NO. 47030-6-II

COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON,

DIVISION II

STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Respondent,

vs.

CHARLES S. LONGSHORE, III,

Appellant.

SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF OF APPELLANT

John A. Hays, No. 16654
Attorney for Appellant

1402 Broadway
Suite 103
Longview, WA 98632
(360) 423-3084

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

A. TABLE OF AUTHORITIES iii

B. ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR

1. Assignment of Error 1

2. Issue Pertaining to Assignment of Error 1

C. STATEMENT OF THE CASE 2

D. ARGUMENT

THIS COURT SHOULD NOT IMPOSE APPELLATE COSTS ON APPEAL 3

E. CONCLUSION ....

F. AFFIRMATION OF SERVICE ....

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

State Cases

State v. Nolan, 141 Wn.2d 620, 8 P.3d 300 (2000) 3, 4

State v. Sinclair, 192 Wn. App. 380, 367 P.3d 612 (2016) 3-5

Statutes and Court Rules

RCW 10.73.160 . . . . 3, 4

RAP 14.2 3

ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR

Assignment of Error

This court should not impose appellate costs on appeal.

Issues Pertaining to Assignment of Error

Should an appellate court impose costs on appeal if an indigent client has no present or future ability to pay those costs?

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On December 18, 2015, the Kitsap County Superior Court sentenced the defendant to two concurrent sentences of life without release upon his two convictions for aggravated murder in the first degree. CP 22-32. At sentencing the court did not impose any discretionary legal-financial obligations. *Id.* Following trial the court appointed an attorney to represent the defendant on appeal upon its finding that he remained indigent. *See* Order of Indigency.

ARGUMENT

THIS COURT SHOULD NOT IMPOSE APPELLATE COSTS ON APPEAL.

The appellate courts of this state have discretion to refrain from awarding appellate costs even if the State substantially prevails on appeal. RCW 10.73.160(1); *State v. Nolan*, 141 Wn.2d 620, 626, 8 P.3d 300 (2000); *State v. Sinclair*, 192 Wn. App. 380, 382, 367 P.3d 612, 613 (2016). A defendant's inability to pay appellate costs is an important consideration to take into account when deciding whether or not to impose costs on appeal. *State v. Sinclair, supra*. In the case at bar the trial court found the defendant indigent and entitled to the appointment of counsel at both the trial and appellate level. In the same matter this Court should exercise its discretion and disallow trial and appellate costs should the State substantially prevail.

Under RAP 14.2 the State may request that the court order the defendant to pay appellate costs if the state substantially prevails. This rule states that a "commissioner or clerk of the appellate court will award costs to the party that substantially prevails on review, unless the appellate court directs otherwise in its decision terminating review." RAP 14.2. In *State v. Nolan, supra*, the Washington Supreme Court held that while this rule does not grant court clerks or commissioners the discretion to decline the imposition of appellate costs. it does grant this discretion to the appellate court itself. The Supreme Court noted:

> Once it is determined the State is the substantially prevailing party, RAP 14.2 affords the appellate court latitude in determining if costs should be allowed; use of the word "will" in the first sentence appears to remove any discretion from the operation of RAP 14.2 with respect to the commissioner or clerk, but that rule allows for the appellate court to direct otherwise in its decision.

State v. Nolan, 141 Wn. 2d at 626.

Likewise, in RCW 10.73.160 the Washington Legislature has also granted the appellate courts discretion to refrain from granting an award of appellate costs. Subsection one of this statute states: "[t]he court of appeals, supreme court, and superior courts ***may*** require an adult offender convicted of an offense to pay appellate costs." (emphasis added). In *State v. Sinclair*, *supra*, this Court recently affirmed that the statute provides the appellate court the authority to deny appellate costs in appropriate cases. *State v. Sinclair*, 192 Wn. App. at 388. A defendant should not be forced to seek a remission hearing in the trial court, as the availability of such a hearing "cannot displace the court's obligation to exercise discretion when properly requested to do so." *Supra.*

Moreover, the issue of costs should be decided at the appellate court level rather than remanding to the trial court to make an individualized finding regarding the defendant's ability to pay, as remand to the trial court not only "delegate[s] the issue of appellate costs away from the court that is assigned to exercise discretion, it would also potentially be expensive and time-consuming for courts and parties." *State v. Sinclair*, 192 Wn. App. at 388. Thus, "it is appropriate for [an appellate court] to consider the issue of appellate costs in a criminal case during the course of appellate review when the issue is raised in an appellate brief." *State v. Sinclair*, 192 Wn. App. at 390. In addition, under RAP 14.2, the Court may exercise its discretion in a decision terminating review. *Id.*

An appellate court should deny an award of costs to the state in a criminal case if the defendant is indigent and lacks the ability to pay. *Sinclair, supra.* The imposition of costs against indigent defendants raises problems that are well documented, such as increased difficulty in reentering society, the doubtful recoupment of money by the government, and inequities in administration. *State v. Sinclair*, 192 Wn.App. at 391 (citing *State v. Blazina, supra*). As the court notes in *Sinclair*, "[i]t is entirely appropriate for an appellate court to be mindful of these concerns." *State v. Sinclair*, 192 Wn.App. at 391.

In *Sinclair*, the trial court entered an order authorizing the defendant to appeal *in forma pauperis*, to have appointment of counsel, and to have the preparation of the necessary record, all at State expense upon its findings that the defendant was "unable by reason of poverty to pay for any of the expenses of appellate review" and that the defendant "cannot contribute anything toward the costs of appellate review." *State v. Sinclair*, 192 Wn. App. at 392. Given the defendant's indigency, combined with his advanced age and lengthy prison sentence, there was no realistic possibility he would be able to pay appellate costs. Accordingly, the Court ordered that appellate costs not be awarded.

Similarly in the case at bar, the defendant is indigent and lacks an ability to pay. In this case the court appointed an attorney at the trial level and on appeal upon its determination that the defendant was indigency. This finding is supported by the record. The defendant was sentenced the life without release and will never have the opportunity for gainful employment. Given these factors, it is unrealistic to think the defendant will be able to pay appellate costs. Thus, this court should exercise its discretion to reach a just and equitable result and direct that no appellate costs be allowed should the State substantially prevail on appeal.

CONCLUSION

If the state prevails, this court should not impose costs on appeal.

DATED this 30th day of May, 2016.

Respectfully submitted,

John A. Hays, No. 16654
Attorney for Appellant

COURT OF APPEALS OF WASHINGTON, DIVISION II

STATE OF WASHINGTON, Respondent, vs. CHARLES S. LONGSHORE, III, Appellant.	NO. 47030-6-II AFFIRMATION OF SERVICE

The under signed states the following under penalty of perjury under the laws of Washington State. On the date below, I personally e-filed and/or placed in the United States Mail the Brief of Appellant with this Affirmation of Service Attached with postage paid to the indicated parties:

1. Mr. Timothy Higgs
   Mason County Prosecuting Attorney
   P.O. Box 639
   Shelton, WA 98584
   timh@co.mason.wa.us

2. Charles S. Longshore, III, No.332121
   Washington State Penitentiary
   1313 North 13th Avenue
   Walla Walla, WA 99362

Dated this 30th day of May, 2016 , at Longview, WA.

Donna Baker

HAYS LAW OFFICE

May 31, 2016 - 12:56 PM

Transmittal Letter

Document Uploaded: 1-470306-Supplemental Appellants' Brief.pdf

Case Name: State vs Charles Longshore, III
Court of Appeals Case Number: 47030-6

Is this a Personal Restraint Petition? Yes ■ No

The document being Filed is:

Designation of Clerk's Papers Supplemental Designation of Clerk's Papers

Statement of Arrangements

Motion: ____

Answer/Reply to Motion: ____

■ Brief: Supplemental Appellants'

Statement of Additional Authorities

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: ________

Comments:

No Comments were entered.

Sender Name: Diane C Hays - Email: jahayslaw@comcast.net

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

timw@co.mason.wa.us
donnabaker@3equitycourt.com