

COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO
OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

FILED
COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION II

2015 MAY -4 AM 9:10

STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE OF WASHINGTON)
)
 Respondent,)
)
 v.)
)
 Expy SANABRIA)
 (your name))
)
 Appellant.)

No. 46685-6-11 BY [Signature]
DEPUTY

STATEMENT OF ADDITIONAL
GROUNDS FOR REVIEW

I, Expy SANABRIA, 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

Additional Ground 1 and 2 Are Attached

Additional Ground 2

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

Date: 4-27-15

Signature: [Signature]

Additional Ground 1

- The Prosecutor held Charges against Me Without evidence to Support officers Allegations. No Fingerprints that would prove I handled Any Drugs or equipment to do so, No offer of Tangible Evidence that would Support that I in Fact lived or had an agreement to Rent the Home in question. This was Key to Make the Stretch that I also intended to Sell drugs with Found paraphernalia.
- The Prosecutor Originally Charged Me With one Count of Possession with intent to Sell Meth. And one of Possession with intent to Sell Marijuana and continued the pendency of those Charges till the day of Trial, indicating that He did not have evidence to charge which could also be interpreted as a tactic to force Me into a plea.
- The Prosecutor Amended the Charges Against Ms ANN, ON the day of Trial, to Simple Possession/Constructive Possession, yet charged Me With the More Serious Crime of Possession with intent to Sell. Mr. Curtis Never offered a Valid reason to be lenient towards Ms. ANN and Not toward Me.
- The Prosecutor did Not provide the buy Report which officer Martin said was used as probable Cause for Searching and Arresting Me. They were also requested to file an Adequate Franks Hearing. That request and burden has Never been Met.

• The Prosecutor lead everyone to believe there would be a Continuence because an officer would be on vacation. Knowing this He Asked to Move Forward with trial and call for the Jurors. This would Violate My Right to Confront the witness Against Me. The officer that Allegedly found nearly all incriminating evidence. He tells the Court His Information was from officer Canton, that He would Not be available, Page 167 Line 17-20. Mr. White Say, Page 167 Line 3-9, "Apparently Mr. Curtis information is directly from the officer". The judge responds by saying, "Its a little bit old as I understood". Mr. Curtis Made No real Attempt to have him present At All. Even if He were truly unavailable on the 23rd, Does Not Make him unavailable the rest of the week we were Scheduled for trial.

Mr Curtis goes Further to Admitt that he released officer Canton from the Subpoena on June 24th Because He could Not get a Hold of Him. This is on Page 307 Line 19 to page 308 Line 9.

Line 18 of page 169 Mr Curtis Says "And Im Not obligated to Call those witnesses. And I make Strategic decisions. Sometimes They Help. Sometimes They Hurt."

Mr Curtis Has Abused his discretion to the point that I could Not recieve a fair trial.

In Fact Mr. Curtis requested that there be a Continuence on June 18th. Ms. Melby offers an e-mail sent to Mr. White And Her by Superior Court Administration, Page 171 Line 16 - page 172 Line 25.

Mr. Curtis intentions were clear. Mr. Curtis understood the Constitutional Right to face My Accuser. He is aware of My Right to the by Reports, which is the Probable Cause for My Search and Arrest. He Was Sworn to uphold Justice and Not Win At ANY Cost.

He understands that I was still under the protection against over charging and charging a higher degree in order to Force a plea, And that the Continued pendency of Charges that are Not supported evidence, is a Sign of Misconduct.

Additional Ground 2

The Phone Call offered by the County jail is Prejudicial. After a Pierce County officer testified that Pin #^s used for Phone Calls were often Sold, Stolen and bought. The Court Still Agreed to enter it As evidence. The Phone Recording lead the Jury to Assume that I was on the Phone Referring to a Crime that I Committed involving Drugs And that the Home which I used to store them is the Home that was Searched by police and found incriminating evidence. There were no Specific's, such as A reference of a Crime, No Specific Address, They can't even track who the Phone Call was to. Even if they could prove that the Pin# wasn't Stolen, Sold, Traded or bought the important Specific's such as the Crime or Any Crime, And the Address of the Home in question has not been established. It Even leaves the Jurors to Assume that the Home belongs to Me Without Facts to Support it.