

Certification of Mail

The Court of Appeals DIVISION 1

I Derrick Hills come now as pro
Appellant, Case # 69335-2
is submitting My NOTICE OF ADDITION
1 Grounds For Review to All Parties.
DNA BRIEF.

FILED
COURT OF APPEALS DIV 1
STATE OF WASHINGTON
FEB 20 PM 1:38

ON this Date 14, February 2013

Signed under penalty to perjury
that law of united state's that I'r
Mail a Certification of Mail to all
party. CLERK ACTION Required Forco

JENNIFER M, WINKLER
NIELSEN, BROMAN & KOCH,
1908 E MADISON ST.
Sattle, wa. 98122
King County Prosecutor
OFFICER

Derrick Hills
Case # 69335-2
Regional Just
Center 620 We
T... street

The Court of Appeals
Division 1

State of Washington }
Respondent }
V. }
Appellant }
Derrick Hills }

Case #69335-2
Cover sheet

FILED
COURT OF APPEALS DIV 1
STATE OF WASHINGTON
2019 FEB 20 PM 1:50

I DERRICK HILLS come now as
Se Appellant I submitting my Addi
onal Grounds For Review, with A Brief.

On this Date 14, on February 2019

DERRICK H.
Regional Just
Center 620 Jan
Street Kent, WA
98927

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

STATE OF WASHINGTON

Respondent,

V.

DERRICK HILLS

Appellant

FILED
COURT OF APPEALS DIV I
STATE OF WASHINGTON
2013 FEB 20 PM 1:38

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

THE Honorable Patrick Oishi, Judge

BRIEF OF APPELLANT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR

1. THE COURT VIOLATED A 60 Days Speed Trial Rights.
2. THE TRIAL COURT ERROR ON 3.5 in 3.6 Challenge OF THE CASE.
3. LAWYER VIOLATED THE OATH

B. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

1. THE COURT VIOLATED A 60 Days Spe Trial rights of the Defendant,
2. THE TRIAL COURT ERROR ON 3. in 3.6 MOTION OF THE CASE.
- 3.B. STATE LAWYER VIOLATED THE OATH. THE STATE MADE FALSE STATEMENTS ON A LEGAL DOCUMENT ON 3.5 IN 3.6 STATE RESPOND BRIEF.

C. CONCLUSION

THE COURT ERR ON THE CONCLUSION OF LAW.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (CONT)

Federal CASES.

US, V. VELEZ-SALDANA, 252 F.3d
49 (1st cir 2001)

TERRY V. OHIO, 392 US 1, 20 Led.
d 889, 85 Sct 1868 (1968)

US V. TWILLEY, 222 F.3d 1092 (9th
2000)

Miranda V. Arizona, 86, Sct. 1602 (1966)

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

WASHINGTON CASES

Page 2

State v. Rankin, 151 Wash. 2d 689,
695, 92 P.3d 202, 205 (2004)

State v. Walker, 66 Wn. App. 626, 534
P.2d 41 (1992).

State v. Harrington, 167, Wash. 2d 656,
222 P.3d 92 (2009).

STATEMENT OF ADDITIONAL
GROUNDS FOR REVIEW

STATE OF WASHINGTON)

Respondent,)

v.)

DERRICK HILLS)

(your name))

Appellant.)

No. 69335-2

STATEMENT OF ADDITIONAL
GROUNDS FOR REVIEW

I, DERRICK HILLS, 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.

A ASSIGNMENT ERROR Additional Ground 1

1) The Court Violated My 60 Days Speedy trial right by given to State a Continue for officers Vacations (2) The State did not Charge me with a Misdemeanor of possessing Marijuana. So with out the State Chargeing me with a Misdemeanor. The Kent Polices Did not have Probable Cause to Stop me or Search me. All Evidence must Be suppress.

Additional Ground 2

(3) A person can have a reasonable expectation of privacy protected by the Fourth Amendment in a hotel room, a cabin, or an enclosed tent or Public Lands. US V. VELEZ-SALDANA, 252 F3d 49 (2nd Cir 2001), (4) TERRY V. OHIO, 392 US 2, 20 LEd2d 889, 88 Sct 1868 (1968)

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

Date: 2-14-2013

Signature: Derrick Hills

B. STATEMENT OF THE CASES.

(1) The State did not charged me with Misdemeanor of possessing of Marijuana. So with all the State charged me with Misdemeanor, the Did not have probable cause to stop me or search me. All must Be suppress of EVIDENCE

A person can have a reasonable expectation of privacy protected by the Fourth Amendment in a hotel room, a cabin, or an enclosed tent OR public Lands. *US. V. VELEZ-SALDANA*, 25 F3d 49 (1st Cir 2001)

TERRY V. OHIO, 392 US 1, 20 LEd2d 889, 88 Sct 1868 (1968)

(4) The test for a Terry stop is whether there is reasonable suspicion that the person detained was engaged in criminal activity, and a Terry stop cannot be justified merely by hunch or intention.

My 60 Days speedy Trial right was Violated By the State getting a Continue For officers Vacation.

US V TWILLEY, 222 F3d 1092 (9th
2000)

There are no good-faith excep-
tion to the exclusionary rule for
police who do not act in accordan-
ce with governing Law.

Article 1, Section 7,
of the Washington State Constitution
State v. Rankin, 151 Wash2d 689, 69.
92 P.3d 202, 205 (2004)

Under Washington law, before an officer
may detain a person for questioning
absent probable cause arrest, there
must be a substantial possibility that
criminal conduct has occurred or
is about to occur. State v. Walker,
66 Wn. App. 622, 626) 834 P.2d 41 (1992)

State Violated Oath of a Lawyer
By file False Statements on a legal
Brief to SUPERIOR COURT OF King CO

C. CONCLUSION

The COURT ERR ON the CONCLUSION OF Law. See Transcripts, pages 140. in 141 in 14. For not Been Miranda Before Question.

(1) The Court Rule That it was a TERRY STOP. See Transcrip page 145. in 146. in 147

(2) The Original CERTIFICATION FOR DETERMINATION OF PROBABLE CAUSE That the OFFICER Made a initial STOP. was a socially Contact. See Transcrip + NO# 42. Line 7. see Transcripts, 142. in 143. 14 State V. Harrington, 167, Wash. 2d 656, 222, P. 3d 92/200

(3) The Defense have proven
(1) Officers safe check out clear of weapon on me.

(2) NO warrants

(3) Vehicle Search was clear in NO Drugs was Found.

I was not charge with a posseing of marijuana, so there was NO reason For the search in seizer.

Be cause the search was illegal