

STATEMENT OF ADDITIONAL
GROUNDS FOR REVIEW

STATE OF WASHINGTON,
Respondent,
v. Ramos, Jason
Appellant.

No. 73063-1
No. 14-C-00026-6-SEA
STATEMENT OF ADDITIONAL
GROUNDS FOR REVIEW

I, Jason Ramos, 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

Both the state and Federal
Constitutions Prohibit
unreasonable searches and
seizures.

Additional Ground 2

Right to speedy trial
U.S.C.A. 10. sec. 1, Constitution
of the state of Washington
Article I section 22.

2015 NOV -2 AM 11:41
CLERK OF SUPERIOR COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
D-1 S DIV 1

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

Date: 10/27/2014 Signature: Jason Ramos

I Jason Ramos, the appellant in the above cause no. Humbly moves the Court of appeals to review the following under B.A.P. 10.10 and B.A.P. 1.2(A) interpretation. These rules will be liberally interpreted to promote justice and facilitate the decision of cases on the merits.

Facts Prelevant

On the 30th day of January, 2014 I Jason Ramos was charged and convicted by a trial by jury in and for the County of King for the term of 169 months, which I'm now serving in the Washington state department of corrections.

My Story

I woke up the next day handcuffed to the hospital bed. when I was questioned I asked for the handcuffs to be removed Det. Takemoto refused to take them off. I was in a lot of pain, but I still gave him

My Story

a statement. When he left the room I was still handcuffed to the bed. He was gone for about an hour; when he came back he said I was free to go. Months later, I was picked up for robbery.

To have probable cause for arrest or detain, the witness's allegations must be corroborated with the officers independent observation to validate a legal seizure. There was no independent observation or corroboration leading to a valid suspicion of a crime committed. The detectives based their suspicion on the interviews with the pretty savvy witness who demanded to speak with his own attorney and then chose to remain silent. The alleged victims jarvis and Neal were interviewed some 15 days after the incident, during that time, many of his friends visited him at the hospital numerous times. It is reasonably inferred that these friends of Neal and jarvis talked with these friends about the incident to get their story straight.

My Story

Mr. Ramos' mere presence with or near Mr. Ibrahim was not sufficient to justify the officer's actions to seize and arrest Mr. Ramos. The facts that Mr. Blum who was not injured and not treated for any medical procedures, concocted the story on how he slashed the throats of Mr. Ramos and Mr. Ibrahim, and proceeded to stab the two of them multiple times after slashing their throats should give rise to the credibility and actions.

Mr. Blum should be charged with assault and use of excessive force and means to assault Mr. Ramos and Mr. Ibrahim. Even if, Mr. Blum's accusation that Ramos and Ibrahim were try to steal the backpack, Mr. Blum's uses of weapons and the multiples stabbing clearly were excessive.

Additional Grounds I.

(a) Both the state and federal Constitutions prohibit unreasonable searches and seizures.

The fourth amendment to the United States Constitution guarantees the right of the people to be secure in their persons and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures. The due process clause of the fourteenth amendment extends this right to protect against intrusions by state governments. (Mapp v. Ohio, 367 U.S. 643 (1960).) "It is by now axiomatic that article 1 section 7 provides greater protection to an individual's right of privacy than that guaranteed by the fourth amendment." (State v. Parker 139 W.2d 486, 493 (1999).)

The Washington constitution has consistently provided greater protection of individual rights than its federal counterpart. see (State v. Williams 102 Wn.2d 733 (1984)) § see (State v. Ladson, 138 Wn.2d 343 (1999).) Indeed the scope of the protections offered by article 1, section 7 is "not limited to subjective expectations

of privacy but, more broadly, protects those privacy interests which citizens of this state have held, and should be entitled to hold, safe from government trespass absent a warrant." Parker, 139 Wn.2d at 494 (quoting State v. Mysick, 102 Wn.2d 506, 511 (1984)).

Quote Sub #'s and Dates

clerk's papers pg # 92 (18-22) 11/18/14

clerk's papers pg # 93 (1-8) 11/18/14

clerk's papers pg # 94 (4-7) 11/18/14

clerk's papers pg # 95 (2-13) 11/18/14

Relief Sought

(1) Dismissal

(2) Remanded for retrial if dismissal is denied.

(3) Resentenced to lower term.

Facts Relevant

On the 17th day of April, 2014. We set my trial date. My omnibus hearing was set for 5/24/14. On the 23rd day of May, 2014. My Counsel Mr. Carey Huffman is relieved of his duties as my counsel and Ms. Wiegand is appointed my new counsel.

My Story

The day before my omnibus hearing my counsel Carey Huffman came to see me and told me "I found a conflict." I told him "that's not right were supposed to go to our omnibus hearing tomorrow." he said "he couldn't represent me any more." I thought that was pretty convenient since we were going to trial soon the date was already set. I was then forced to have a new attorney. I was forced in giving my new attorney time to look into my case. Which took more than 9 months before I would go to trial.

Additional Grounds II.

Right to speedy trial
U.S.C.A. 10 sec. 1. constitution
of the state of Washington
article I section 22.

Forcing a defendant
to choose between his right to
a speedy trial and to a fair
trial with adequately prepared
counsel who has had time
is grounds for dismissal.
(state v. terms, 89 Wn. app. 390, 448 P.2d (1338))

Such prejudice includes the
right to a speedy trial and
the "right to be represented by
counsel who has had sufficient
opportunity to adequately prepare
a material part of his defense."
(state v. Price Wn. 2d 810, 814, 620 P.2d 994 (1980))

A Lawyer shall provide competent
representation to a client. Competent
representation requires the legal
knowledge, skill, thoroughness, and
preparation reasonably necessary
for the representation. RPC 1.1

Quote Sub #'s and Dates

(A) order for continuance 3/17/14 to 4/7/14 total of 3 continuances. Sub # 9-16 E.

(B) Trial Date set 4/17/14 Sub # 18 E.C.R. (Electronic Court Records)

(C) Sub of Counsel 5/23/14 CLK. paper pg # 13 Sub # 25 E.C.R.

(D) order to continue omnibus hearing 5/23/14 to 10/29/14 total of 5 continuance. Sub # 26, 39, 57, 67, 71. E.C.R.

(E) order to continue trial date 5/30/14 to 12/02/14 total of 10 times continued. Sub # 28, 32, 37, 55, 59, 61, 65, 68, EC

Relief Sought

1. Dismissal.
2. Remanded for retrial if dismissal is denied.
3. Resentenced to lower term.

Conclusion

I would like to thank the court in advance for your time and patience in this matter.

Jason Pramos 10/27/20