

FILED  
Court of Appeals  
Division II  
State of Washington  
4/30/2019 10:13 AM

NO. 52636-1-II

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

---

---

STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Respondent,

v.

KURTIS WILLIAM MONSCHKE,

Appellant.

---

---

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

The Honorable Elizabeth P. Martin, Judge

---

---

OPENING BRIEF OF APPELLANT

---

---

RITA J. GRIFFITH  
Attorney for Appellant

RITA J. GRIFFITH, PLLC  
4616 25<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, #453  
Seattle, WA 98105  
(206) 547-1742

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	Page
<b>I. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II. ASSIGNMENTS OF ERROR AND ISSUES RELATING TO ASSIGNMENTS OF ERROR.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>A. Assignments of error.....</b>	<b>3</b>
1. The trial court erred in ruling that Mr. Monschke had to wait until his release from total confinement to seek remission of appellate costs.	
2. The trial court erred in not granting remission of appellate costs because such costs create a manifest hardship on Mr. Monschke who is indigent and has no prospect of ever paying them.	
3. The trial court erred in not granting remission of appellate costs under the remedial 2018 amendments to RCW 10.01.160 (4) which equates indigency with manifest hardship.	
<b>B. Issues pertaining to assignment of error.....</b>	<b>4</b>
1. Did the trial court err in ruling that Mr. Monschke had to wait until after release from total confinement to seek remission of appellate costs where at this time the costs were imposed, RCW 10.01.160(4) provided that “a defendant who has been sentenced to pay costs and is not in contumacious default <b>may at any time</b> petition for remission of the payment of costs . . . .”?(emphasis added)	
2. Did the trial court err in ruling that Mr. Monschke had to wait until after release from total confinement to seek remission of appellate costs where he is serving life without parole and would never get to seek remission?	

**TABLE OF CONTENTS – cont’d**

Page

3. Does the imposition of appellate costs constitute “manifest hardship” on Mr. Monschke, who was indigent throughout his trial, appeal and post-appeal petition; who has no assets beyond what his family and friends can send and a possible gratuity for a prison job; who has been unable to make a significant change to the amount of his LFOs in his fifteen years in custody; and who is serving a sentence of life without parole and will not likely ever be able to pay his appellate costs?

4. Does a 2018 amendment which limits the right to seek remission of appellate costs apply to costs imposed under the former statute where the amendment is part of a larger revision of the legal financial obligation statutes under which the appellate costs would not have been imposed in the first place?

5. Do the remedial provisions of RCW 10.01.160(4) -- equating indigency with manifest hardship – apply retroactively to Mr. Monschke such that he is not subject to imposition of appellate costs as legal financial obligations?

6. Do remedial provisions which lessen the penalty for a crime apply retroactively to crimes committed before their enactment?

**III. STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....5**

**III. RELEVANT DOC POLICIES AND LEGAL FINANCIAL OBLIGATION STATUTES.....7**

**A. Overview of inmate finances within prison.....7**

**B. Relevant legal financial obligations statutes and amendments.....9**

TABLE OF CONTENTS - cont'd

	Page
V. ARGUMENT.....	11
1. THE RIGHT TO SEEK REMISSION AT ANY TIME WAS A RIGHT CONFERRED UNDER THE FORMER STATUTE WHICH COULD NOT BE TAKEN AWAY BY A SUBSEQUENT LEGISLATIVE ENACTMENT, AS THE STATE IMPLICITLY CONCEDED AND THE COMMISSIONER IMPLICITLY FOUND. IT WAS ALSO ESSENTIAL TO THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE FORMER STATUTE ALLOWING COURTS TO IMPOSE APPELLATE COSTS ON INDIGENT DEFENDANTS.....	11
2. THE 2018 AMENDMENT LIMITING THE RIGHT TO SEEK REMISSION OF APPELLATE COSTS TO AFTER RELEASE FROM TOTAL CONFINEMENT APPLIES ONLY PROSPECTIVELY WHERE THE REMEDIAL AMENDMENT EQUATING IMPOSITION OF APPELLATE COSTS ON AN INDIGENT DEFENDANT TO MANIFEST HARDSHIP IS REMEDIAL AND SHOULD APPLY RETROACTIVELY.....	14
3. THE APPELLATE COSTS IMPOSED ON MR. MONSCHKE CONSTITUTE A MANIFEST HARDSHIP ON HIM. HE IS SERVING A SENTENCE OF LIFE WITHOUT PAROLE; HIS INDIGENCY IS UNREBUTTED BY ANY EVIDENCE THAT HE CAN OR EVER WILL BE ABLE TO PAY.....	17
VI. CONCLUSION.....	20

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

### WASHINGTON CASES:

<u>Addleman v. Board of Prison Terms and Paroles,</u> 107 Wn.2d 503, 730 P.2d 1327 (1986).....	15
<u>City of Richland v. Wakefield,</u> 186 Wn.2d 596, 605-06, 380 P.3d 459 (2016).....	13
<u>Conrad v. University of Washington,</u> 119 Wn.2d 519, 834 P.2d 17 (1992).....	11
<u>Haddenham v. State,</u> 87 Wn.2d 145, 550 P.2d 9 (1976).....	15
<u>In re Personal Restraint of Monschke,</u> 160 Wn. App. 479, 251 P.3d 884 (2010).....	5
<u>State v. Bajardi,</u> 3 Wn. App.2d 726, 468 P.3d 164 (2018).....	19
<u>State v. Bigsby,</u> 196 Wn. App. 803, 384 P.3d 668 (2016).....	19
<u>State v. Blank,</u> 131 Wn.2d 230, 930 P.2d 1213 (1997).....	14
<u>State v. Blazina,</u> 182 Wn.2d 827, 344 P.3d 680 (2015).....	18
<u>State v. Blockman,</u> 198 Wn.App. 34, 392 P.3d 1094 (2017).....	19
<u>State v. Burch,</u> 197 Wn. App. 382, 389 P.3d 685 (2016).....	19

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – cont’d**

	Page
<u>State v. Cardenas-Flores</u> , 194 Wn. App. 496, 374 P.3d 1217, <u>aff’d</u> , 189 Wn.2d 243, 401 P.3d 19 (2017).....	19
<u>State v. Cruz</u> , 139 Wn.2d 186, 985 P.2d 384 (1999).....	15
<u>State v. Hart</u> , 195 Wn. App. 449, 381 P.3d 142 (2016).....	18
<u>State v. Heath</u> , 85 Wn.2d 196, 532 P.2d 621 (1975).....	15
<u>State v. Hood</u> , 196 Wn. App. 127, 382 P.3d 170 (2016).....	19
<u>State v. Grant</u> , 196 Wn. App. 644, 385 P.3d 184 (2016).....	18, 19
<u>State v. Monschke</u> , 133 Wn. App. 313, 135 P.3d 966 (2006), <u>review denied</u> , 159 Wn.2d 1010 (2007).....	5
<u>State v. Ramirez</u> , 191 Wn.2d 732, 526 P.3d 714 (20018).....	10, 11
<u>State v. Shirts</u> , 195 Wn. App. 849, 381 P.3d 1223 (2016).....	13
<u>State v. Sinclair</u> , 192 Wn. App. 380, 367 P.3d 612 (2016).....	18
<u>State v. Smith</u> , 144 Wn.2d 665, 30 P.2d 1245 (2012).....	14, 15

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – cont’d**

	Page
<u>State v. Sorrell</u> , 2 Wn. App. 2d 156, 408 P.3d 1100 (2008).....	13
<u>State v. T.K.</u> , 139 Wn.2d 320, 987 P.2d 63 (1999).....	12
<u>State v. Velezmoro</u> , 196 Wn. App. 552, 384 P.3d 613 (2016).....	19
<u>State v. Wilson</u> , 198 Wn. App. 632, 393 P.3d 892 (2017).....	13
<u>State v. Young</u> , 198 Wn. App. 797, 396 P.3d 386 (2017).....	17, 19
<u>Tellier v. Edwards</u> , 56 Wn.2d 652, 354 P.2d 925 (1960) (disagreed with on other grounds, <u>State Dept. of Ecology. Campbell and Gwim, LLC</u> , 146 Wn.2d 1, 43 P.3d 4 (2016)).....	7, 15

**FEDERAL CASES**

<u>Fuller v. Oregon</u> , 417 U.S. 40, 95 S. Ct. 2166, 40 L. Ed 642 (1974).....	13, 14
<u>Ky Dep’t of Corrections v. Thompson</u> , 490 U.S. 454, 109 S. t. 1904, 104 L. Ed. 2d 506 (1989).....	11

**STATUTES AND OTHER AUTHORITY**

DOC Policy 440.080.....	7
House Bill’s 1783.....	11
Laws of 1995, Ch. 275 (S.H.B. 1237).....	9
RAP 2.3(b) (1).....	6

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – cont’d**

	Page
RAP 14.2 (former and amended).....	17, 18
RAP 15.2(f) (amended).....	1
RCW 7.68.045.....	8
RCW 10.01.160 (4) and note following.....	2-5, 8, 10-13, 16
RCW 10.73.160(4) (former and amended).....	1, 9, 12-14
RCW 10.73.170(4) (former).....	9
RCW 10.82.090.....	6, 10
RCW 10.101.010(3).....	10
RCW 72.09.015.....	7
RCW 72.09.450 (1), (2).....	7
RCW 72.09.480(6).....	8
RCW 72.09.480 (2) (a), (c), (e).....	8
RCW 10.73.106(3).....	10, 17

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

As the state has conceded and a Commissioner of this Court found, the trial court's ruling that Mr. Monschke could not seek remission of appellate costs because he has not been released from total confinement is in error. Under the statute in effect at the time the costs were imposed on him, former RCW 10.73.160(4), the legislature provided that he could seek remission of such costs at any time. Costs could be, and were, imposed in spite of his poverty, but with the guarantee that he could always seek remission of them.

Mr. Monschke retains that right under the former statute to seek remission at any time. This right to seek remission was integral to the authority of the courts to impose costs. Once the conditions of the statute were satisfied -- that he had been ordered to pay costs and was not in contumacious default in paying them -- he had the right to seek remission of the costs at any time. This right could not be abrogated by subsequent legislative enactments.

The legislature's amendment to the statute in 2018, which now requires that a defendant be released from total confinement before seeking remission of appellate costs, is but one component of a remedial overhaul of statutes governing legal financial obligations for persons convicted of crimes. Under the current, revised statutory scheme, courts

cannot impose appellate costs on indigent defendants; Mr. Monschke would not be limited by the fact that he had not been released from total confinement if he had lost an appeal after the effective date of the statutory amendments because the costs would not have been authorized in the first place. A person seeking remission of costs after the 2018 amendments would **not** have been indigent at the time the costs were imposed – or they would not have been imposed -- and the right to seek remission would represent an opportunity to establish hardship at the point of reentering society after serving a prison term, even if not indigent. To limit Mr. Monschke’s right to seek remission of appellate costs because he is in prison would give him neither the protection of the former law nor the benefit of the new amendments.

Further, to impose a limitation on Mr. Monschke’s right to seek remission of appellate costs – in his case a total abrogation of the right since he is serving life without parole – would unconstitutionally increase the punishment for his crime when the legislature intended to alleviate the punishment. If any portion of the 2018 amendments should apply retroactively to him it should be the remedial portions equating his indigency with manifest hardship.

Even if the remedial amendments are not applied, Mr. Monschke is indigent and has no prospect for changing his indigent status nor any

prospect for paying off his appellate cost financial obligation. Taking an additional 20% of any money he earns or receives from his friends and family -- beyond the 25% automatically taken for cost of incarceration and victim compensation -- does nothing more than impose a hardship on them and impose a barrier to his efforts to use his time well through programming and artistic endeavors. Under these circumstances and relevant authority, this Court should hold that appellate costs should be remitted. It should not be necessary to remand to the trial court.

## **II. ASSIGNMENTS OF ERROR AND ISSUES RELATING TO ASSIGNMENTS OF ERROR**

### **A. Assignments of error**

1. The trial court erred in ruling that Mr. Monschke had to wait until his release from total confinement to seek remission of appellate costs.

2. The trial court erred in not granting remission of appellate costs because such costs create a manifest hardship on Mr. Monschke who is indigent and has no prospect of ever paying them.

3. The trial court erred in not granting remission of appellate costs under the remedial 2018 amendments to RCW 10.01.160 (4) which equate indigency with manifest hardship.

**B. Issues pertaining to assignment of error**

1. Did the trial court err in ruling that Mr. Monschke had to wait until after release from total confinement to seek remission of appellate costs where at this time the costs were imposed, RCW 10.01.160(4) provided that “a defendant who has been sentenced to pay costs and is not in contumacious default **may at any time** petition for remission of the payment of costs . . . .”? (emphasis added)

2. Did the trial court err in ruling that Mr. Monschke had to wait until after release from total confinement to seek remission of appellate costs where he is serving life without parole and would never get to seek remission?

3. Does the imposition of appellate costs constitute “manifest hardship” on Mr. Monschke, who was indigent throughout his trial, appeal and post-appeal petition; who has no assets beyond what his family and friends can send and a possible gratuity for a prison job; who has been unable to make a significant change to the amount of his LFOs in his fifteen years in custody; and who is serving a sentence of life without parole and will not likely ever be able to pay his appellate costs?

4. Does a 2018 amendment which limits the right to seek remission of appellate costs apply to costs imposed under the former statute where the amendment is part of a larger revision of the legal

financial obligation statutes under which the appellate costs would not have been imposed in the first place?

5. Do the remedial provisions of RCW 10.01.160(4) -- equating indigency with manifest hardship – apply retroactively to Mr. Monschke such that he is not subject to imposition of appellate costs as legal financial obligations?

6. Do remedial provisions which lessen the penalty for a crime apply retroactively to crimes committed before their enactment?

### **III. STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

The trial court sentenced Kurtis Monschke to life without parole after a jury convicted him of first degree aggravated murder, for a crime committed when he was nineteen years old. CP 1-4, 25-36.. The Court of Appeals affirmed his conviction. State v. Monschke, 133 Wn. App. 313, 135 P.3d 966 (2006), review denied, 159 Wn.2d 1010 (2007). Following the issuance of the mandate after the conclusion of the appeal, on June 8, 2007, the trial court added \$20,769.24 in appellate costs to his judgment and sentence. CP 5-7, 37-38, 39, 40-41,

The Court of Appeals appointed counsel to represent Mr. Monschke for his personal restraint petition, which was ultimately unsuccessful. CP 42. In re Personal Restraint of Monschke, 160 Wn. App. 479, 251 P.3d 884 (2010). After the certificate of finality issued, on June

15, 2012, the trial court added an additional \$25,042.01 to his previously-imposed appellate costs. CP 43-44, 45, 46-47.

On June 12, 2018, Mr. Monschke moved for remission of appellate costs and waiver of interest on his legal financial obligations and appellate costs. CP 48-80. The trial court granted relief from interest on legal financial obligations, but ruled that Mr. Monschke could address appellate costs and interest on appellate costs “by way of motion to the Court of Appeals.” CP 81-82.

Mr. Monschke moved to reconsider with regard to appellate costs. CP 83-87, The trial court denied this motion without prejudice because he “has not been released from total confinement as required by RCW 10.82.090 (2).” CP 88-89.

Mr. Monschke then sought review of the order denying reconsideration of appellate costs. CP 90-95. On April 4, 2019, Commissioner Schmidt of this Court granted review, noting:

The State concedes the trial court erred in concluding it lacked the authority to consider Monschke’s request to waive appellate costs and when it denied Monschke’s motion to remit the appellate costs on the basis that he remains incarcerated.

This court agrees the trial court erred in refusing to consider Monschke’s petition for remission of his appellate costs and denying his motion for reconsideration on the basis of his incarceration. . . . Monschke demonstrates review is appropriate under RAP 2.3(b)(1) [The Superior Court has committed obvious error which would render further proceedings useless]

CP 99-102,

### **III. RELEVANT DOC POLICIES AND LEGAL FINANCIAL OBLIGATION STATUTES**

#### **A. Overview of inmate finances within prison**

While the Department of Corrections (DOC) is not permitted, by statute, to deny an inmate necessary services or supplies because he or she cannot pay for them, when such services or supplies are provided without payment, the inmate becomes indebted to the DOC for them. RCW 72.09.450 (1) and (2). Whenever the inmate has more than \$10 in his institutional account, the DOC indigency threshold, the DOC can recoup the debt from available funds in the account. RCW 72.09.015; RCW 72.09.450 (2). The DOC can also “pursue other remedies” to recoup the debt “after the period of incarceration.” Id.

An inmate receives hygiene supplies such as soap, toothbrushes and other dental supplies, deodorant, safety razor and a starter kit containing small quantities of common over-the-counter items such as Ibuprofen, hydrocortisone cream, Pepto-Bismol tablets once without cost. DOC Policy 440.080. After this initial issue, inmates must pay for any further hygiene supplies and, if they cannot, as set out above, they become indebted to the DOC for them.

Inmates must also make copayments for “health care services” and pay for postage, legal mail, copying, and identification cards; if they cannot, they owe the DOC the cost of these goods or services. DOC 200.000 Attachment 3.

This supplies-service debt **is in addition to** other statutory deductions from any money either earned by the inmate or sent to the inmate from family or friends.<sup>1</sup> The DOC deducts 20% from money earned or sent to an inmate for cost of incarceration and 5% for crime victims’ compensation. RCW 72.09.480 (2) (a), (e), RCW 7.68.045. An additional 20% is deducted for legal financial obligations, and 10% diverted to an inmate savings account.<sup>2</sup> RCW 72.09.480 (2) (c).

In sum, whenever an inmate receives money from work, family or friends that will raise his institutional account balance over \$10.00, the DOC will take one-fourth or 25% of it for cost of incarceration and victims’ compensation – an unvarying percentage which applies throughout the duration of confinement. If the inmate has legal financial obligations, an additional 20% for a total of 45% will be taken. If the inmate has unpaid debt for hygiene supplies or medical copayments, that

---

<sup>1</sup> Money is not deducted from non-transferrable funds set up by an inmate exclusively for postage, certain medical expenses such as eyeglasses, and certain educational and vocational programs. RCW 72.09.480(6).

<sup>2</sup> Because Mr. Monschke is serving life without the possibility of parole, no money is diverted to a trust account

debt will be repaid as far as possible from the remaining 55%. Thus, if an inmate wants to purchase art supplies, books or coffee from the commissary, his family or friends would have to send in a great deal more than the cost of the items for the purchase. The 20% deduction for legal financial obligations, including appellate costs, would shrink the amount of money available by that amount.

**B. Relevant legal financial obligations statutes and amendments**

In 1995, the Washington Legislature amended RCW 10.73.160, “Court fees and costs” to allow, for the first time, “the court of appeals, supreme court, and superior courts” to require adults who unsuccessfully challenged a criminal conviction to pay appellate costs. Laws of 1995, Ch. 275 (S.H.B. 1237). The amendment conditioned this imposition of appellate costs on the right of the defendant upon whom appellate costs had been imposed to petition the sentencing court “at any time” for remission of all or part of the costs when continued payment would constitute a “manifest hardship.” *Id.*

In 2018, as part of the revision of the statutes relating to legal financial obligations, the legislature amended RCW 10.73.170(4) to limit the right of a defendant to seek remission of appellate costs to “any time after relief from confinement.” (emphasis added) At the same time,

10.73.106(4) was amended to expressly equate the obligation to pay appellate costs, if indigent, to manifest hardship: “manifest hardship exists where the defendant . . . is indigent as defined in RCW 10.101.010(3).” Laws of 2018, ch. 26.

As central components of the revision of the legal financial obligations statutory scheme, the 2018 amendments to RCW 10.01.160 now provide that the court “shall not” order a defendant who is indigent to pay costs of his prosecution, State v. Ramirez, 191 Wn.2d 732, 746, 526 P.3d 714 (20018), and amendments to RCW 10.82.090, provide that “[a]s of June 7, 2018, no interest shall accrue on non-restitution legal financial obligations.” Further, a defendant who is no longer in custody is given a right to petition for waiver of all interest on non-restitution legal financial obligations that accrued before June 7, 2018, the effective date of the amendments, and on costs of prosecution imposed at sentencing before the effective date of the statute.

These 2018 amendments were based, in part on legislative findings that:

[A]ccrual of interest on nonrestitution debt during the term of incarceration results in many individuals leaving prison with insurmountable debt. These circumstances make it less likely that restitution will be paid in full and more likely that former offenders and their families will remain in poverty.

Note following RCW 10.01.160. See also, State v. Ramirez, 191 Wn.2d 732, 747, 426 P.2d 714 (2917) (“House Bill’s 1783 amendments modify Washington’s LFOs, addressing some of the worst facets of the system that prevent offenders from rebuilding their lives after conviction”).

## V. ARGUMENT

### 1. THE RIGHT TO SEEK REMISSION AT ANY TIME WAS A RIGHT CONFERRED UNDER THE FORMER STATUTE WHICH COULD NOT BE TAKEN AWAY BY A SUBSEQUENT LEGISLATIVE ENACTMENT, AS THE STATE IMPLICITLY CONCEDED AND THE COMMISSIONER IMPLICITLY FOUND. IT WAS ALSO ESSENTIAL TO THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE FORMER STATUTE ALLOWING COURTS TO IMPOSE APPELLATE COSTS ON INDIGENT DEFENDANTS.

The trial court erred in ruling that Mr. Monschke could not seek remission of appellate costs because he had not been released from total confinement. The statute which authorized the imposition of appellate costs on him provided that he could seek remission of the costs imposed “at any time,” as long as he was not in contumacious default. Such “[p]rocedural guaranties may create protected property interests when they contain ‘substantive predicates’ to guide the discretion of decision makers” and specific direction that when a “substantive predicate is present, a particular outcome must follow.” Conrad v. University of Washington, 119 Wn.2d 519, 536, 834 P.2d 17 (1992) (citing Ky Dep’t of

Corrections v. Thompson, 490 U.S. 454, 662-663, 109 S. Ct. 1904, 1910, 104 L. Ed. 2d 506 (1989)). A person is entitled to exercise the procedural right established by statute when preconditions set out in the statute are met. State v. T.K., 139 Wn.2d 320, 332, 987 P.2d 63 (1999).

In T.K., the court held that the defendant had a right to seal his juvenile record because he satisfied each of the conditions required by the sealing statute in effect at the time of his disposition – even though T.K. did not move to seal his record until after the amendments to the former sealing statute became effective. Id. at 331, 334. The T.K. Court, in comparing the former sealing statute to a statute of limitations, concluded that the right to seal remained like the right to seek dismissal under a statute of limitations where a statutory period had run -- “it is a defense . . . absolute and vested . . . not to be taken away by legislative enactment.” Id. at 332 (internal citations omitted).

Here, Mr. Monschke met the statutory preconditions – costs had been imposed after appeal and he was not in contumacious default. He could, accordingly, ask the court for relief at any time. Former 10.73.160(4). He had a clear, statutory right to ask the court to remit his appellate financial obligations at any time which could not be taken away by subsequent “legislative enactment.” Id.

The Commissioner implicitly found Mr. Monschke had such a protected right under the former statute. The Commissioner found that the trial court's ruling that Mr. Monschke could not seek remission was obvious error and the state conceded in its Response to the Motion for Discretionary Review that it was:

The State concedes that the trial court erred in concluding it lacked authority to consider the defendant's request to waive appellate costs. Under former RCW 10.01.160(4) the defendant is allowed to file a motion to remit his discretionary LFOs at any time. State v. Shirts, 195 Wn. App. 849, 858-859, 381 P.3d 1223 (2016). If the offender has not contumaciously defaulted, the trial court must determine whether the court's imposition of financial obligations creates a "manifest hardship," RCW 10.01.106(4). City of Richland v. Wakefield, 186 Wn.2d 596, 605-06, 380 P.3d 459 (2016); State v. Wilson, 198 Wn. App. 632, 634035, 393 P.3d 892 (2017). . . . RCW 10.73.160(4) and RCW 10.01.160(4), the subsections on remission are nearly identical in language and are identical in meaning. State v. Shirts, 195 Wn.2d 849, 854 n.4, 381 P.3d 1223 (2016); State v. Sorrell, 2 Wn. App. 2d 156, 408 P.3d 1100 (2008).

Response to Motion for Discretionary Review at 3.

Moreover, the right to seek remission at any time was critical to the constitutionality of the right of the Washington Courts to impose appellate costs under the former statute. As the United States Supreme Court held in Fuller v. Oregon, 417 U.S. 40, 95 S. Ct. 2166, 40 L. Ed 642 (1974), the State of Oregon could require someone convicted of a crime to repay the costs of representation "when he is indigent at the time of the criminal proceeding but subsequently acquires the means to bear the costs

of his legal defense without hardship” because, among other reasons, “a convicted person under an obligation to repay ‘may at any time petition the court which sentenced him for remission of the payment of costs or of any unpaid portion thereof.’” In State v. Blank, 131 Wn.2d 230, 245, 930 P.2d 1213 (1997), former RCW 10.73.160(4) survived a due process challenge in large part because under 10.73.160(4), like the statute challenged in Fuller, convicted defendants, even those who were still confined, could seek remission at any time.

The trial court erred in ruling that Mr. Monschke could not seek remission of appellate costs imposed on him until he was released from total confinement.

**2. THE 2018 AMENDMENT LIMITING THE RIGHT TO SEEK REMISSION OF APPELLATE COSTS TO AFTER RELEASE FROM TOTAL CONFINEMENT APPLIES ONLY PROSPECTIVELY WHERE THE REMEDIAL AMENDMENT EQUATING IMPOSITION OF APPELLATE COSTS ON AN INDIGENT DEFENDANT TO MANIFEST HARDSHIP IS REMEDIAL AND SHOULD APPLY RETROACTIVELY.**

Statutes – such as the 2018 amendment to RCW 10.73.160(4) which limit the right to seek remission of appellate costs to those no longer in total custody – presumptively operate prospectively only. State v. Smith, 144 Wn.2d 665, 673, 30 P.2d 1245 (2012).

Under the standard rules of statutory construction, however, amendments may apply retroactively if:

(1) the Legislature so intended; (2) the amendments were “curative”; or (3) the amendments were remedial.

Smith, 144 Wn.2d at 671 (citing State v. Cruz, 139 Wn.2d 186, 191, 985 P.2d 384 (1999)). “A statute is remedial and has retroactive application when it relates to practice, procedure, or remedies, and does not affect a substantive or vested right.” Addleman v. Board of Prison Terms and Paroles, 107 Wn.2d 503, 510, 730 P.2d 1327 (1986) (citing Tellier v. Edwards, 56 Wn.2d 652, 653, 354 P.2d 925 (1960) (disagreed with on other grounds, State Dept. of Ecology. Campbell and Gwim, LLC, 146 Wn.2d 1, 43 P.3d 4 (2016))).

“A remedial statute is presumed retroactive.” Id. (citing Haddenham v. State, 87 Wn.2d 145, 148, 550 P.2d 9 (1976)). That a statute reduces the penalty for a crime provides another strong reason for finding it applies retroactively.

An additional reason for holding the legislation to operate retroactively is that it, in effect, reduced the penalty for a crime. When this is so, the legislature is presumed to have determined that the new penalty is adequate and that no purpose would be served by imposing the older, harsher one. This rule has even been applied in the face of a statutory presumption against retroactivity.

Id., State v. Heath, 85 Wn.2d 196, 198, 532 P.2d 621 (1975).

Under this authority, the limitation on Monschke's right to seek remission of appellate costs would not apply retroactively to increase the penalty for his conviction, where the remedial portions of the amendments – such as equating indigency with a manifest hardship -- should. The legislature, in enacting the 2018 amendment explicitly intended to correct facets of the prior legal financial obligations legislation which “prevent offenders from rebuilding their lives after conviction.” Note following RCW 10.01.160. Not only are appellate costs unlikely to be significantly reduced while in prison, taking 20% of any money provided by a job or friends and family, may also increase the amount of prison debt owing. Applying the amendment equating indigency with manifest hardship where appellate costs have been imposed would address the problem the amendment was enacted to address. This would potentially increase the amount available for restitution and increase the likelihood that offenders will not be weighed down by the debt burden imposed by appellate costs. The amendment requiring a defendant to be out of total confinement before seeking remission of appellate costs should apply only prospectively where the remedial portions – including the provision that makes the imposition of appellate debt on an indigent person a manifest hardship – should apply retroactively.

**3. THE APPELLATE COSTS IMPOSED ON MR. MONSCHKE CONSTITUTE A MANIFEST HARDSHIP ON HIM. HE IS SERVING A SENTENCE OF LIFE WITHOUT PAROLE; HIS INDIGENCY IS UNREBUTTED BY ANY EVIDENCE THAT HE CAN OR EVER WILL BE ABLE TO PAY.**

Mr. Monschke has no assets; he has been in custody since he was nineteen years old. Courts have found him indigent at trial, on appeal and on collateral review; the State has not claimed otherwise. CP 24-25n 103. The DOC takes approximately half of all of the money that his friends and family are able to send to him for necessities or art supplies as well as a portion of his wages when he is able to work.<sup>3</sup> Fourteen years of paying on his LFO's has accomplished little, if anything, beyond creating a hardship on him, his family and friends. This Court can and should find that, in light of his un rebutted continuing indigency and future inability to pay, the appellate costs imposed on him should be remitted.

In State v. Young, 198 Wn. App. 797, 396 P.3d 386 (2017), the Court remanded the case to the Court's Commissioner to determine whether costs should be imposed due to the defendant's indigency. The Court noted that former RAP 14.2 and RCW 10.73.106(3) directed that appellate costs should be imposed unless the court directed otherwise in their opinion, but that these provisions had been amended effective

---

<sup>3</sup> Wages for most jobs in prison are called "gratuities."

January 31, 2017. Under the amended RAP 15.2(f), a party is given the benefit of the doubt and presumed still indigent if an order of indigency has been granted for the appeal; and, under RAP 14.2, the Commissioner has discretion to determine current or likely future ability to pay costs.

In State v. Sinclair, 192 Wn. App. 380, 392-293, 367 P.3d 612 (2016), the Court held that, while ability to pay is not the only relevant factor in determining whether appellate costs should be imposed as legal financial obligations, given the presumption of continuing indigency it would exercise discretion to deny appellate costs in the case. There was no reason to believe Sinclair, who was sixty-six years old and serving a twenty year sentence, was or ever would be able to pay. In State v. Hart, 195 Wn. App. 449, 463, 381 P.3d 142 (2016), the Court similarly held that continuing indigency is presumed and that, therefore, it should exercise discretion to waive appellate costs.

In State v. Grant, 196 Wn. App. 644, 385 P.3d 184 (2016), the Court noted that imposing cost on indigent defendants raises “well-documented” problems such as “increased difficulty reentering society, the doubtful recoupment of money by the government, and inequities in administration.” Grant, at 652 (citing Sinclair, 192 Wn App. at 391, quoting State v. Blazina, 182 Wn.2d 827, 8835, 344 P.3d 680 (2015)). In

light of these problems the Court declined to impose appellate costs.

Grant, at 651-652.

While the Court in State v. Cardenas-Flores, 194 Wn. App. 496, 374 P.3d 1217, aff'd, 189 Wn.2d 243, 401 P.3d 19 (2017), like the Court in Young, remanded to the Commissioner for determination of ability to pay legal financial obligations, in most cases the un rebutted presumption of indigency has been sufficient to justify the exercise of discretion by the appellate court to deny imposition of appellate costs. See State v. Burch, 197 Wn. App. 382, 407, 389 P.3d 685 (2016) (if the defendant meets the GR 34 standard of indigency, the court should seriously question ability to pay costs; not an abuse of discretion to deny costs in the case); State v. Bajardi, 3 Wn. App.2d 726, 468 P.3d 164 (2018) (award of costs inappropriate where defendant presumed indigent); State v. Blockman, 198 Wn.App. 34, 392 P.3d 1094 (2017) (no evidence finances improved; costs not imposed); State v. Bigsby, 196 Wn. App. 803, 384 P.3d 668 (2016) (decline to impose as there is no evidence not indigent); State v. Velezmoro, 196 Wn. App. 552, 384 P.3d 613 (2016) (indigency not rebutted); State v. Hood, 196 Wn. App. 127, 382 P.3d 170 (2016) (same).

Under this authority, the Court should also hold that the imposition of appellate costs on Mr. Monschke constitutes a manifest hardship and

remission of costs should be granted. His indigency is presumed and unrebutted. The record shows that he will not likely ever be able to pay.

**VI. CONCLUSION**

This court should grant remission of the appellate costs imposed on Mr. Monshke.

DATED this 30th day of April, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

*Rita J. Griffith*

RITA J. GRIFFITH  
Attorney for Appellant

I certify that on the 30<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2019, I caused a true and correct copy of the Opening Brief of Appellant to be served on the following by e-mail

Counsel for the Respondent:  
Maureen C. Goodman  
Pierce County Prosecutor's Office  
930 Tacoma Avenue S., Rm. 946  
Tacoma, WA 98402-2102  
[PCpatcecf@co.pierce.wa.us](mailto:PCpatcecf@co.pierce.wa.us)

By U.S. Mail  
Kurtis Monschke  
DOC 871510  
Clallam Bay Corrections Center  
1830 Eagle Crest Way  
Clallam Bay, WA 98326

*Rita Griffith* April 30, 2019  
Rita Griffith    DATE    at Seattle, WA

**April 30, 2019 - 10:13 AM**

**Transmittal Information**

**Filed with Court:** Court of Appeals Division II  
**Appellate Court Case Number:** 52636-1  
**Appellate Court Case Title:** State of Washington, Respondent v. Kurtis W. Monschke, Appellant  
**Superior Court Case Number:** 03-1-01464-0

**The following documents have been uploaded:**

- 526361\_Briefs\_20190430101131D2630584\_6820.pdf  
This File Contains:  
Briefs - Appellants  
*The Original File Name was MonschkeLFO AOB.pdf*

**A copy of the uploaded files will be sent to:**

- PCpatcecf@piercecountywa.gov
- maureen.goodman@piercecountywa.gov

**Comments:**

---

Sender Name: Rita Griffith - Email: griff1984@comcast.net  
Address:  
4616 25TH AVE NE  
PMB 453  
SEATTLE, WA, 98105-4523  
Phone: 206-547-1742

**Note: The Filing Id is 20190430101131D2630584**