

FILED
Court of Appeals
Division II
State of Washington
5/2/2019 4:22 PM

No. 97149-8

COA # 50707-2-II
Clark County # 16-1-02761-0

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Respondent,

v.

HOWARD B. GOODWIN, IV,

Petitioner/Appellant.

ON REVIEW FROM
THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON,
DIVISION TWO, AND THE
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON,
CLARK COUNTY,
the Honorable Scott A. Collier (trial judge)

PETITION FOR REVIEW

KATHRYN RUSSELL SELK
WSBA No. 23879

Counsel for Petitioner

RUSSELL SELK LAW OFFICE
1037 N.E. 65th Street PMB # 176
Seattle, Washington 98115
(206) 782-3353

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. IDENTITY OF PETITIONER. 1

B. COURT OF APPEALS DECISION...... 1

C. ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW...... 1

D. OTHER ISSUES SUPPORTING REVIEW...... 1

E. STATEMENT OF THE CASE...... 1

F. ARGUMENT WHY REVIEW SHOULD BE GRANTED...... 4

1. THE PROSECUTOR COMMITTED FLAGRANT, PREJUDICIAL MISCONDUCT WHICH COMPELS REVERSAL IN COMMENTING ON GOODWIN'S EXERCISE OF HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO BE PRESENT AND CONFRONT WITNESSES AT HIS OWN TRIAL 4

2. COUNSEL WAS PREJUDICIALLY INEFFECTIVE. 7

G. OTHER ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW. 8

3. REVIEW SHOULD ALSO BE GRANTED ON ALL THE ISSUES PETITIONER RAISED PRO SE...... 8

H. CONCLUSION. 9

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

WASHINGTON SUPREME COURT

State v. Rupe, 101 Wn.2d 664, 705, 683 P.2d 571 (1984)..... 4

State v. Brett, 126 Wn.2d 136, 892 P.2d 29 (1995), cert. denied, 516 U.S. 1121 (1996)..... 8

State v. Gregory, 158 Wn.2d 759, 147 P.3d 1201 (2006), overruled in part and on other grounds by, State v. W.R., Jr., 181 Wn.2d 757, 336 P.3d 1134 (2014)..... 4-7

State v. Grier, 171 Wn.2d 17, 246 P.3d 1260 (2011), cert denied, ___ U.S. ___, 135 S. Ct. 153 (2014). 7

State v. Martin, 171 Wn.2d 521, 252 P.3d 872 (2011)..... 5

WASHINGTON COURT OF APPEALS

State v. Goodwin, IV, ___ Wn. App. 3d ___ (2019 WL 1490621). . . . *passim*

State v. Jones, 71 Wn. App. 798, 86 P.2d 85 (1993), review denied, 124 Wn.2d 1018 (1994). 5

FEDERAL CASES

Illinois v. Allen, 397 U.S. 337, 338, 90 S.Ct. 1057, 25 L.Ed.2d 353 (2011).. 5

RULES, STATUTES AND CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

Art. 1, sec. 22..... 7

RAP 10.10..... 8

RAP 13.4(b)(1). 5, 7

RAP 13.4(b)(3). 5, 7

RAP 13.7(b).....	8
Sixth Amend.....	7

A. IDENTITY OF PETITIONER

Petitioner Howard B. Goodwin, IV, the appellant below, asks the Court to review a portion of the decision referred to in section B.

B. COURT OF APPEALS DECISION

Petitioner seeks review of decision of the court of appeals, Division Two, in State v. Goodwin, IV, __ Wn. App. 3d __ (2019 WL 1490621), issued April 2, 2019. The opinion is attached hereto as Appendix A.

C. ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

1. Does a prosecutor draw a negative inference from the accused's exercise of his constitutional rights to trial and to confrontation by commenting about how the alleged victim's testimony at trial, mostly exonerating the accused and conflicting with the victim's prior statements, was given "in front of Mr. Goodwin," the accused?
2. Is counsel prejudicially ineffective in failing to object where the state comments on the defendant's exercise of his constitutional rights?

D. OTHER ISSUES SUPPORTING REVIEW

3. Should review be granted on all of the issues raised by the Petitioner in his Statement of Additional Grounds for Review?

E. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner Howard B. Goodwin, IV, was charged in Clark County superior court with attempted second-degree rape, fourth-degree assault, felony violation of a domestic violence court order and indecent liberties with forcible compulsion, all charged as "domestic violence" offenses. CP 18-26. A jury acquitted Goodwin of the attempted rape and found the violation of a the court order was *not* an assault. CP 32-44.

Mr. Goodwin was convicted of the other counts as charged. CP 32-44.

The charges arose when Patricia Meyer called police on November 16, 2016, claiming her longtime boyfriend, Goodwin, had assaulted her when they went to spend the night together in a park. RP 469-70. Meyer was homeless and they had to sleep in the park to be together and have sex. RP 469-70. Meyer testified at trial that Goodwin went and got an extra blanket, plastic tarp and some food from the home where he was living when she complained about being cold and hungry. RP 362-64, 474. They then got things "situated," consumed drugs together and ate. RP 362-64, 474.

Ms. Meyer said she and Goodwin argued and he left the park several times, saying he did not want to fight. RP 367-69. Meyer testified that, at some point, her shirt was off, her pants half off and they were engaged in consensual touching. RP 379-80. They then started fighting, however. RP 379-80. Meyer also testified, in contrast, that her clothes had only come off after the fight. RP 381.

Ms. Meyer testified that she started the fighting at first by throwing some things which hit Goodwin. RP 386-87. He said, "knock it off" and left, came back to see if she was okay and they started arguing and getting "physical," so she ran away with her pants half off. RP 386-87. She said they wrestled and he held her down and she ended up calling police, who arrived and took her to get examined. RP 390. At the emergency room, Ms. Meyer claimed Goodwin had assaulted her "through various means," picking her up, throwing her, hitting and kicking her and, at some point, having attempted sexual contact. RP

290-91. She said there was attempted forced oral sex but no penetration and reported a headache, neck, arm and back pain. RP 293. The doctor who saw Meyer admitted there was no bruising, contusion or swelling of her back and the diagnoses of back injury was "self-reported" based on pain. RP 306. There were some tender areas and an abrasion on Meyer's right forehead, however, and some "welling" of the scalp and right side of her head and the doctor thought the injuries consistent with blunt force trauma. RP 296. Meyer declined counseling, pain pills and a sexual assault exam. RP 298-302.

Meyer gave a different version of events to police than at trial, saying in the call to police that Goodwin had attacked her and "beat me and beat me." RP 409. She also said in the call that he wanted to have sex and she declined so he then started hitting her saying he was going to "make" her. RP 411. She told the operator he had then calmed down and stopped. RP 411. She also said on the call he had sexually assaulted her. RP 411. Meyer's written statement to police also talked about sexual assault and said he was trying to rape her and threatened to kill her if she called police. RP 457.

Mr. Goodwin testified at trial about being frustrated about having to sleep outside because Meyer was not allowed to stay with him. RP 579-80. She had gotten mad at him when he fell asleep during foreplay. RP 579-80, 583-84. He said he had not tried to force Meyer into sex and may have told her not to call police but not to threaten her, just because calling police did not make things better, ever. RP 600-602. Mr. Goodwin agreed he had tried to get the phone from Meyer when she

tried to call police. RP 604-605. When arrested, Goodwin told police he did not remember what happened and he explained at trial this was because he “messed up” from the drugs and the incident. RP 610-11.

The only issue at trial was whether the jury would accept the version of events Meyer had given at trial or the claims she made in her statement and 9-1-1 call. In initial closing argument, the prosecutor told jurors that the defense wanted them to “disbelieve” the out-of-court evidence and instead believe the testimony. RP 672-73. The prosecutor then went on:

So, what do we make of her testimony in the last two days? **Well, first off, remember, that testimony, those statements were made in front of Mr. Goodwin.** This 911 call was not, the statements to the doctor were not. She has admittedly said, she wants to see him again.

RP 672-73 (emphasis added). Counsel did not object.

F. ARGUMENT WHY REVIEW SHOULD BE GRANTED

1. THE PROSECUTOR COMMITTED FLAGRANT, PREJUDICIAL MISCONDUCT WHICH COMPELS REVERSAL IN COMMENTING ON GOODWIN’S EXERCISE OF HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO BE PRESENT AND CONFRONT WITNESSES AT HIS OWN TRIAL

A prosecutor is prohibited from commenting on or drawing a negative inference from the exercise of a constitutional right by the accused. State v. Rupe, 101 Wn.2d 664, 705, 683 P.2d 571 (1984). This Court has described such conduct not only as misconduct but as constitutional error, because it chills the exercise of a right. State v. Gregory, 158 Wn.2d 759, 807, 147 P.3d 1201 (2006), overruled in part and on other grounds by, State v. W.R., Jr., 181 Wn.2d 757, 336 P.3d 1134 (2014). In this case, this Court should grant review, because the

comments of the prosecutor were improper comments on Goodwin's exercise of his constitutional rights to be present and confront witnesses at his own trial, and Division Two erred in finding to the contrary.

A person accused of a crime has a constitutional right to be present at their own trial. State v. Martin, 171 Wn.2d 521, 536-37, 252 P.3d 872 (2011); Illinois v. Allen, 397 U.S. 337, 338, 90 S.Ct. 1057, 25 L.Ed.2d 353 (2011). The court of appeals has held that the prosecutor's "wide latitude" in closing argument to discuss the evidence and draw reasonable inferences from it is not a grant of authority to commenting on the accused having exercised his constitutional rights. State v. Jones, 71 Wn. App. 798, 809-10, 86 P.2d 85 (1993), review denied, 124 Wn.2d 1018 (1994).

In holding that the prosecutor had not committed misconduct, the court of appeals relied on its belief that Gregory, supra, had held that it was not improper to "arguably comment[] on a defendant's exercise of a constitutional right," even in closing argument, so long as the court of appeals could find that the comment was not really "focused" on the exercise of the right. App. A at 6. Division Two relied on this interpretation of Gregory and held that, rather than a comment drawing a negative inference from the alleged domestic violence victim having told a different story *while testifying in front of the defendant*, the comment was simply "to provide one reason why Meyer's testimony conflicted with previous multiple statements" and to "bolster" Meyer's credibility. App. A at 6.

This Court should grant review under RAP 13.4(b)(1) and (3). In

Gregory, the issues was whether the jury would believe the victim, who said Gregory had raped her or had engaged in consensual sex for money, as Gregory claimed and was angry about a broken condom. 158 Wn.2d at 807-808. At trial, the prosecutor asked the victim how she felt having to testify in court and be cross-examined in arguing that she would not have put herself through that for the reason Gregory stated, i.e., anger at a broken condom. 158 Wn.2d at 805-806. Defense counsel objected as to relevance and, after being overruled, objected when the witness' response about her feelings became "narrative," and in closing, the prosecutor read back the answer and argued that the victim would not have gone through all of this over the condom as the defense claimed. 158 Wn.2d at 806. On review, Gregory argued that the prosecutor had improperly appealed to sympathy and had chilled his exercise of his rights to trial and confrontation "by asking how R.S. felt about cross-examination." Id. The state did not criticize or draw attention to the cross-examination or imply that Gregory should have "spared" the victim having to go through a trial, because the comments were only about the victim's testimony and the credibility of the defense. 158 Wn.2d at 807-808.

Here, in contrast, the comments *did* draw the prohibited negative inference based on Goodwin exercising his rights to be present and to confrontation. The comment told the jury to draw a negative inference as to why the alleged victim would tell a different story "in front of Mr. Goodwin" at trial. RP 672-73. The prosecutor was using Mr. Goodwin's exercise of his constitutional rights to be present and physically confront

the witness against him to draw a negative inference about how that would affect the victim of alleged domestic violence incidents to change her story. RP 672-73.

Gregory does not allow for a prosecutor to ask jurors to find a witness' testimony less credible by drawing a negative inference from that testimony having been made "in front of" the accused. The court of appeals erred in stretching that case to so hold. Review should be granted to address Division Two's improper interpretation of Gregory under RAP 13.4(b)(1) but also under RAP 13.4(b)(3), because what amounts to a comment on the exercise of a constitutional right is an issue of grave constitutional concern.

2. COUNSEL WAS PREJUDICIALLY INEFFECTIVE

In addition, the Court should grant review based on counsel's prejudicial ineffectiveness in handling the misconduct below. Because the court of appeals found no misconduct, it dismissed counsel's failure to object. See App. A at 5-7. The right to effective assistance of appointed counsel is a fundament and foundation of our criminal justice system, as this Court has pointed out. State v. Grier, 171 Wn.2d 17, 34, 246 P.3d 1260 (2011), cert denied, ___ U.S. ___, 135 S. Ct. 153 (2014); Sixth Amend.; Art. 1, sec. 22. If this Court grants review of the error regarding the misconduct, it should further review whether counsel's failure to object to the misconduct below was ineffective assistance.

G. OTHER ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

3. REVIEW SHOULD ALSO BE GRANTED ON ALL THE ISSUES PETITIONER RAISED PRO SE

Mr. Goodwin filed a pro se RAP 10.10 Statement of Additional Grounds for Review ("SAG") in the Court of Appeals. See App. A at 1-10. More specifically, he argued there was insufficient to support the convictions, that he was deprived of his right to a fair trial, that the jurors returned inconsistent and illogical verdicts, that the prosecutor was vindictive, and that the prosecutor failed to uphold his duties in violation of Goodwin's due process and equal protection rights. App. A at 7-10. Division Two rejected all of his arguments without appointing counsel to assist or research the issues raised. See App. A; see also RAP 10.10(f).

This Court has not yet resolved the issue of how a Petitioner who has filed a SAG should seek review of the issues presented in the SAG in such circumstances. In State v. Brett, 126 Wn.2d 136, 206, 892 P.2d 29 (1995), cert. denied, 516 U.S. 1121 (1996), this Court held that it would not address arguments parties tried to incorporate by reference from other cases. However, this Court has not disapproved of incorporation by reference of arguments raised pro se when counsel has not been appointed on those issues pursuant to RAP 10.10. Thus, to comply with RAP 13.7(b) and raise all issues in this Petition without making any representations about their relative merit as required by the WSBA Rules of Professional conduct, incorporated herein by reference are the arguments Mr. Goodwin raised in his RAP 10.10 SAG. This Court should grant review on those issues as well.

H. CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated herein, this Court should grant review.

DATED this 2nd day of May, 2019.

Respectfully submitted,



KATHRYN RUSSELL SELK, No. 23879
Appointed counsel for Petitioner
RUSSELL SELK LAW OFFICE
1037 N.E. 65th Street, #176
Seattle, Washington 98115
(206) 782-3353

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE BY MAIL/EFILING

Under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington, I hereby declare that I sent a true and correct copy of the attached Petition for Review to opposing counsel at Clark County Prosecutor's Office via this Court's upload service and caused a true and correct copy of the same to be sent to appellant by deposit in U.S. mail, with first-class postage prepaid at the following address: Howard Goodwin, DOC 733205, WSP, 1313 N. 13th Ave., Walla Walla, WA. 99362.

DATED this 2nd day of May, 2019.



KATHRYN RUSSELL SELK, No. 23879
Appointed counsel for Petitioner
RUSSELL SELK LAW OFFICE
1037 N.E. 65th Street, #176
Seattle, Washington 98115
(206) 782-3353

2019 WL 1490621

Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.

NOTE: UNPUBLISHED OPINION, SEE WA R GEN GR 14.1

Court of Appeals of Washington, Division 2.

STATE of Washington, Respondent,

v.

Howard B. GOODWIN, IV, Appellant.

No. 50707-2-II

|

Filed April 2, 2019

Appeal from Clark Superior Court, 16-1-02761-0, Honorable Scott A. Collier, J.

Attorneys and Law Firms

Kathryn A. Russell, Selk Russell Selk Law Office, 1037 Ne 65th St., Seattle, WA, 98115-6655,
Counsel for Appellant.

Aaron Bartlett, Attorney at Law, 1013 Franklin St., Vancouver, WA, 98660-3039, Counsel
for Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED OPINION

Glasgow, J.

*1 Despite a court order prohibiting Howard Goodwin from having contact with Patricia Meyer, he decided to spend the night with her in a park because she was homeless. Meyer called the police in the early morning hours and said that Goodwin, her boyfriend of 14 years, had assaulted and attempted to rape her. Later that night, she also told the police and emergency room staff that Goodwin had assaulted her and tried to force her to have sex and perform oral sex on him.

At trial, Meyer recanted to some degree. The prosecutor argued to the jury that they should believe Meyer's statements on the night of the assault, rather than Meyer's testimony at trial where Goodwin was present. Defense counsel did not object. The jury acquitted Goodwin

of second degree attempted rape but convicted him of second degree assault, fourth degree assault, violation of a court order, and indecent liberties with forcible compulsion.

Goodwin appeals, arguing that the prosecutor improperly commented on Goodwin's exercise of his right to be present at his own trial and that Goodwin's defense counsel was ineffective for failing to object to the prosecutor's statement. We conclude that the prosecutor's statement was not improper because it addressed the credibility of witness statements. As a result, defense counsel was not deficient in his failure to object. Goodwin also raises several arguments in his statement of additional grounds and supplemental statement of additional grounds. We reject those arguments as well. Accordingly, we affirm Goodwin's convictions.

FACTS

At the time of the incident, a no-contact order prohibited Goodwin from having contact with Meyer. Nevertheless, the two of them went to a park together, where they began kissing and engaging in foreplay.

After some time they began arguing, and the argument eventually escalated into a physical fight. Goodwin started wrestling Meyer to keep her from leaving as she was trying to run away, and he threw Meyer to the ground where she hit her head. Meyer then managed to get away. Goodwin told her that “it wasn't going to be good” if she called the police and then he ran away. Verbatim Report of Proceedings (VRP) (Vol. IV) at 390. Meyer called the police. During that call, Meyer said that she had refused to have sex with Goodwin and in response, he had hit her.

When police and medics arrived at the park, they took Meyer to the emergency room. There Meyer told Dr. Brett Jensen that Goodwin had assaulted her, saying he had picked her up, thrown her, kicked her, and hit her. Meyer also told Dr. Jensen that he tried to force her to have oral sex, but that no penetration had occurred. Meyer reported a significant headache and pain in her back, neck, hand, wrist, left arm, and leg. Dr. Jensen noted multiple tender areas, abrasions, and swelling on Meyer's scalp and the side of her head. Meyer declined a sexual assault exam.

Meyer also discussed the incident with a nurse and a police officer, Deputy Russell Bradseth, at the hospital. Meyer told the nurse that Goodwin had shoved, pushed, kicked her, and grabbed her by the face, but she denied being sexually assaulted. Meyer reported to Deputy Bradseth that she had told Goodwin she did not want to have sex and just wanted to sleep, and she told him several times to stop touching her. Meyer said that Goodwin had climbed on top of her, tried to force her to have sex, and yelled at her to touch his penis.

*2 Meyer also made a written statement to the police in which she said that Goodwin had “physically assaulted and sexually assaulted” her “three separate times,” and on his “last attempt to rape” her he body slammed her onto the concrete and threatened to kill her if she called the police. VRP (Vol. IV) at 457.

The State charged Goodwin with second degree attempted rape, second degree assault, fourth degree assault, felony violation of a domestic violence court order, and indecent liberties with forcible compulsion.

At trial, the prosecutor played a redacted version of Meyer's 911 call for the jury. During the call, Meyer said that Goodwin “wanted to have sex and I said ‘no,’ and he just started hitting me and beating me and telling me how he was going to (inaudible) make me, make me.” VRP (Vol. IV) at 411. Meyer told the dispatcher that she was sexually assaulted and that Goodwin “picked [her] up and body slammed [her] on the cement,” and also tried to force her to perform oral sex on him “[s]everal times.” VRP (Vol. IV) at 412, 420-24. Dr. Jensen, the emergency room nurse, and Deputy Bradseth all testified to what Meyer had told them that night.

At trial, Meyer recanted to some degree. She testified that Goodwin never hit her, but he told her he was going to force her to have sex, he attempted to make her perform oral sex, and he threatened to kill her if she called the police. She also denied any sexual assault. She admitted that she had been using methamphetamine that night, but she was not sure if it had affected her memory. Dr. Jensen testified that he saw no signs of drugs or alcohol use when he examined Meyer in the emergency room.

Goodwin also testified at trial. He agreed that he and Meyer got into a verbal argument that escalated into a physical altercation, although he claimed it was Meyer who instigated the argument and escalated it by throwing a bucket of chicken at him as he was leaving because he had fallen asleep during foreplay. He admitted that he grabbed Meyer by the hair, “smacked her upside the head,” and wrestled with her to keep her from calling 911. VRP (Vol. V) at 584-86, 605. He also did not dispute that he violated the no-contact order. He said he never tried to force Meyer to have sex with him, nor did he threaten to hurt her if she called the police.

In closing argument, the prosecutor read aloud Meyer's written statement to the police, noting that she signed it under penalty of perjury, and then made the following argument:

Now, defense counsel may want you to disbelieve [Meyer], disbelieve what she says to 911, what she said to the doctor, what she wrote in her statement. He, defense [counsel], he wants you to believe what [Meyer] has testified to the last two days.

So what do we make of her testimony in the last two days? Well, first off, remember, that testimony, those statements were made in front of Mr. Goodwin. This 911 call was not, the statements to the doctor were not, and her statements to Deputy Bradseth were not. She has admittedly said, she wants to see him again. She told you that at one point back in November she felt that Mr. Goodwin was all that she had.

VRP (Vol. V) at 672. Defense counsel did not object to any of these statements.

The jury acquitted Goodwin of attempted second degree rape and convicted on all other counts.

*3 Goodwin appeals his convictions.

ANALYSIS

I. PROSECUTORIAL MISCONDUCT

Goodwin argues that during closing argument the prosecutor improperly commented on Goodwin's exercise of his constitutional right to be present at trial. We disagree.

A. Burden for Allegations of Prosecutorial Misconduct

To prevail on a prosecutorial misconduct claim, Goodwin bears the burden to show that the prosecutor's comment on his presence at trial was both improper and prejudicial in the context of the entire record and the circumstances at trial. *See State v. Thorgerson*, 172 Wn.2d 438, 442, 258 P.3d 43 (2011). When a claim is made that the prosecutor committed misconduct during closing argument, we review the prosecutor's statements “within the context of the prosecutor's entire argument, the issues in the case, the evidence discussed in the argument, and the jury instructions.” *State v. Dhaliwal*, 150 Wn.2d 559, 578, 79 P.3d 432 (2003). During closing argument, prosecutors have “ ‘wide latitude in making arguments to the jury and prosecutors are allowed to draw reasonable inferences from the evidence.’ ” *State v. Fisher*, 165 Wn.2d 727, 747, 202 P.3d 937 (2009) (quoting *State v. Gregory*, 158 Wn.2d 759, 860, 147 P.3d 1201 (2006)).

The defendant must show there is a “ ‘substantial likelihood’ ” the improper statements affected the jury's verdict. *State v. McCreven*, 170 Wn. App. 444, 468, 284 P.3d 793 (2012) (quoting *State v. Magers*, 164 Wn.2d 174, 191, 189 P.3d 126 (2008)). The failure to object to an improper remark constitutes waiver “unless the remark is so flagrant and ill intentioned

that it causes enduring and resulting prejudice” that an instruction or admonition to the jury could not have cured. *Thorgerson*, 172 Wn.2d at 443 (quoting *State v. Russell*, 125 Wn.2d 24, 86, 882 P.2d 747 (1994)); see also *State v. Emery*, 174 Wn.2d 741, 760-61, 278 P.3d 653 (2012).

B. Reference to a Defendant's Exercise of a Constitutional Right

The State may not draw adverse inferences from the exercise of a constitutional right. See generally, *United States v. Jackson*, 390 U.S. 570, 581, 88 S.Ct. 1209, 20 L.Ed.2d 138 (1968); *State v. Rupe*, 101 Wn.2d 664, 705, 683 P.2d 571 (1984) (listing cases). Our Supreme Court has recognized that “a comment in closing argument that is ‘tied only to the defendant's presence in the courtroom and not to his actual testimony’ ” can run afoul of article I, section 22 of the Washington Constitution. *State v. Martin*, 171 Wn.2d 521, 535-36, 252 P.3d 872 (2011) (quoting *Portuondo v. Agard*, 529 U.S. 61, 77, 120 S.Ct. 1119, 146 L.Ed.2d 47 (2000) (Ginsburg, J., dissenting)). A comment on the exercise of a constitutional right in closing argument after the defendant has submitted his case is particularly problematic because the defendant may be prevented from providing a meaningful response. *Id.* at 535-36.

Nevertheless, our Supreme Court recently reiterated that “not all arguments that discuss a defendant's constitutional rights are impermissible. The question is ‘whether the prosecutor manifestly intended the remarks to be a comment on that right.’ ” *State v. Scherf*, 192 Wn.2d 350, 391, 429 P.3d 776 (2018) (quoting *State v. Crane*, 116 Wn.2d 315, 331, 804 P.2d 10 (1991)). And in *Crane*, a fleeting comment was insufficient to amount to an improper comment on a constitutional right. There, the prosecutor commented during witness examination that the defense thought someone else had committed the murder at issue. *Crane*, 116 Wn.2d at 331. That comment was too fleeting to amount to an improper comment on the defendant's right not to testify, even though it might have suggested that the defendant had a burden to prove someone else killed the victim. *Id.*

*4 *State v. Gregory* is the most similar to this case because it came down to a credibility contest between Gregory and the victim, who alleged Gregory had raped her. 158 Wn.2d 759, 807-08, 147 P.3d 1201 (2006), *overruled on other grounds by State v. W.R.*, 181 Wn.2d 757, 336 P.3d 1134 (2014). In those circumstances, the *Gregory* court concluded that it was not improper for the prosecutor to comment in closing argument on the emotional effect that testifying had on the victim, so long as the focus was on her credibility and not specifically on Gregory's right of confrontation. *Id.* The court explained,

We conclude that the questioning and argument at issue here were not improper because they did not focus on Gregory's exercise of his

constitutional rights to trial and to confront witnesses. Instead they focused on the credibility of the victim as compared to the credibility of the accused.

Id. at 808.

Thus, even where a prosecutor has arguably commented on a defendant's exercise of a constitutional right, and even where the prosecutor has done so in closing argument, our Supreme Court has analyzed whether the comment was focused on the defendant's exercise of the right or on something else like the relative credibility of witnesses.

C. The State Did Not Improperly Comment on Goodwin's Right to Be Present

Goodwin contends that the prosecutor improperly commented on Goodwin's exercise of his right to be present at trial by suggesting that Meyer changed her story because she had to testify in front Goodwin, her boyfriend of 14 years. The State counters that the entire context of the prosecutor's argument shows that he sought not to draw a negative inference against Goodwin on account of his presence, but rather to provide one reason why Meyer's testimony conflicted with multiple previous statements. We agree with the State.

The prosecutor commented on Goodwin's presence to bolster the credibility of Meyer's statements on the night of the assault and explain one possible reason why her trial testimony contradicted those statements. In the context of this case, like the comments in *Gregory*, the prosecutor's comment here was focused on the credibility of the witness rather than the exercise of Goodwin's right to be present. As a result, we conclude that the State did not manifestly intend it to be a comment on Goodwin's right to be present and the prosecutor's statement was not improper.

II. INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL

In the alternative, Goodwin contends that he received ineffective assistance of counsel when his trial counsel failed to object to the prosecutor's statement discussed above. Both the Sixth Amendment to the United States Constitution and article I, section 22 of the Washington Constitution guarantee the right of a criminal defendant to effective assistance of counsel. *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668, 685-86, 104 S.Ct. 2052, 80 L.Ed.2d 674 (1984); *State v. Thomas*, 109 Wn.2d 222, 229, 743 P.2d 816 (1987). Washington follows the *Strickland* test: the defendant must show both that (1) counsel's performance was deficient, and (2) the deficient performance prejudiced the defense. 466 U.S. at 687; *State v. Cienfuegos*, 144 Wn.2d 222, 226, 25 P.3d 1011 (2001).

Here, we have concluded that the prosecutor's comment was focused on the credibility of the witness rather than the exercise of Goodwin's right to be present. As a result, the prosecutor's comment was not improper. Because the prosecutor's comment was not improper, defense counsel's performance was not deficient when he failed to object. We conclude that Goodwin's ineffective assistance claim fails.

III. STATEMENT OF ADDITIONAL GROUNDS

*5 Goodwin raises several more claims in his statement of additional grounds and supplemental statement of grounds. We reject his arguments that there was insufficient evidence to support his convictions and that he was deprived of his right to a fair jury trial because, he asserts, the jury returned verdicts that were inconsistent. We decline to consider his remaining arguments that he was deprived of his right to an impartial jury, the prosecutor was vindictive and failed to uphold his duties in violation of Goodwin's due process and equal protection rights, and the trial court abused its discretion.

A. Sufficiency of the Evidence

Goodwin argues that his convictions for indecent liberties with forcible compulsion and second degree assault, as well as the jury's specific finding of sexual motivation, were based on insufficient evidence. We disagree.

Evidence is sufficient to support a conviction if, viewed in the light most favorable to the State, it permits any rational trier of fact to find the essential elements of the crime beyond a reasonable doubt. State v. Imokawa, 4 Wn. App. 2d 545, 560, 422 P.3d 502 (2018). A claim of insufficiency admits the truth of the State's evidence and all reasonable inferences drawn from that evidence. *Id.* Circumstantial evidence and direct evidence are equally reliable. State v. Arquette, 178 Wn. App. 273, 282, 314 P.3d 426 (2013). “ ‘Credibility determinations are for the trier of fact and cannot be reviewed on appeal.’ ” Imokawa, 4 Wn. App. 2d at 560 (quoting State v. Camarillo, 115 Wn.2d 60, 71, 794 P.2d 850 (1990)).

Goodwin argues there was insufficient evidence because Meyer's trial testimony and her statements made on the night of the assault were inconsistent and she was under the influence of drugs on that night. He also claims that the 911 dispatcher, police officers, and hospital staff misinterpreted some of Meyer's statements. Goodwin essentially argues that inconsistencies in Meyer's various accounts of the incident undermine the State's evidence to such an extent that no rational jury would have convicted him.

The evaluation of witness credibility is left to the jury. See Imokawa, 4 Wn. App. 2d at 560. The jury ultimately resolved the credibility of various witnesses, as well as Meyer's inconsistent statements, by acquitting Goodwin of attempted rape and making a finding reducing his conviction for violating the no-contact order to a misdemeanor, but otherwise finding the elements of the charged crimes were met. Admitting the truth of the State's evidence, and viewing that evidence in the light most favorable to the State, we conclude there was sufficient evidence to support the jury's verdict.

Goodwin also claims that the evidence was insufficient to support the element of forcible compulsion for his conviction for indecent liberties. In relevant part, “[f]orcible compulsion means physical force that overcomes resistance, or a threat, express or implied, that places a person in fear of death or physical injury.” Clerk's Papers at 65. Goodwin maintains that he never used physical force, nor did he make any threats that placed Meyer in fear of death or physical injury. But there is ample evidence from Meyer's 911 call, statements to hospital staff and police officers, and her sworn written statement to the police to support the jury's finding on this element. We conclude there was sufficient evidence of forcible compulsion to support the jury's verdict.

Finally, without citation to supporting case law, Goodwin argues that the standard of review for insufficient evidence violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment and the right to a fair appeal under article I, section 22 of the Washington Constitution. This unsupported argument is clearly without merit.

B. Consistency of the Verdicts

*6 Goodwin next argues that the jury's verdicts were inconsistent. We disagree.

Goodwin contends that because the jury acquitted him of attempted second degree rape, which requires a finding of intent to commit second degree rape, it could not have also found him guilty of second degree assault, because that crime also requires a finding of intent to commit second (or third) degree rape. In other words, because the intent element in the jury instructions was the same for both crimes, Goodwin argues that the jury made a mistake by convicting him of second degree assault when it had acquitted him of attempted second degree rape.

However, attempted second degree rape requires another element that second degree assault does not: that the defendant commit an act that was a substantial step toward the commission of second degree rape. RCW 9A.44.050; RCW 9A.28.020(1). Second degree assault, on the other hand, requires that the defendant assault another with the intent to commit a felony, in this case to commit second or third degree rape. RCW 9A.36.021(1)(e). It is reasonable to infer from the jury's verdict that it found that Goodwin had the intent to commit second

degree rape, but acquitted him of attempted rape because he did not take a substantial step toward committing that crime. The jury then separately found that he committed assault with sexual motivation, with the intent to commit second degree rape, and thus properly found him guilty of second degree assault.

In addition, even if there were some inconsistency in the jury's verdicts, that alone would not require reversal. *State v. Goins*, 151 Wn.2d 728, 737, 92 P.3d 181 (2004). When a reviewing court concludes that a jury's verdicts are inconsistent, it must then verify that the guilty verdict is supported by sufficient evidence. *Id.* This approach respects the jury's role where, for example, lenity provides a possible explanation for the inconsistency. *Id.* at 735. Here, we have already concluded that there was sufficient evidence to support the guilty verdict on second degree assault. Thus, even if the jury's verdicts were inconsistent, reversal would not be required.

Because there was no apparent mistake or inconsistency on the part of the jury and there was sufficient evidence to support the conviction of second degree assault in any event, we conclude Goodwin was not deprived of his right to a fair trial.

C. Other Claims

Goodwin claims that his right to an impartial jury was violated, the prosecutor was vindictive and failed to uphold his duties in violation of Goodwin's due process and equal protection rights, and the trial court abused its discretion. Rather than argue these issues in his direct appeal, Goodwin expresses his intent to reserve and raise them in a future personal restraint petition or through other means.

Although RAP 10.10(c) does not require Goodwin to refer to the record or cite authority, it does require him to inform us of the “nature and occurrence of the alleged errors.” These assertions of error are too vague to allow us to identify the issues and we do not reach them.

CONCLUSION

*7 We affirm Goodwin's convictions.

A majority of the panel having determined that this opinion will not be printed in the Washington Appellate Reports, but will be filed for public record in accordance with RCW 2.06.040, it is so ordered.

We concur:

Worswick, J.

Maxa, C.J.

All Citations

Not Reported in Pac. Rptr., 2019 WL 1490621

End of Document

© 2019 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

RUSSELL SELK LAW OFFICE

May 02, 2019 - 4:22 PM

Transmittal Information

Filed with Court: Court of Appeals Division II
Appellate Court Case Number: 50707-2
Appellate Court Case Title: State of Washington, Respondent v. Howard B. Goodwin, Appellant
Superior Court Case Number: 16-1-02761-0

The following documents have been uploaded:

- 507072_Motion_20190502161937D2253710_3739.pdf
This File Contains:
Motion 1 - Extend Time to File
The Original File Name was GOODWIN.P4R.pdf

A copy of the uploaded files will be sent to:

- CntyPA.GeneralDelivery@clark.wa.gov
- aaron.bartlett@clark.wa.gov

Comments:

Sender Name: Kathryn Selk - Email: KARSDroit@gmail.com

Address:

1037 NE 65TH ST

SEATTLE, WA, 98115-6655

Phone: 206-782-3353

Note: The Filing Id is 20190502161937D2253710