

FILED
Court of Appeals
Division I
State of Washington
4/1/2021 2:55 PM

FILED
SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
4/2/2021
BY SUSAN L. CARLSON
CLERK

Supreme Court No. 99616-4
(COA No. 80672-6-I)

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Respondent,

v.

B.J.N.,

Petitioner.

ON APPEAL FROM THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE
STATE OF WASHINGTON FOR SNOHOMISH COUNTY

PETITION FOR REVIEW

KATE R. HUBER
Attorney for Petitioner

WASHINGTON APPELLATE PROJECT
1511 Third Avenue, Suite 610
Seattle, WA 98101
(206) 587-2711
katehuber@washapp.org
wapofficemail@washapp.org

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. IDENTITY OF PETITIONER AND DECISION BELOW 1

B. ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW 1

C. STATEMENT OF THE CASE 2

D. ARGUMENT 3

 1. The Court of Appeals misinterpreted the statutory scheme and affirmed Brittany’s conviction for possession of a dangerous weapon on school facilities based on insufficient evidence. 3

 2. The Court of Appeals’ opinion conflicts with this Court’s precedent holding an information must allege all the essential elements and specific conduct supporting each element to be constitutionally sufficient under the essential elements rule. 6

E. CONCLUSION 10

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Washington Supreme Court Cases

City of Auburn v. Brooke, 119 Wn.2d 623, 836 P.2d 212 (1992)..... 6

State v. Carey, 4 Wash. 424, 30 P. 729 (1892)..... 8

State v. Holt, 104 Wn.2d 315, 704 P.2d 1189 (1985)..... 9

State v. Hugdahl, 195 Wn.2d 319, 458 P.3d 760 (2020) 6, 9

State v. Kjorsvik, 117 Wn.2d 93, 812 P.2d 86 (1991)..... 7

State v. Leach, 113 Wn.2d 679, 782 P.2d 552 (1989) 7

State v. McCarty, 140 Wn.2d 420, 998 P.2d 296 (2000)..... 9

State v. Pry, 194 Wn.2d 745, 452 P.3d 536 (2019) 6

State v. Recuenco, 163 Wn.2d 428, 180 P.3d 1276 (2008)..... 8

State v. Vasquez, 178 Wn.2d 1, 309 P.3d 318 (2013)..... 4

State v. Zillyette, 178 Wn.2d 153, 307 P.3d 712 (2013)..... 7

Washington Court of Appeals Cases

City of Seattle v. Termain, 124 Wn. App. 798, 103 P.3d 209 (2004)..... 8

State v. J.R., 127 Wn. App. 293, 111 P.3d 264 (2005)..... 5

United States Supreme Court Cases

In re Winship, 397 U.S. 358, 90 S. Ct. 1068, 25 L. Ed. 2d 368 (1970) 3

Jackson v. Virginia, 443 U.S. 307, 99 S. Ct. 2781, 61 L. Ed. 2d 560 (1979)
..... 4

Washington Constitution

Const. art. I, § 3..... 1, 3, 6

Const. art. I, § 22..... 1, 6

United States Constitution

U.S. Const. amend. VI 6
U.S. Const. amend. XIV 1, 3, 6

Washington Statutes

RCW 9.41.250 1, 4, 5
RCW 9.41.280 1, 4, 5
RCW 13.40.180 3

Rules

RAP 13.3..... 1
RAP 13.4..... 1, 6, 9, 10

A. IDENTITY OF PETITIONER AND DECISION BELOW

Brittany N., petitioner here and appellant below, asks this Court to accept review of the Court of Appeals decision, filed March 8, 2021, terminating review. RAP 13.3(a)(1), 13.4(b).

B. ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

1. Possessing a dangerous weapon on school facilities requires proof the accused possessed “any . . . dangerous weapon as defined in RCW 9.41.250.” RCW 9.41.280. That statute, in turn, requires proof the person carried the weapon furtively with intent to conceal. The juvenile convicted Brittany, a 14 year-old girl, of this offense because she had a folding knife in her belt, without finding she possessed it furtively with the intent to conceal it. The government presented insufficient evidence to prove every element of the offense beyond a reasonable doubt where it failed to prove the knife possessed qualified as a dangerous weapon under the statute.

2. Article I, sections 3 and 22 and the Fourteenth Amendment require charging documents to fairly inform the accused of the facts underlying the charges and to enable the accused to plead double jeopardy as a bar in future prosecutions for the same offense. Here, the information was entirely generic and failed to allege any facts supporting the offense. The information contained a county designation and dates but otherwise

failed to allege the “who” “what” “where” and “how” for the offense. The Court of Appeals agreed this language was vague and lacked any connection to the underlying behavior charged. The information is not constitutionally adequate when it fails to specify any particular facts supporting the essential elements of the charge and does not provide notice or enable a plea of double jeopardy.

C. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Fourteen-year-old Brittany got into an argument with another student on a school bus. CP 66. Police responded and ordered her off the bus. CP 66. Police handcuffed Brittany, placed her in the backseat of the police car, and questioned her about the argument without *Mirandizing* her. CP 66.

After uncuffing her and while waiting for her mother to arrive to take her home, police searched Brittany’s waistband and recovered a gray folding knife in her belt. CP 66. No one claimed Brittany used the knife or threatened anyone. Nonetheless, the government charged Brittany with possessing a dangerous weapon on school facilities. CP 68.

Brittany moved to suppress the knife recovered in the warrantless search and to dismiss the charge. CP 56-64. Before the court decided the motion, Brittany entered a diversion agreement to resolve the case, as well as another matter. CP 70-73; RP 6-10. Brittany was unable to complete

the diversion agreement successfully, and the court terminated the contract. RP 105.

The court tried Brittany based on a stipulated record of documents the prosecutor submitted. CP 70-73; RP 110-14. The court found Brittany guilty of possessing a dangerous weapon on school facilities. CP 25, 40; RP 113. The court sentenced Brittany to six months of community supervision, consecutive to six months of community supervision on another case, and sixteen hours of community service.¹ RP 118-19; CP 25-39.

D. ARGUMENT

1. The Court of Appeals misinterpreted the statutory scheme and affirmed Brittany’s conviction for possession of a dangerous weapon on school facilities based on insufficient evidence.

The prosecution is required to prove every element of a charged offense beyond a reasonable doubt. U.S. Const. amend. XIV; Const. art. I, § 3; *In re Winship*, 397 U.S. 358, 364, 90 S. Ct. 1068, 25 L. Ed. 2d 368 (1970). A reviewing court must reverse unless it concludes “after viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the prosecution, *any* rational trier of fact could have found the essential elements of the crime beyond a

¹ The Court of Appeals agreed with Brittany that RCW 13.40.180(2) requires the juvenile court to impose the terms of community custody concurrently and remanded the case for this modification. Slip op. at 10. Brittany does not appeal that holding, nor does she appeal from the other case, Case No. 80673-4-I.

reasonable doubt.” *Jackson v. Virginia*, 443 U.S. 307, 319, 99 S. Ct. 2781, 61 L. Ed. 2d 560 (1979); accord *State v. Vasquez*, 178 Wn.2d 1, 6, 309 P.3d 318 (2013).

To convict Brittany of possessing a dangerous weapon on school facilities as charged, the government was required to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that Brittany (1) carried or possessed on (2) school-provided transportation (3) an object prohibited under the statute. RCW 9.41.280(1). The statute contains an exclusive list of prohibited items, including, “Any other dangerous weapon as defined in RCW 9.41.250.” RCW 9.41.280(1)(b).

RCW 9.41.250, in turn, provides a person is guilty of a gross misdemeanor, punishable under chapter 9A.20 RCW, when he or she, “Furtively carries with intent to conceal any dagger, dirk, pistol, or other dangerous weapon.” RCW 9.41.250(1)(b).

The prosecution did not prove the folded, secured knife Brittany possessed qualified as a dangerous weapon under the statute. The court focused on only the fact of possession, finding Brittany had “a knife with a blade over three inches in length, a dangerous weapon as defined in RCW 9.41.250,” to convict her of possessing a dangerous weapon on school grounds under RCW 9.41.280(1). CP 40. But possession alone is not enough. Under the plain language of the statute, an object qualifies as a

dangerous weapon under RCW 9.41.250 only where the person “[f]urtively carries with intent to conceal any dagger, dirk, pistol, or other dangerous weapon.” RCW 9.41.250(1)(b); RCW 9.41.280(1)(b). Here, the court made no finding Brittany “[f]urtively carrie[d] with intent to conceal” the folding knife, nor do the facts support such a finding. CP 40.

The Court of Appeals held furtively carrying a knife with the intent to conceal is part of the definition of RCW 9.41.250(1)(b) but is not an element of RCW 9.41.280. Slip op. at 4 (citing *State v. J.R.*, 127 Wn. App. 293, 298, 111 P.3d 264 (2005)). This analysis misunderstands the statutory scheme.

RCW 9.41.280 applies only to specific weapons listed in that statute, as well as a broader category of dangerous weapons possessed in the specific manner set forth in RCW 9.41.250. RCW 9.41.250 specifies that certain weapons must be carried in a certain manner. It includes a “dagger, dirk, pistol, or other dangerous weapon” when carried “[f]urtively” and “with intent to conceal.” RCW 9.41.250(1)(b). Thus, to qualify as a dangerous weapon under RCW 9.41.280, the prosecution must prove the item qualifies as a dangerous weapon under the constraints of RCW 9.41.250. It did not do so here.

The government failed to prove beyond a reasonable doubt the object Brittany possessed satisfied the criteria of a dangerous weapon as

required by statute. This Court should accept review because the Court of Appeals misinterpreted the relevant statutory scheme and affirmed a conviction based on insufficient evidence, violating the due process rights of a child who simply had a folded knife in a secure location that she did not use. RAP 13.4(b)(3)-(4).

2. The Court of Appeals’ opinion conflicts with this Court’s precedent holding an information must allege all the essential elements and specific conduct supporting each element to be constitutionally sufficient under the essential elements rule.

“[T]he accused . . . has a constitutional right to be apprised of the nature and cause of the accusation against him.” *State v. Pry*, 194 Wn.2d 745, 751, 452 P.3d 536 (2019) (internal quotations omitted); U.S. Const. amends. VI, XIV; Const. art. I, §§ 3, 22. Constitutional notice of the “nature and cause” of the charges against the accused requires the information or charging document to contain “all essential elements of the crime, statutory or otherwise, *and the particular facts supporting them.*” *State v. Hugdahl*, 195 Wn.2d 319, 324, 458 P.3d 760 (2020) (emphasis added); *City of Auburn v. Brooke*, 119 Wn.2d 623, 630, 836 P.2d 212 (1992).

Only where an information apprises the accused of both “the elements of the crime charged” and “the conduct of the defendant which is alleged to have constituted that crime” does an information provide the

defendant with the notice that the constitution demands. *State v. Kjorsvik*, 117 Wn.2d 93, 98, 812 P.2d 86 (1991). A charging document that does not “*allege facts supporting every element of the offense*, in addition to adequately identifying the crime charged,” is constitutionally deficient. *State v. Leach*, 113 Wn.2d 679, 689, 782 P.2d 552 (1989); *State v. Zillyette*, 178 Wn.2d 153, 162-63, 307 P.3d 712 (2013) (holding information deficient where it did not contain “[t]he particular facts necessary” to support the charge of controlled substance homicide).

Here, the information contained the statutory elements but did not include *any* facts supporting the crime with which the State charged Brittany. CP 68.

Count 1: POSSESSING DANGEROUS WEAPON ON SCHOOL FACILITIES, committed as follows:

That the respondent, on or about the 25th day of October, 2018, did carry onto and possess on elementary or secondary school premises, school-provided transportation, or facility areas while being used exclusively by schools a dangerous weapon; proscribed by RCW 9.41.280(1), a gross misdemeanor.

The information alleges the date and the county. Otherwise, it fails to include any other “particular facts” supporting any of the essential elements. The information does not state in what manner Brittany carried or possessed the weapon, where the possession occurred, what particular dangerous weapon Brittany possessed, or how it qualified as one of the dangerous weapons itemized in the statute. The information lacks any “critical facts” to notify the accused “of the elements of the charged crime

and the conduct of the defendant which is alleged to have constituted the crime.” City of Seattle v. Termain, 124 Wn. App. 798, 803, 103 P.3d 209 (2004).

Moreover, the information leaves Brittany without the ability to plead double jeopardy in a future prosecution. If, for example, a person carried more than one object that could potentially qualify under the statute, or entered more than one school facility on the same day, they could be subject to two separate prosecutions. This generic information devoid of facts denies a person the ability to defend against prosecution for what could be the same conduct. *See State v. Carey, 4 Wash. 424, 430-33, 30 P. 729 (1892)* (where offense could be committed more than once in the same day, failure to allege facts identifying specific violation renders complaint deficient).

This Court has clearly held, “The essential elements rule requires a charging document *allege facts supporting every element of the offense* and identify the crime charged.” *State v. Recuenco, 163 Wn.2d 428, 434, 180 P.3d 1276 (2008)* (emphasis added). The Court of Appeals here treated the essential elements rules as if it required the prosecution to identify only the crime charged, not the facts supporting it. The Court of Appeals ignored this Court’s precedent requiring allegations of fact as

well as the elements and held the recitation of the statutory language alone rendered the information is constitutionally sufficient. Slip op. at 5-9.

The Court also disregarded this Court's precedent when it held a person waives the constitutional deficiency of a failure to allege facts if the accused does not demand a bill of particulars. Slip op. at 8-9. The Court of Appeals agreed the information was "vague" but found it constitutionally sufficient nonetheless. Slip op. at 9. A person's failure to challenge the information at trial or to request a bill of particulars for clarification does not prevent a person from raising a challenge to the constitutional sufficiency of the information on appeal. *Hugdahl*, 195 Wn.2d at 328. "The State cannot rely on trial testimony, jury instructions, or the failure to request a bill of particulars to cure a charging deficiency." *Id.* (citing *State v. Holt*, 104 Wn.2d 315, 321-22, 704 P.2d 1189 (1985), and *State v. McCarty*, 140 Wn.2d 420, 427, 998 P.2d 296 (2000)).

Here, the information is completely devoid of any facts supporting any essential elements. The Court of Appeals affirmed this deficient information because it disregarded half of the essential elements rule and ignored this Court's precedent. This Court should accept review. RAP 13.4(b)(1) -(4).

E. CONCLUSION

This Court should accept review. RAP 13.4(b).

DATED this 1st day of April, 2021.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'K. Huber', written in a cursive style.

KATE R. HUBER (WSBA 47540)
Washington Appellate Project (91052)
Attorneys for Petitioner
katehuber@washapp.org
wapofficemail@washapp.org

APPENDIX A

March 8, 2021, Opinion

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Respondent,

v.

B.J.N.,

Appellant.

No. 80672-6-I

DIVISION ONE

UNPUBLISHED OPINION

CHUN, J. — After an incident on a school bus, the State charged B.J.N. with possessing a dangerous weapon on school facilities. The trial court found B.J.N. guilty as charged. It sentenced her to six months of community supervision consecutive with six months of community supervision in the linked appeal, No. 80673-4-I. B.J.N. appeals. We affirm her disposition but remand for the trial court to modify the community custody term to run concurrently with the term in the linked case.

I. BACKGROUND

Fourteen-year-old student B.J.N. argued with another student on a school bus. The bus driver reported a verbal disturbance to the police and parked on the side of the road. Officers Lever and Moss responded to the report, boarded the bus, and told B.J.N. to exit the bus. B.J.N. refused to exit. Officer Lever again told B.J.N. to exit the bus and this time she complied.

Officer Lever escorted B.J.N. to a patrol car, handcuffed her, placed her inside the car, and questioned her about the argument on the bus. After B.J.N. calmed down, the officer removed the handcuffs. B.J.N. began to adjust something around her waistband. Officer Lever frisked the waistband and located a gray folding knife with a three-inch curved blade behind her belt.

The State charged B.J.N. with possessing a dangerous weapon on school facilities under RCW 9.41.280(1). B.J.N. moved to suppress the knife and to dismiss the charge. Before the court ruled on the motion, B.J.N. entered into a diversion contract in this case and in the linked appeal. B.J.N. did not successfully satisfy her obligations under the diversion agreement and the court terminated the contract. The court tried B.J.N. based on a stipulated record. The court found her guilty of possessing a dangerous weapon on school facilities as defined in RCW 9.41.280. The court sentenced B.J.N. to six months of community supervision to run consecutive to six months of supervision in the linked appeal.

II. ANALYSIS

B.J.N. contends that insufficient evidence supports her disposition and that the charging document is constitutionally insufficient. She also says that the trial court erred in imposing her community custody term consecutively with the term in the linked appeal. The State disagrees as to the sufficiency of the evidence and information issues but concedes that we should remand on the community custody issue.

A. Sufficiency of Evidence

B.J.N. contends that insufficient evidence supports the guilty finding because the State failed to show that she carried the knife furtively with intent to conceal as defined by RCW 9.41.250(1)(b). We disagree.

To challenge the sufficiency of the evidence, a respondent must show that, when viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the State, a rational trier of fact could not have found the essential elements of the charged crime—here, RCW 9.41.280—beyond a reasonable doubt. State v. Hendrickson, 129 Wn.2d 61, 81, 917 P.2d 563 (1996). The State bears the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt each element of the charged crime. State v. J.R., 127 Wn. App. 293, 297, 111 P.3d 264 (2005). We defer to the trier of fact on issues about the persuasiveness of the evidence. State v. Walton, 64 Wn. App. 410, 415–16, 824 P.2d 553 (1992).

The trial court found B.J.N. guilty of possessing a dangerous weapon on school facilities as defined in RCW 9.41.280, which states in pertinent part:

It is unlawful for a person to carry onto, or to possess on, public or private elementary or secondary school premises, school-provided transportation, or areas of facilities while being used exclusively by public or private schools . . . any dangerous weapon as defined in RCW 9.41.250.

RCW 9.41.280(1)(b).

The law required the State to prove that B.J.N. (1) carried onto or possessed on (2) public or private school premises (3) any dangerous weapon as defined in RCW 9.41.250. RCW 9.41.250(1)(b) provides that “[e]very person

who . . . [f]urtively carries with intent to conceal any dagger, dirk, pistol, or other dangerous weapon” is guilty of possession of a dangerous weapon.

B.J.N. contends the law requires the State to demonstrate she carried the knife furtively with intent to conceal as defined by RCW 9.41.250(1)(b).¹ But “[f]urtively carrying a dangerous weapon with intent to conceal is not an element of RCW 9.41.280.” J.R., 127 Wn. App. at 298 (“We conclude that all weapons described in RCW 9.41.250 are ‘dangerous weapons’ for purposes of RCW 9.41.280”).²

We conclude that sufficient evidence supports the trial court’s guilty finding. The State charged B.J.N. with possession of a dangerous weapon on school facilities under RCW 9.41.280, not RCW 9.41.250(1)(b). J.R., 127 Wn. App. at 298 (“[I]f J.R. had been charged under RCW 9.41.250(2), the State would have had to prove J.R. carried the dagger ‘[f]urtively...with intent to conceal.’” (alteration in original) (quoting RCW 9.41.250)).

¹ Even if the State charged B.J.N. under RCW 9.41.250, “[that statute] by its terms does not require furtive overt movement. It does require evidence of intent to conceal a dangerous weapon.” State v. Myles, 127 Wn.2d 807, 815, 903 P.2d 979 (1995). In Myles, the evidence supported a finding that Myles furtively carried the knife because Myles carried the knife in an inner pocket, “an unusual and suspicious place to carry a knife.” 127 Wn.2d at 817. Similar to the circumstances in Myles, B.J.N. carried the knife behind her belt, an unusual and suspicious place to carry a knife, and made adjustments prior to Officer Lever discovering the knife.

² See also State v. Bonebright, noted at 112 Wn. App. 1028, 2002 WL 1389426 at *2 (2002) (holding, where a student brought an eight-inch serrated edged knife to school, that RCW 9.41.280 refers to RCW 9.41.250 solely for the definition of dangerous weapon and thus elements of RCW 9.41.250(2) are not elements of RCW 9.41.280); see GR 14.1(c) (“Washington appellate courts should not, unless necessary for a reasoned decision, cite or discuss unpublished opinions in their opinions”). RCW 9.41.250(1)(b) was formerly RCW 9.41.250(2) and is listed in Bonebright and J.R. as such.

B. Sufficiency of the Information

For the first time on appeal, B.J.N. contends that the information fails to satisfy constitutional requirements because it does not specify particular facts supporting the essential elements of RCW 9.41.280(1). The State disagrees. We determine the information, while vague, is constitutionally sufficient.

We review de novo a challenge to the sufficiency of a charging document. State v. Siers, 174 Wn.2d 269, 273–74, 274 P.3d 358 (2012). We construe the charging document liberally when, as here, the respondent challenges it for the first time on appeal. State v. Kjorsvik, 117 Wn.2d 93, 103, 812 P.2d 86 (1991); State v. McCarty, 140 Wn.2d 420, 425, 998 P.2d 296 (2000). If the charging document is constitutionally deficient, the remedy is dismissal without prejudice to the State for refile of charges. State v. Simon, 120 Wn.2d 196, 199, 840 P.2d 172 (1992).

“A charging document must describe the essential elements of a crime with reasonable certainty such that the accused may prepare a defense and plead the judgment as a bar to any subsequent prosecution for the same offense.” City of Seattle v. Termain, 124 Wn. App. 798, 802, 103 P.3d 209 (2004).³ This “essential elements” rule requires a charging document to allege facts supporting every element of the offense. Kjorsvik, 117 Wn.2d at 98. “[I]f the document cannot be construed to give notice of or to contain in some manner

³ This rule stems from article 1, section 22 of the Washington Constitution and the Sixth Amendment to the United States Constitution, which afford the accused the right to know the nature and cause of the accusation against them. Kjorsvik, 117 Wn.2d at 97.

the essential elements of a crime, the most liberal reading cannot cure it.” State v. Moavenzadeh, 135 Wn.2d 359, 363, 956 P.2d 1097 (1998) (quoting State v. Campbell, 125 Wn.2d 797, 802, 888 P.2d 1185 (1995)). “If the necessary elements are not found or fairly implied, however, we presume prejudice and reverse without reaching the question of prejudice.” State v. Haberman, 105 Wn. App. 926, 934, 22 P.3d 264 (2001) (quoting McCarty, 140 Wn.2d at 425). We do not look past the face of the charging document or examine documents such as the statement of probable cause when applying the essential elements test. State v. Pry, 194 Wn.2d 745, 753, 452 P.3d 536 (2019).⁴ “Words in a charging document are read as a whole, construed according to common sense, and include facts which are necessarily implied.” Kjorsvik, 117 Wn.2d at 109. “While the information need not restate the precise language of the essential elements of a crime, the information must do more than merely name the offense and list the elements—it must *allege* the particular facts supporting them.” Pry, 194 Wn.2d at 752 (emphasis added).

But “[i]t is sufficient to charge in the language of a statute *if* the statute defines the offense with certainty.” Kjorsvik, 117 Wn.2d at 99. The State’s “failure to allege specific facts in an information may render [it] vague, but . . . not constitutionally defective.” State v. Laramie, 141 Wn. App. 332, 340, 169 P.3d 859 (2007). “A charging document that states each statutory element of a crime,

⁴ If the defendant cannot satisfy the essential elements test, they may alternatively claim that they were still prejudiced by inartful language in the charging document, causing them a lack of notice. Kjorsvik, 117 Wn.2d at 105–06. B.J.N. makes no such claim.

but is vague as to some other significant matter, may be corrected under a bill of particulars.” State v. Winings, 126 Wn. App. 75, 84, 107 P.3d 141 (2005). If the respondent does not demand a bill of particulars at trial, “a challenge to vague, inartful or imprecise language will not be entertained on appeal.” Laramie, 141 Wn. App. at 340.

Here, the State charged B.J.N. with violating RCW 9.41.280(1). The information says:

That the respondent, on or about the 25th day of October, 2018, did carry onto and possess on elementary or secondary school premises, school-provided transportation, or facility areas while being used exclusively by schools a dangerous weapon; proscribed by RCW 9.41.280(1), a gross misdemeanor.

This closely tracks the language of RCW 9.41.280(1)(b), which provides, in part:

It is unlawful for a person to carry onto, or to possess on, public or private elementary or secondary school premises, school-provided transportation, or areas of facilities while being used exclusively by public or private schools . . . any dangerous weapon as defined in RCW 9.41.250.

B.J.N. contends the charging document is deficient because it lacks any “particular fact” to support the essential elements. She claims the information fails to inform B.J.N. what object is the “dangerous weapon,” what statutory definition that object met, and on which school facility the State alleges she committed the offense.

In Termain, the information tracked the language of the statute for violating a domestic violence order but failed to identify the order claimed to be violated or the court granting the order. 124 Wn. App. at 803. The court held the charging document was constitutionally deficient, reasoning:

The charging document here is awkwardly worded and vague. Frankly it is gobbledygook. It charges the language of the statute but it does not recite the specific statute pursuant to which the underlying order was issued, the number of the order, the date of issuance, or any underlying facts or the name of the protected person. There are many simple ways the City could have included bare facts in the charging document so that Termain could fairly imply what actual conduct was being charged. To fail to do so makes Termain guess at the crime alleged to have [been] committed.

Id. at 806.

In State v. Zillyette, the State charged the defendant with controlled substances homicide after the defendant provided the victim with Xanax and methadone, leading to the victim's overdose death. 178 Wn.2d 153, 156, 307 P.3d 712 (2013). The information merely recited the statutory elements of controlled substances homicide without specifying which controlled substance the defendant provided the victim. Id. Under the charging statute, provision of Xanax could not serve as a basis for controlled substances homicide, but provision of methadone could. Id. at 160. Our Supreme Court held that because the information did not list either the name of the controlled substance or its schedule level, the information was constitutionally deficient. Id. at 163.

In Winings, the State charged the defendant with second degree assault while armed with a deadly weapon, and the associated information stated: "In the County of Clallam, State of Washington, on or about the 24th day of March, 2003, the Defendant did assault another with a deadly weapon; in violation of RCW 9A.36.021, a Class B felony." 126 Wn. App. at 81. But there, the court stated that while the information did not identify the victim, weapon used, or how the defendant used the weapon, when construed liberally, it sufficiently stated the

required facts and each essential legal element of the charge. Id. at 85–86. The court noted that there is no requirement for the State to “describe the facts with great specificity,” and since the defendant did not request a bill of particulars at trial, the court declined to consider the issue. Id. at 85-86.

Here, RCW 9.41.280(1) defines the charged offense with certainty such that the information is constitutionally sufficient. Construed liberally, the information alleges “sufficient facts to support every element of the crime charged”: it alleges that B.J.N. carried or possessed a dangerous weapon on an elementary or secondary school premises, school-provided transportation, or facility areas while being used exclusively by schools, that her actions violated RCW 9.41.280(1), and that the incident occurred on or about October 25, 2018. Winings, 126 Wn. App. at 85 (quoting State v. Leach, 113 Wn.2d 679, 688, 782 P.2d 552 (1989) (emphasis omitted)). As noted by Winings, the State need not have stated what kind of weapon B.J.N. used. And unlike in Zillyette, where two substances were at play, there was not more than one item or facility that could have served as the basis for the charge here. Furthermore, the information in Termain required more specificity because the charged crime was one against another specific person. 124 Wn. App. at 805.

Thus, the information’s omission of the particular school facility on which B.J.N. possessed the dangerous weapon, and what sort of dangerous weapon she possessed, are matters of vagueness, not constitutional deficiency. While the information may be vague, B.J.N. apparently did not request a bill of particulars at trial and may not now raise this issue on appeal.


C. Community Custody Term

The trial court imposed consecutive six-month terms of community custody for this disposition and the disposition in the linked appeal. B.J.N. says the court erred in imposing these terms consecutively, since RCW 13.40.180(2) requires that “[w]here disposition in separate disposition orders is imposed on a youth, the periods of community supervision contained in separate orders, if any, shall run concurrently.” The State properly concedes that the two terms of community custody must run concurrently.

“A trial court’s sentencing authority is limited to that granted by statute,” and “[w]hether a sentencing court has exceeded its statutory authority is a question of law that we review de novo.” State v. Button, 184 Wn. App. 442, 446, 339 P.3d 182 (2014). Use of the word “shall” is presumptively imperative, creating a duty rather than conferring discretion. State v. Blazina, 182 Wn.2d 827, 838, 344 P.3d 680 (2015). Thus, the trial court erred by imposing the two community custody terms consecutively.

We agree with the State’s concession and remand for the trial court to impose the terms concurrently.

WE CONCUR:



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'H. S. J.', written over a horizontal line.



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Chun, J.', written over a horizontal line.



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Smith, J.', written over a horizontal line.

DECLARATION OF FILING AND MAILING OR DELIVERY

The undersigned certifies under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that on the below date, the original of the document to which this declaration is affixed/attached, was filed in the **Court of Appeals – Division One** under **Case No. 80672-6-I**, and a true copy was mailed with first-class postage prepaid or otherwise caused to be delivered to the following attorney(s) or party/parties of record at their regular office or residence address as listed on ACORDS:

respondent Scott Halloran, DPA
[shalloran@co.snohomish.wa.us]
Snohomish County Prosecutor's Office
[Diane.Kremenich@co.snohomish.wa.us]

appellant

Attorney for other party



MARIA ARRANZA RILEY, Legal Assistant
Washington Appellate Project

Date: April 1, 2021

WASHINGTON APPELLATE PROJECT

April 01, 2021 - 2:55 PM

Transmittal Information

Filed with Court: Court of Appeals Division I
Appellate Court Case Number: 80672-6
Appellate Court Case Title: State of Washington, Respondent v. B. J. N., Appellant
Superior Court Case Number: 19-8-00028-7

The following documents have been uploaded:

- 806726_Petition_for_Review_20210401145042D1367822_1523.pdf
This File Contains:
Petition for Review
The Original File Name was washapp.040121-02.pdf

A copy of the uploaded files will be sent to:

- Diane.Kremenich@co.snohomish.wa.us
- diane.kremenich@snoco.org
- greg@washapp.org
- shalloran@co.snohomish.wa.us
- wapofficemail@washapp.org

Comments:

Sender Name: MARIA RILEY - Email: maria@washapp.org

Filing on Behalf of: Kate Huber - Email: katehuber@washapp.org (Alternate Email: wapofficemail@washapp.org)

Address:
1511 3RD AVE STE 610
SEATTLE, WA, 98101
Phone: (206) 587-2711

Note: The Filing Id is 20210401145042D1367822