RECEIVED SUPREME COURT STATE OF WASHINGTON Jan 15, 2015, 10:49 am BY RONALD R. CARPENTER CLERK

RECEIVED BY E-MAIL

NO. 90773-1 COA NO. 44911-1-II Cowlitz Co. Cause NO. 13-1-00125-7

SUPREME COURT OF STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Respondent,

v.

GENARO BRANDON VILLANUEVA,

Appellant/Petitioner.

RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR REVIEW

RYAN JURVAKAINEN
Prosecuting Attorney
SEAN BRITTAIN/WSBA 36804
Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
Representing Respondent

HALL OF JUSTICE 312 SW FIRST KELSO, WA 98626 (360) 577-3080



TABLE OF CONTENTS

FAGE

I.	IDENTITY OF RESPONDENT	1
11.	ANSWER TO ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW	1
III.	STATEMENT OF THE CASE	1
IV.	ARGUMENT	2
v.	CONCLUSION	3

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
Cases	
State v. Cobos, 338 P.3d 283 (2014	2, 3
State v. Jones, 338 P.3d 278 (2014)	2, 3
Statutes	
RCW 9.94A.530	2
RCW 9.94A.530(2)	2
Rules	
RAP 13.4(b)	2

I. IDENTITY OF RESPONDENT

The State of Washington, by and through the Cowlitz County Prosecuting Attorney's Office, respectfully requests this Court deny review of the August 19, 2014 unpublished opinion of the Court of Appeals in *State* v. Villanueva, COA No. 44911-1-II. This decision remanded the matter for resentencing.

II. ANSWER TO ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

- 1. The decision of the Court of Appeals is not in conflict with a decision of the Supreme Court.
- 2. The decision of the Court of Appeals is not in conflict with a decision of another decision of the Court of Appeals.
- 3. The decision of the Court of Appeals does not involve a significant question of law under the Constitution of the State of Washington or of the United States.
- 4. The decision of the Court of Appeals does not involve an issue of substantial public interest that should be determined by the Supreme Court.

III. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The State agrees, for the most part, with the factual and procedural history as set forth by the petitioner. Where appropriate, the State's brief will point to the record to address specific facts in contention regarding the issues before the Court.

IV. ARGUMENT

RAP 13.4(b) states that a petition for review will only be accepted by the Supreme Court only if one of four conditions are met: (1) If the decision of the Court of Appeals is in conflict with a decision of the Supreme Court; or (2) If the decision of the Court of Appeals is in conflict with a decision of another division of the Court of Appeals; or (3) If a significant question of law under the Constitution of the State of Washington or of the United States is involved; or (4) If the petition involves an issue of substantial public interest that should be determined by the Supreme Court. Neither in the petition for review nor in the decision from the Court of Appeals are there any issues that would fall under one of the four conditions as outlined by RAP 13.4(b).

The present matter was stayed pending this Court's decision in *State v. Jones*, 338 P.3d 278 (2014) and *State v. Cobos*, 338 P.3d 283 (2014). In those recent decisions, this Court held that the common law rule of "no second chance" was superseded by the legislature's decision to amend RCW 9.94A.530, which states: "[o]n remand for resentencing following appeal or collateral attack, the parties shall have the opportunity to present and the court to consider all relevant evidence regarding criminal history, including criminal history not previously presented." RCW 9.94A.530(2).

[I]n those cases where relief is ordered in an appellate proceeding and the case is remanded, such as occurred here, under the statutory remand provisions both parties have the opportunity to present any evidence relevant to ensure the accuracy of the criminal history. Because ensuring the accuracy of the criminal history does not implicate due process, the legislature acted consistent with its plenary authority over sentencing in enacting the statutory remand provision.

Jones, 338 P.3d at 282-83.

Based upon this Court's conclusions in *Jones* and *Cobos*, the State respectfully requests that the petition for review be denied. Upon such decision, the matter will be remanded to Cowlitz County Superior Court for resentencing.

V. CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, Petitioner's petition for discretionary review should be denied.

Respectfully submitted this day of January, 2015.

RYAN P. JURVAKAINEN Prosecuting Attorney

By:

SPANM. BRITTAIN/WSBA #36804

Deputy Prosecuting Attorney Representing Respondent

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Michelle Sasser, certifies the Response to Petition for Review was served electronically via e-mail to the following:

Supreme Court
Temple of Justice
P.O. Box 40929
Olympia, WA 98504
supreme@courts.wa.gov

and,

Mr. Eric J. Nielsen/Casey Grannis Attorney at Law Nielsen Broman & Koch, PLLC 1908 E. Madison Street Seattle, WA 98122-2842 nielsene@nwattorney.net sloanej@nwattorney.net grannisc@nwattorney.net

I CERTIFY UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

Signed at Kelso, Washington on January 5, 2015.

Michelle Sasser

ichille Sasser

OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK

To:

Sasser, Michelle

Subject:

RE: PAs Office Scanned Item Genaro Brandon Villanueva, 90773-1 - Response to Petition

for Review

Received 1-15-15

From: Sasser, Michelle [mailto:SasserM@co.cowlitz.wa.us]

Sent: Thursday, January 15, 2015 10:49 AM

To: nielsene@nwattorney.net; 'sloanej@nwattorney.net'; grannisc@nwattorney.net; OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK

Subject: FW: PAs Office Scanned Item Genaro Brandon Villanueva, 90773-1 - Response to Petition for Review

Attached, please find the Response to Petition for Review regarding Genaro Brandon Villanueva, 90773-1.

If you have any questions, please contact this office. Thank you. Michelle Sasser

From: pacopier_donotreply@co.cowlitz.wa.us [mailto:pacopier_donotreply@co.cowlitz.wa.us]

Sent: Thursday, January 15, 2015 11:46 AM

To: Sasser, Michelle

Subject: PAs Office Scanned Item