

COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO
OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE OF WASHINGTON)
)
Respondent,)
)
v.)
Leldon Roy Pittman)
(your name))
)
Appellant.)

No. 44652-9-II

STATEMENT OF ADDITIONAL
GROUNDS FOR REVIEW

FILED
COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION II
2013 NOV 14 PM 1:14
STATE OF WASHINGTON
BY [Signature]

I, Leldon Roy Pittman, 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

Please see attached:

Additional Ground 2

Please see attached:

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

Date: 11-10-13

Signature: Leldon [Signature]

State of Washington

v.

Leldon Roy Pittman

Case # 44652-9-II

Additional Grounds for Review

1. Violation of my speedy trial rights;

I was arrested on 11/22/12 charged with Assault 1, Assault 3 on an Officer, Vehicular Assault, Malicious Mischief, Hit and Run Accident/Injury, Eluding a Police Vehicle, and DUI. Upon my Arraignment they proceeded with the Elude and the DUI, All other charges were dismissed. At my Omnibus hearing on 4-16-12 I was threatened that if I didn't take the deal and chose to exercise my right to trial, the prosecution was going to punish me by adding New charges. But they didn't just rearraign, they held me for nearly 3 months while they investigated just to rearraign me on two of the charges that were initially dismissed in January, violating the speedy trial rule and my due process. This requires a Dismissal of all charges. I objected and contested every continuance on record. This was clearly a "witchhunt" on the prosecution's behalf and the fact that I was

found not guilty of these "additional" charges only further proves that they held no standing and were clearly vindictive.

2. Ineffective Counsel and denial of facts being presented at trial;

American Bar Association states: A Lawyer shall abide by a client's decisions concerning the objectives of representation and, shall consult with the client as to the means by which they are to be pursued.

Mr. Quillian refused to abide by my decisions by lying to me about what he was doing and having little to no contact between hearings. In doing so I was denied a Diminished Capacity defense. Despite several separate evaluations by accredited psychiatrists all affirming diagnosis of PTSD and Severe Anxiety and a statement from forensic psychologist Bret C. Troubridge acknowledging that due to the events that took place, I was "likely out of my mind and had trouble conforming my intents to the requirements of the law" I went to trial with NO Expert Testimony. Mr. Quillian told me he was going to subpoena an expert but the fact that he did not, only became aware to me on the day of trial when I asked the judge who was

on my witness list. I was upset and discussed his deceiving behavior on Records. Mr. Quillian then filed petition to withdraw as my counsel stating he would not and did not want to represent me and forcing him to do so would be a clear violation of my right to effective counsel. But he had already been ineffective, by not allowing expert testimony and refusing to subpoena my witnesses he took the decision of Diminished Capacity out of the jury's hands and made it his own. His petition was denied and I was forced to proceed to trial with someone who clearly did not want to represent me. Though there was testimony as to my mental disabilities, there was not the required expert testimony asserting the presence of my condition and the causal connection between the illness and the events that took place, denying the jury instructions on Diminished Capacity. Expert testimony may have, and I believe would have provided an outcome of not guilty on all charges, Mr. Quillian's gross negligence is what ultimately found me guilty.