRAINT BY MEANS OF THREAT TO USE OF DEADLY FORCE, OR RESTRAINT BY MEANS OF DEADLY FORCE OTHER THAN KILLING ITSELF AND (2) WHERE NATURE OF VERDICT FORM IN CASE MADE IT IMPOSSIBLE TO ESTABLISH WHETHER JURY WAS UNANIMOUS IN DETERMINING

HIS GUILT. (JURY CAME OUT FROM DELIBERATIONS, ASKED FOR STATEMENT MR. HALEY MADE WHEN ARRESTED IN POLICE CAR!!)

MR. HALEY WAS SECRETED IN A HOME OF HIS FRIENDS

AND GIRL FRIEND. PAGE #106, #107, TRANSCRIPT, PAGES #108,

#109, #110, #111, #112, #113, #114, AND PAGE #115. POLICE SURROUNDED

THE HOUSE, OPEN SPACE, OPEN VIEW AND WERE USING

TO GO INTO THE HOME, THEY ONLY SAW MR. HAIKEY IN
THE HOME. STILL REALLY NO TRAK IDENTITY THAT MR.
HAIKEY WAS THE ELUDING SUSPECT AND NO IDENTITY
THAT THERE WAS A MAN OR WOMAN IN HIS NISSAN
CARR "HE" WAS SUPPOSED TO BE DRIVING, AND SUPPOSED
TO BE ELUDING POLICE, BUT THEY GO TO A HOME AND
USE DEADLY FORCE TO ENTER RESIDENCE AND USE A DOG TO
FIND HIM IN 2ND. FLOOR OF HOME AND IN ATTICK AND THE
DOG BIT HIM. MR. HAIKEY HAD NO DUCK, NO WEAPONS,
BUT POLICE USED DEADLY FORCE AND A DOG ON A
SUPPOSED TO BE SUSPECT, MR. SAYLES HIS LAWYER
ON PAGE #100 SAYS "UNDER ER 403, THE QUESTION
THEN BECOMES WHETHER THE EVIDENCE SHOULD BE EXCLUDED
ON THE BASIS THAT ITS PROBATIVE VALUE IS SUBSTANTIALLY
OUTWEIGHED BY THE DANGER OF UNFAIR PREJUDICE,
CONFUSION OF THE ISSUES, OR MISLEADING THE JURY."

Page #111, Mr. Hailey was bit by dog and was in
"FEAR FOR HIS LIFE", SUPREME COURT, 91 WASH. 2D,
431, 588 P.2d, 1390 (1979).

203 K 1165 (PREDICATE OFFENSES OR CONDUCTS,
FORMERLY 203K 235)

Considering unusually short time involved,
minimal distance victim was moving, location of
PARTICIPANT when found, clear visibility of that
location from outside as well as total lack of
evidence of actual isolation from ^{OPEN} public areas,
abduction through RESTRAINT by means of SECRETING
victim in a place where she or he was not likely
to be found was not established under either the
substantial evidence or reasonable doubt, Rule
WEST RCW WA 9A.02.045 (2), 9A.40020. All

evidence so far through all trial was circumstantial
evidence. No REAL IDENTITY! No FINGERPRINT DONE

ON EITHER MUSTANG OR PISSAN CARS, NO TAKING PRINTS
OF SMUDGES OR FINGER PRINTS ON STEERING WHEEL OR
SMUDGES THROUGHOUT ANY OF CARS, AGAIN NO EVIDENCE
MR. HAILEY WAS DRIVING EITHER MUSTANG OR PISSAN
CARS. WAS NOT APPENDED IN EITHER CAR OR CAUGHT
IN VEHICLES. ONLY SEEN AT ALLEY WAY OR HOUSES,
OR APARTMENT WHERE MR. HAILEY WAS SEEN, NOT
EVEN NEAR EACH VEHICLE, A "BLOCK HEAD" "SQUARE
JAW" IN THE DARK IN A SPEEDING CAR TURNING
LEFT IS NOT TAKE IDENTITY! OR PASSENGER IN CAR,
NOT MALE OR FEMALE DID NOT KNOW BY EITHER
POLICEMAN IN CHASE OF CAR, MAYBE A DUMMY
WITH LONG HAIR WIG? ARRESTED IN HOME OF FRIEND
ALL USE OF DEADLY FORCE AND ENDANGERED OF MR.
HAILEY'S LIFE! NO DOPE, NO GUN OWNED BY MR. HAILEY.
ONLY IN HOUSE WITH FRIEND, WHY? DEADLY FORCE, AND

THREAT TO MR. HAILEY'S LIFE BY USE OF DOG WHO BIT
HIM AND MR. HAILEY WAS IN FEAR OF BEING KILLED,
SUPREME COURT, 91 WASH. 2D. 431, 588, P. 2D. 1370 (1974)

Additional Grounds 3

"FREEDOM OF SPEECH OR OF THE PRESS, OR THE RIGHT
OF THE PEOPLE PEACEABLY ASSEMBLE, AND TO PETITION
THE GOVERNMENT FOR REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES," ARTICLE
I, UNITED STATE CONSTITUTION, PAGE # 34, SENTENCES
#1 - #17, PAGE # 43, SENTENCES #13 - #25, PAGE # 44 SENTENCES
#1 - #3, MR. HAILEY'S FRIENDS COMING TO COURT WITH
"FREE DAVID" T-SHIRTS, THE COURT SAYS MULTIPLE
PERSONS. THEN SAYING TWO PEOPLE HAVE THESE
T-SHIRTS ON THEM. JUDGE TELLING THEM THEY CAN
NOT DO THIS. THEY HAVE TO COVER THEM UP AND THIS
IS A OPEN COURT ROOM AND TRIAL. NO REASON FOR
THE JUDGE TO ORDER T-SHIRTS COVERED UP WHEN

THESE IS "FREEDOM OF SPEECH" ALLOWED BY
UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION, THESE INDIVIDUALS
WERE MAKING NO NOISE, CAUSING NO TROUBLE
IN COURT ROOM, JUST WEARING "FREE DAVID" T-
SHIRTS, THEY HAVE RIGHT TO ASSEMBLE AS CITIZENS
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. ALSO SEE;
ARTICLE I, CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES,
CONCERNING "THE RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE TO BE SECURE
IN THEIR PERSONS, HOUSES, PAPERS AND EFFECTS AGAINST
UNREASONABLE SEARCHES, AND SEIZURES, SHALL NOT BE
VIOLATED AND NO WARRANTS SHALL ISSUE." JUDGE SAID
ON PAGE #44, TRANSCRIPT, SENTENCE #1-#3, PAGE #4-#8.

THAT HE WAS NOT GOING TO LET ANYBODY INTIMIDATE
THIS COURT. MAN AND WOMEN IN COURT ROOM WEARING
"FREE DAVID" T-SHIRTS WERE NOT INTIMIDATING ANYONE,
PERSONS BEING THREATENED BY JUDGE. AND NOW

Article # XIV, SECTION 1: "All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the Jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any Law which shall abridge the Privileges or Immunities of citizen of the United States, nor shall any State deprive any person of life, Liberty, or property without due process of Law, nor deny to any person within its Jurisdiction the Equal Protection of the Law."

Judge In Court Room had No Right To Deny These Persons, These Individuals Their Right Under Our Constitution of The United States, Article # I, Article # V, Article # XIV.

GREEN I. Shortly AFTER publication of GREEN I, The United States Supreme Court held

In JACKSON v. Virginia, SUPRA, THAT ON REVIEW THE PROPER TEST IS WHETHER THERE WAS SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE TO JUSTIFY A RATIONAL TRIER OF FACT TO FIND GUILT BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT. (LENZ) "AFTER Winship (397 U.S. 358, 90 S. Ct. 1028, 25 L. Ed. 2d. [94 Wn. 2d. 221] 328 (1970)), THE CRITICAL INQUIRY ON A REVIEW OF THE SUFFICIENCY OF THE EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT A CRIMINAL CONVICTION MUST BE NOT SIMPLY TO DETERMINE WHETHER THE JURY WAS PROPERLY INSTRUCTED, BUT TO DETERMINE WHETHER THE RECORD EVIDENCE COULD REASONABLY DOUBT.

JACKSON v. Virginia, SUPRA, 443 U.S. AT 318, 99 S. Ct. at 2489. THE CRITERION IMPINGES UPON A JURY'S DISCRETION ONLY TO THE EXTENT NECESSARY TO PROTECT THE CONSTITUTIONAL STANDARD OF REASONABLE DOUBT. AS POINTED OUT

In JACKSON AT PAGE 320, 99 S. Ct. AT PAGE 2790,
A LESSEER STANDARD WOULD FAIL "to supply a workable,
OR PREDICTABLE STANDARD FOR DETERMINING WHETHER
DUE PROCESS COMMAND OF WINSHIP HAS BEEN
HONORED,

MR. HAILEY JR. UPON REASONABLE DOUBT, LACK
OF EVIDENCE, LACK OF IDENTITY, DEPRIVED OF
LIFE, LIBERTY AND DENIED DUE PROCESS OF LAW. AND
ARTICLE # I, ARTICLE # IV and ARTICLE # XIV CONSTITUTION
OF THE UNITED STATES, JUDGE IN COURT ROOM HAD NO
RIGHT TO DENY PERSONS IN COURT ROOM THEIR RIGHTS
IN THEIR JURISDICTION THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE
LAW. ALSO THE USE OF DEADLY FORCE AND FEAR FOR
HIS LIFE BY DOG ATTACKING HIM AND BITING HIM,

"Conclusion"

FOR THE REASONS DISCUSSED ABOVE, HAILEY'S
CONVICTIONS SHOULD BE REVERSED AND CASE REMANDED.

DATED this 14th Day of November, 2014.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID HAILEY JR

David Hailey

DOC# 844128 N-B46^u

Airway Heights correction cent

99001

I, DAVID HAILEY ^{DOC#} 844128, declare, under

Penalty of Perjury, under penalty of perjury, under

the laws of the State of Washington, and to the

Laws of the United States of America, that

The foregoing is true and correct pursuant to:

RCW 9A.72.085, and 28 U.S.C. § 1746.

DATED November 14th, 2014

David Hailey 844128

Signature DOC#

DAVID HAILEY N-B46^u

Airway Heights Correction Print Name

Center

P.O. Box 2049

Page # 21

Airway Heights, WA, 99001

NIELSEN, BROMAN & KOCH, PLLC

November 19, 2014 - 2:27 PM

Transmittal Letter

FILED
Nov 19, 2014
Court of Appeals
Division I
State of Washington

Document Uploaded: 715640-David Hailey - SAG.pdf

Case Name: David Hailey

Court of Appeals Case Number: 71564-0

Party Represented:

Is this a Personal Restraint Petition? Yes No

Trial Court County: ____ - Superior Court # ____

The document being Filed is:

- Designation of Clerk's Papers Supplemental Designation of Clerk's Papers
- Statement of Arrangements
- Motion: ____
- Answer/Reply to Motion: ____
- Statement of Additional Authorities
- Affidavit of Attorney Fees
- Cost Bill
- Objection to Cost Bill
- Affidavit
- Letter
- Copy of Verbatim Report of Proceedings - No. of Volumes: ____
Hearing Date(s): _____
- Personal Restraint Petition (PRP)
- Response to Personal Restraint Petition
- Reply to Response to Personal Restraint Petition
- Petition for Review (PRV)
- Other: SAG

Comments:

No Comments were entered.

Sender Name: Patrick P Mayavsky - Email: mayovskyp@nwattorney.net

A copy of this document has been emailed to the following addresses:

Diane.Kremenich@co.snohomish.wa.us