

RECEIVED
SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON

2010 FEB 19 AM 8:04

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE OF WASHINGTON

CLERK

Respondent/Petitioner,¹

NO. 81921-1

vs.

STATEMENT OF
ADDITIONAL
AUTHORITY

LEO B. BUNKER, et.al.,

Petitioner/Respondent.

FILED
FEB 19 2010
CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON

Pursuant to RAP 10.8, the appellants in the above referenced appeal cite

as additional authority for consideration by this Court the following cases on

interpretation of statutes:

In re Forfeiture of One 1970 Chevrolet Chevelle, 166 Wn.2d 834, 838-39, 215 P.3d 166 (2009) ("The objective of statutory interpretation is to carry out legislative intent. Where a statute is plain on its face, we give effect to that plain meaning as an expression of legislative intent. In determining the meaning, we may account for the ordinary meaning of words, basic rules of grammar, and the statutory context to conclude what the legislature has provided for in the statute and related statutes. When a statute remains susceptible to more than one reasonable meaning, it is appropriate to resort to other aids of construction, such as legislative history.")

State v. Bustmante Gonzalez, __ Wn.2d __, __ P.3d __, (Slip Op. 81525-9 filed February 18, 2010) Slip Op. at 5 ("When we interpret a statute, our goal is to carry out the legislature's intent. The first step in interpreting a statute is to examine its plain language. Plain meaning "is to be discerned from the ordinary meaning of the language at issue, the context of the statute in which that provision is found, related provisions, and the statutory scheme as a whole." If the statute is unambiguous after a review of the plain meaning, the court's inquiry is at an end. A statute is ambiguous when it is "susceptible to two or more reasonable


¹ This matter involves the consolidated case of State v. Bunker, State v. Williams, and State v. Vincent. The State is the "respondent" in Bunker and Williams, and the "petitioner" in Vincent.

interpretations,' but 'a statute is not ambiguous merely because different interpretations are conceivable.'" (citations omitted).

DATED THIS 18th day of February, 2010.

Respectfully submitted,

NIELSEN, BROMAN & KOCH, PLLC.,



CHRISTOPHER H. GIBSON

WSBA 25097

Office ID No. 91051

Attorneys for Appellant

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE OF WASHINGTON,)
)
 Respondent/Petitioner,)
)
 vs.)
)
 LEO BUNKER, et.al.,)
)
 Petitioners/Respondent.)

NO. 81921-1

RECEIVED
SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
2010 FEB 19 AM 8:04
L. J. DONALD R. CARPENTER
CLERK

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

I, PATRICK MAYOVSKY, DECLARE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON THAT THE FOLLOWING IS TRUE AND CORRECT:

THAT ON THE 18TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 2010, I CAUSED A TRUE AND CORRECT COPY OF THE **STATEMENT OF ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY** TO BE SERVED ON THE PARTY / PARTIES DESIGNATED BELOW BY DEPOSITING SAID DOCUMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MAIL.

[X] RANDI AUSTELL
KING COUNTY PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE
516 3RD AVENUE
SUITE W554
SEATTLE, WA 98104

[X] MELODY CRICK
PIERCE COUNTY PROSECUTING ATTORNEY
930 TACOMA AVENUE SOUTH
ROOM 946
TACOMA, WA 98402

SIGNED IN SEATTLE WASHINGTON, THIS 18TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 2010.

x. Patrick Mayovsky