

FILED
Court of Appeals
Division III
State of Washington
3/7/2019 9:29 AM
No. 36190-0-III

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
DIVISION III

STATE OF WASHINGTON,
Plaintiff/Respondent,

vs.

JUAN ENRIQUEZ-MARTINEZ,
Defendant/Appellant.

APPEAL FROM THE KLICKITAT COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT
Honorable Randall C. Krog, Motions Judge

MOTION TO WITHDRAW AND BRIEF REFERRING TO
MATTERS IN THE RECORD WHICH MIGHT ARGUABLY
SUPPORT REVIEW

SUSAN MARIE GASCH
WSBA No. 16485
P. O. Box 30339
Spokane, WA 99223-3005
(509) 443-9149
Attorney for Appellant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. IDENTITY OF MOVING PARTY.....1

II. STATEMENT OF RELIEF SOUGHT.....1

III. FACTS RELEVANT TO MOTION.....1

IV. GROUNDS FOR RELIEF3

V. MEMORANDUM OF MATTERS IN THE RECORD THAT
MIGHT ARGUABLY SUPPORT REVIEW.....3

A. Potential Assignments of Error.....3

B. Statement of the Case.....4

C. Authorities Pertaining to Potential Assignment of Error.....9

VI. CONCLUSION.....11

Exhibit A:
Judgement entered December 14, 2017, in State of Oregon v. Juan
Enriquez-Martinez, Case No. 1400119CR, in the Circuit Court of
the State of Oregon for the County of Wasco.....2, 6, 8, 9

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>Cases</u>	<u>Page</u>
<i>Anders v. California</i> , 386 U.S. 738, 87 S.Ct. 1396, 18 L.Ed.2d 811 (1963).....	3
<i>In re Pers. Restraint of Cadwallader</i> , 155 Wn.2d 867, 123 P.3d 456 (2005).....	9
<i>In re Pers. Restraint of Costello</i> , 131 Wn. App. 828, 129 P.3d 827 (2006).....	10

<i>In re Pers. Restraint of Phelan</i> , 97 Wn.2d 590, 647 P.2d 1026 (1982).....	10
<i>In re Schaupp</i> , 66 Wn. App. 45, 831 P.2d 156 (1992).....	10
<i>State v. Cook</i> , 37 Wn. App. 269, 679 P.2d 413 (1984).....	10
<i>State v. Gaut</i> , 111 Wn. App. 875, 36 P.3d 832 (2002).....	11
<i>State v. Quismundo</i> , 164 Wn.2d 499, 192 P.3d 342 (2008).....	9
<i>State v. Smith</i> , 159 Wn. App. 694, 247 P.3d 775 (2011).....	9
<i>State v. Theobald</i> , 78 Wn.2d 184, 470 P.2d 188 (1970).....	3

Statutes

former RCW 9.94A.1 20(17).....	10
RCW 9.94A.505(6).....	10

Court Rules

CrR 7.8.....	<i>passim</i>
CrR 7.8(b).....	11
RAP 18.3(a).....	1, 3
RAP 183(a)(2).....	9

Other Resources

13B SETH A. FINE & DOUGLAS J. ENDE, WASHINGTON PRACTICE: CRIMINAL LAW § 3603 (2 ed. & Supp. 2013–2014)....	10
---	----

I. IDENTITY OF MOVING PARTY

Susan Marie Gasch, appointed counsel for Appellant, requests the relief designated in Part II.

II. STATEMENT OF RELIEF SOUGHT

Appointed counsel for Appellant requests permission to withdraw pursuant to RAP 18.3(a).

III. FACTS RELEVANT TO MOTION

On September 6, 2018, counsel was appointed to represent Juan Enriquez-Martinez on his appeal from the May 7, 2018, Order denying Defendant's CrR 7.8 Motion that was filed by Appellant's counsel on November 28, 2018.

In reviewing the case for appealable issues, counsel took the following actions:

1. Read and reviewed the verbatim report of proceedings from the guilty plea hearing on January 19, 2016; the sentencing hearing on February 16, 2016; the miscellaneous short hearings on December 19, 2016 and December 18, 2017; and the hearings on December 5, 2016, and February 6, 2017, on defendant's motion to modify the judgment filed by his defense counsel on November 28, 2018.

2. Read and reviewed all of the clerk's papers;
3. In order to ascertain the scope of the appeal to which undersigned counsel was assigned, she reviewed the ACORDs chronological events and comments entered in WA Supreme Court No. 95628-6, in Juan Enriquez-Martinez v. Honorable Randall C. Krog, regarding a Petition for Writ of Mandamus¹ filed with the Klickitat County Clerk by Appellant on March 16, 2018. Appellant sought assistance in compelling Klickitat County Superior Court to rule or otherwise act on his *pro se* Motion to Modify or Correct Judgment and Sentence Pursuant to CrR 7.8 that was filed with the county on October 2, 2017.² To date, the Klickitat County Superior Court has not ruled on the *pro se* motion, and thus its eventual outcome is not at issue in this appeal.
4. Requested and received from Appellant's Oregon defense counsel a copy of the Judgment entered on December 14, 2016, regarding the outcome of Appellant's Oregon charges included in the global plea agreement. *See* Exhibit A to this motion.

¹ The petition is included in the Clerk's Papers at pages 61–66.

5. Researched all pertinent legal issues and conferred with other attorneys concerning legal and factual bases for appellate review.
6. Wrote to Appellant using an interpreter, explaining the procedure and reason for this motion, and informing him of his right to file a *pro se* supplemental brief; and
7. Served Appellant with a copy of this motion.

IV. GROUNDS FOR RELIEF

Rap 18.3(a) allows counsel appointed to represent an indigent defendant to withdraw if counsel can find no basis for a good faith argument on review and sets forth the procedures to be followed in making such a motion. Further due process requirements are established by *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 87 S.Ct. 1396, 18 L.Ed.2d 811 (1963) and explained in *State v. Theobald*, 78 Wn.2d 184, 470 P.2d 188 (1970).

V. MEMORANDUM OF MATTERS IN THE RECORD THAT MIGHT ARGUABLY SUPPORT REVIEW

A. Potential Assignments of Error

1. Whether the trial court erred in denying Enriquez-Martinez' November 28, 2016, motion to modify the judgment and sentence, under CrR 7.8.

² The *pro se* motion and supporting affidavit are included in the Clerk's Papers at pages

2. Whether Enriquez-Martinez is entitled to receive credit for all of his pretrial jail time served while in-custody in Oregon but under arrest on Washington charges.

B. Statement of the Case

On April 21, 2014, the defendant, Juan Enriquez-Martinez, was arrested and held in-custody in Oregon on charges involving sex offenses for allegedly having sexual contact and/or penetration with a minor, L.P., in Wasco County, Oregon. CP 34 lines 3–5.

On May 27, 2014, Enriquez-Martinez was charged via information in the Klickitat County cause number that is involved in the current appeal with one count of first degree rape of a child and one count of first degree child molestation for conduct allegedly occurring with L.P. while she and the defendant were in Bingen, Klickitat County, Washington. CP 1–2.

On June 11, 2014, Enriquez-Martinez, while in-custody in Oregon, was served with the arrest warrant in this Washington matter. CP 34 lines 11–12.

Approximately one year later, on June 17, 2015, Enriquez-Martinez, while still in-custody in Oregon, accepted a global resolution for

both matters, wherein he would receive 75 months in prison concurrent with each other count and to be served in Oregon. CP 34 lines 13–14.

On June 23, 2015, Enriquez-Martinez, through Oregon counsel, submitted a petition to enter a plea of guilty to the Wasco County Circuit Court. No immediate action was taken by the Oregon Court. CP 38 paragraph 5.

On January 18, 2016—more than 21 months after he was arrested on the Washington charges—Enriquez-Martinez waived extradition and was transferred from Oregon to Klickitat County, Washington. CP 38 paragraph 9; 2/16/2016 RP 9.

On January 19, 2016, Enriquez-Martinez, pleaded guilty in Klickitat County to count II, first degree child molestation. 1/19/2016 RP 4.³

On February 16, 2016, Enriquez-Martinez was sentenced on the Klickitat matter, with the Honorable Brian Altman presiding. 2/16/2016 RP 8–13. In boilerplate language, the judgment and sentence states in section 4.1(c), “**Credit for Time Served.** The defendant shall receive credit for time served prior to sentencing if that confinement was solely

³ Count I was dismissed at sentencing. CP 20 at paragraph 3.2.

under this cause number. RCW 9.94A.505. The jail shall compute time served.” CP 20.

Following sentencing, Enriquez-Martinez was remanded to Washington Department of Corrections, wherein he remained until June 2016. CP 34 lines 23–25. Thereafter, Enriquez-Martinez was transferred back to Oregon and on November 16, 2016, Wasco County accepted the plea he had submitted nearly 15 months earlier. CP 39 paragraphs 15 and 16. He was sentenced in the Oregon matter in December 2016. CP 39 paragraph 19; Exhibit A.

On November 28, 2016, after Enriquez-Martinez entered his Oregon plea but before he was sentenced on the Oregon matter, his Washington counsel filed a CrR 7.8 motion seeking to amend the February 16, 2016, judgment and sentence to include approximately 18 [sic]⁴ months credit for time served in Oregon from June 11, 2014 (date Enriquez-Martinez was served while in-custody in Oregon with the Washington arrest warrant) to the January 18, 2016, date when Enriquez-Martinez was brought to Klickitat County to enter his plea to the Washington charges the following day. CP 36 lines 7–11; 12/5/2016 RP 15, 20–21; 2/6/2017 RP 29. Counsel asserted that “[t]o date, Washington

Department of Corrections is refusing to give the defendant any credit for time served while the defendant was in Oregon and before transportation to Washington in early 2016.” CP 35 lines 1–3.⁵

Enriquez-Martinez was not present when the CrR 7.8 motion was first addressed on December 5, 2016, with the original sentencing judge, the Honorable Brian Altman, presiding. The matter was continued in order to secure the defendant’s presence. 12/5/2016 RP *passim*.

On February 6, 2017, the defendant was present and the Honorable Randall Krog heard argument on the motion. 2/6/2017 RP 27–34.

Among other things, the State represented that the global plea agreement “was for credit for concurrent [sentence] time, but not credit for time he wasn’t ... serving solely on this cause number.” 2/6/2017 RP 30. The State computed the credit served “solely on this cause number” as beginning on “[January 18, 2016] when he came in[to] the state of Washington.” 2/6/2017 RP 32.

⁴ From June 11, 2014, to January 18, 2016, is slightly over 20 months. Thus 20 months should be the approximate credit for time served between these dates.

⁵ Although the verbatim report of proceedings notes a number of “inaudible” portions, it appears the State and defense counsel agree Enriquez-Martinez received credit from DOC for time served while in Washington to enter a plea and be sentenced on the Washington charges. CP 35 lines 1–3; 12/5/2016 RP 16 lines 17–18; 12/5/2016 RP 17 lines 18–19, 22–24; 12/5/2016 RP 18 lines 8–9; 2/6/2017 RP 31 line 25 through RP 32 lines 1–6.

The court asked, “So what authority do I have to go back before that, Mr. Lantz?” Defense counsel responded, “Other than the fact that this is the court that sentenced him, there’s no extra, I guess, statutory or rule authority. ...” 2/6/2017 RP 32,

After hearing further argument, the court orally denied the CrR 7.8 motion. It stated,

At this point in time I’m going to go ahead and deny the request to [] give Mr. Enriquez-Martinez credit for any time before the sentence that was imposed in this matter – from his plea date of January 19, 2016. The [State’s] recommendation appears that it will be 68 months in – prison to run concurrently with [the] sentence imposed in the defendant’s case in Wasco County, Oregon.

Th[is] court had sentenced Mr. Enriquez-Martinez previously, had that information beforehand, could have given credit for time prior to that. It doesn’t appear that that was what the bargain was that was reached between the parties, at least from the written documentation that we have here.

And so I’m going to go ahead and deny the request for – additional time. He’ll get credit from the time ... he was actually brought [] in[to] Washington. He should get credit not only from January 19th[, 2016,] but [also from] the time that he was ... brought into the state of Washington ... to deal with this charge.

2/6/2017 RP 34–35.

On December 14, 2016, Enriquez-Martinez had been sentenced on the Oregon charges. CP 39 paragraphs 18 and 19; *see* Exhibit A. The Judgment states that the Oregon sentences “shall be concurrent with ... [the Klickitat County, Washington case]” and “[d]efendant shall receive

credit for time served from 04/21/2014.” Exhibit A pages 2, 3. The Oregon sentencing hearing had not yet taken place at the time of the first Washington hearing on the CrR 7.8 motion on December 5, 2016. The December 14, 2016, Oregon Judgment and its contents were not brought to the attention of the court at the time of the second Washington hearing on the CrR 7.8 motion on February 6, 2017.

On May 7, 2018, the trial court entered a written order denying the CrR 7.8 motion filed by defense counsel on November 28, 2016. CP 67. Enriquez-Martinez thereafter filed his Notice of Appeal. CP 70.

C. Authorities Pertaining to Potential Assignments of Error⁶

A decision on a CrR 7.8 motion is reviewable for abuse of discretion. *In re Pers. Restraint of Cadwallader*, 155 Wn.2d 867, 879–80, 123 P.3d 456 (2005). A trial court abuses its discretion when it exercises its discretion in a manifestly unreasonable manner, or when the exercise of discretion is based on untenable grounds or reasons. *State v. Smith*, 159 Wn. App. 694, 699–700, 247 P.3d 775 (2011). An abuse of discretion occurs where the court bases its decision on an incorrect legal standard. *State v. Quismundo*, 164 Wn.2d 499, 504, 192 P.3d 342 (2008).

⁶ As required by RAP 18.3(a) (2), counsel presents citations of authority without argument.

A defendant sentenced to a term of confinement has both a constitutional and statutory right to receive credit for all confinement time served prior to sentencing. "Failure to allow credit [for time served] violates due process, equal protection, and the prohibition against multiple punishments." *State v. Cook*, 37 Wn. App. 269, 271, 679 P.2d 413 (1984). RCW 9.94A.505(6) provides:

The sentencing court shall give the offender credit for all confinement time served before the sentencing if that confinement was solely in regard to the offense for which the offender is being sentenced.

The statute has been held to reflect the constitutional mandate. *In re Pers. Restraint of Costello*, 131 Wn. App. 828, 832, 129 P.3d 827 (2006) (citing former RCW 9.94A.120(17), now renumbered as RCW 9.94A.505(6)).


Credit is not allowed for time served on other charges. *In re Pers. Restraint of Phelan*, 97 Wn.2d 590, 597, 647 P.2d 1026 (1982). However, if the offender is confined on two charges simultaneously, "any time not credited towards one charge must be credited towards the other." 13B SETH A. FINE & DOUGLAS J. ENDE, WASHINGTON PRACTICE: CRIMINAL LAW § 3603 (2 ed. & Supp. 2013-2014); *In re Schaupp*, 66 Wn. App. 45, 49-50, 831 P.2d 156, 158-59 (1992).

The scope of review is limited to the trial court's exercise of its discretion in deciding the issues that were raised by the CrR 7.8(b) motion. *State v. Gaut*, 111 Wn. App. 875, 881, 36 P.3d 832 (2002).

VI. CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated, undersigned counsel asks this Court to conduct an independent review of the record to determine whether this appeal is wholly frivolous and, if so, to allow counsel to withdraw from further representation in this matter and permit Appellant to proceed *pro se*.

Respectfully submitted on March 7, 2019.



s/Susan Marie Gasch, WSBA #16485
Gasch Law Office, P.O. Box 30339
Spokane, WA 99223-3005
(509) 443-9149
FAX: None
gaschlaw@msn.com

PROOF OF SERVICE (RAP 18.5(b))

I, Susan Marie Gasch, do hereby certify under penalty of perjury that on March 7, 2019, I mailed to the following by U.S. Postal Service first class mail, postage prepaid, or provided e-mail service by prior agreement (as indicated), a true and correct copy of brief of appellant:

Juan Enriquez-Martinez (#388286)
Airway Heights Corrections Center
PO Box 2049
Airway Heights WA 99001

E-mail: davidq@klickitatcounty.org
E-mail: davidw@klickitatcounty.org
David Quesnel/David Wall
Klickitat County Prosecutor's Office



s/Susan Marie Gasch, WSBA #16485

EXHIBIT “A”

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE STATE OF OREGON FOR THE COUNTY OF WASCO

State of Oregon,)	
Plaintiff)	
)	Case No.: 1400119CR
vs.)	
)	JUDGMENT
)	
JUAN ENRIQUEZ MARTINEZ,)	Case File Date: 04/18/2014
Defendant)	

DEFENDANT

True Name: JUAN ENRIQUEZ MARTINEZ	Sex: Male
Date Of Birth: 01/30/1981	
Fingerprint Control No (FPN): JNOR114105988	

HEARING

Proceeding Date: 12/08/2016
Court Reporter: FTR Recording, Courtroom 1

Defendant appeared in person and was in custody. The court determined that the defendant was indigent for purposes of court-appointed counsel, and the court appointed counsel for the defendant. The defendant was represented by Attorney(s) MATTHEW E ELLIS, OSB Number 116628. Plaintiff appeared by and through Attorney(s) LESLIE C WOLF, OSB Number 964627. Defendant was assisted by interpreter, Adrian Arias. The court finds the defendant to be indigent for the purposes of appeal.

COUNT(S)

It is adjudged that the defendant has been convicted on the following count(s):

Count 1 : Attempt to Commit a Class B Felony - Sexual Abuse in the First Degree

Count number 1, Attempt to Commit a Class B Felony - Sexual Abuse in the First Degree, 161.405(2)(c), Felony Class C, committed on or about 10/03/2009. Conviction is based upon a Guilty Plea on 11/16/2016.

Sentencing Guidelines

The Crime Severity Classification (CSC) on Count Number 1 is 6 and the Criminal History Classification (CHC) is D.

Incarceration

Defendant is sentenced to the custody of Oregon Dept of Corrections, for a period of 14 month(s). Defendant is remanded to the custody of the Wasco Sheriff for transportation to the Oregon Dept of Corrections for service of this sentence. Defendant may receive credit for time served. Defendant shall receive credit for time served from 04/21/2014.

The Defendant may not be considered by the executing or releasing authority for any form of Reduction in Sentence, Conditional or Supervised Release Program, Temporary Leave From Custody, Work Release. The Defendant may not be considered for release on post-prison supervision under ORS 421.508(4) upon successful completion of an alternative incarceration program.

This sentence shall be concurrent with the following cases Washington State case 14-1-00084-9.

Post-Prison Supervision

The term of Post-Prison Supervision is 60 month(s) minus time actually served pursuant to ORS 144.103. If the Defendant violates any of the conditions of post-prison supervision, the defendant shall be subject to sanctions including the possibility of additional imprisonment in accordance with the rules of the State Sentencing Guidelines Board. The court recommends as a condition of post-prison supervision:

- Defendant is to have no contact with victim Lizbeth Pulido or her family.

Statutory Provisions

Defendant is ordered to submit blood or buccal sample and thumbprint pursuant to ORS 137.076. Defendant is ordered to register as a sex offender pursuant to Oregon Revised Statutes.

Monetary Terms

Defendant shall be required to pay the following amounts on this count:

Fees and Assessments: Payable to the Court.

Type	Amount	Modifier	Reduction	Actual Owed
Fine - Felony	\$200.00			\$200.00
Total	\$200.00			\$200.00

Compensatory Fine/Restitution:

A compensatory fine is ordered to be paid to the court and disbursed to the payee(s) named below.

Payee	Not To Exceed	Amount
PULIDO LIZBETH		\$500.00
PULIDO LIZBETH		\$500.00
Total		\$1,000.00

Count 4 : Attempt to Commit a Class A Felony - Unlawful Sexual Penetration in the First Degree

Count number 4, Attempt to Commit a Class A Felony - Unlawful Sexual Penetration in the First Degree, 161.405(2)(b), Felony Class B, committed on or about 01/01/2010. Conviction is based upon a Guilty Plea on 11/16/2016.

Sentencing Guidelines

The Crime Severity Classification (CSC) on Count Number 4 is 8 and the Criminal History Classification (CHC) is D.

The court finds substantial and compelling reason for an Upward Durational Departure, as stated on the record. This departure is pursuant to the following aggravating or mitigating factor(s):

- Stipulation of Parties

Incarceration

Defendant is sentenced to the custody of Oregon Dept of Corrections, for a period of 56 month(s). Defendant is remanded to the custody of the Wasco Sheriff for transportation to the Oregon Dept of Corrections for service of this sentence. Defendant may receive credit for time served. Defendant shall receive credit for time served since 04/21/2014.

The Defendant may not be considered by the executing or releasing authority for any form of Reduction in Sentence, Conditional or Supervised Release Program, Temporary Leave From Custody, Work Release. The Defendant may not be considered for release on post-prison supervision under ORS 421.508(4) upon successful completion of an alternative incarceration program.

For the reasons stated on the record, this sentence shall be consecutive to the sentence(s) on the following cases: The 14 month sentence in Count 1. This sentence shall be concurrent with the following cases Washington State case 14-1-00084-9.

Post-Prison Supervision

The term of Post-Prison Supervision is 120 month(s) minus time actually served pursuant to ORS 144.103. If the Defendant violates any of the conditions of post-prison supervision, the defendant shall be subject to sanctions including the possibility of additional imprisonment in accordance with the rules of the State Sentencing Guidelines Board. The court recommends as a condition of post-prison supervision:

- Defendant is to have no contact with Lizbeth Pulido or her family.

Statutory Provisions

Defendant is ordered to submit blood or buccal sample and thumbprint pursuant to ORS 137.076. Defendant is ordered to register as a sex offender pursuant to Oregon Revised Statutes.

COUNTS DISPOSED WITH NO CONVICTION

Count # 2, Sexual Abuse in the First Degree is Dismissed.

Count # 3, Sexual Abuse in the First Degree is Dismissed.

Count # 5, Sexual Abuse in the First Degree is Dismissed.

Count # 6, Sexual Abuse in the First Degree is Dismissed.

Count # 7, Sexual Abuse in the Second Degree is Dismissed.

If convicted of a felony or a crime involving domestic violence, you may lose the right to buy, sell, transport, receive, or possess a firearm, ammunition, or other weapons in both personal and professional endeavors pursuant to ORS 166.250, ORS 166.291, ORS 166.300, and/or 18 USC 922(g).

MONEY AWARD

Judgment Creditor: State of Oregon

Judgment Debtor: JUAN ENRIQUEZ MARTINEZ

Compensatory Fine

Payee	Amount
PULIDO LIZBETH	\$1,000.00

Payees are to be paid as ordered under Monetary Terms.

Defendant is ordered to pay the following monetary totals, including restitution or compensatory fine amounts stated above, which are listed in the Money Award portion of this document:

Type	Amount Owed
Compensatory Fine	\$1,000.00
Fine - Felony	\$200.00
Total	\$1,200.00

The court may increase the total amount owed by adding collection fees and other assessments. These fees and assessments may be added without further notice to the defendant and without further court order.

Subject to amendment of a judgment under ORS 137.107, money required to be paid as a condition of probation remains payable after revocation of probation only if the amount is included in the money award portion of the judgment document, even if the amount is referred to in other parts of the judgment document.

Any financial obligation(s) for conviction(s) of a violation, which is included in the Money Award, creates a judgment lien.

Payment Schedule

Payment of the fines, fees, assessments, and/or attorney's fees noted in this and any subsequent Money Award shall be scheduled by the clerk of the court pursuant to ORS 161.675.


Payable to:

Wasco County Circuit Court
511 Washington St.
The Dalles, Oregon 97058
P: 541.506.2700
F: <http://courts.oregon.gov/Wasco>

Dated the _____ day of _____, 20_____

Signed: 12/14/2016 11:10 AM

Signed: _____



Circuit Court Judge John A Olson

GASCH LAW OFFICE

March 07, 2019 - 9:29 AM

Transmittal Information

Filed with Court: Court of Appeals Division III
Appellate Court Case Number: 36190-0
Appellate Court Case Title: State of Washington v. Juan Enriquez-Martinez
Superior Court Case Number: 14-1-00084-9

The following documents have been uploaded:

- 361900_Briefs_Plus_20190307092539D3413538_9724.pdf
This File Contains:
Affidavit/Declaration - Service
Briefs - Anders
The Original File Name was brief - mtn 2 withdraw pursuant to Anders 2019 03 07 Enriquez-Martinez Juan 361900.pdf

A copy of the uploaded files will be sent to:

- davidq@klickitatcounty.org
- davidw@klickitatcounty.org
- paapeals@klickitatcounty.org

Comments:

Sender Name: Susan Gasch - Email: gaschlaw@msn.com
Address:
PO BOX 30339
SPOKANE, WA, 99223-3005
Phone: 509-443-9149

Note: The Filing Id is 20190307092539D3413538