

66836-6

66836-6

FILED  
COURT OF APPEALS DIV I  
STATE OF WASHINGTON

2012 AUG 29 PM 3: 22  
NO. 66836-6-I

COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

DIVISION I

88663-6

---

STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Respondent,

v.

RICHARD SWEAT,

Appellant.

---

APPEAL FROM THE SUPERIOR COURT FOR KING COUNTY

THE HONORABLE MARIANE SPEARMAN

---

**SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF OF RESPONDENT**

---

DANIEL T. SATTERBERG  
King County Prosecuting Attorney

JEFFREY C. DERNBACH  
Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorney  
Attorneys for Respondent

King County Prosecuting Attorney  
W554 King County Courthouse  
516 Third Avenue  
Seattle, Washington 98104  
(206) 296-9000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
A. <u>ISSUE PRESENTED</u> .....	1
B. <u>ARGUMENT</u> .....	1
SWEAT'S PROPOSED STATUTORY INTERPRETATION IS CONTRARY TO LEGISLATIVE INTENT AND ABSURD .....	1
1. The Plain Language Is Unambiguous And Expanded The Pattern Of Abuse Aggravator From "The Victim" To "A Victim Or Multiple Victims".....	1
2. The Legislative History Shows The 2010 Amendment To The Statute Was Intended To Target Serial Domestic Violence Abusers.....	3
C. <u>CONCLUSION</u> .....	11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

Table of Cases

Washington State:

Brown v. State, 155 Wn.2d 254,  
119 P.3d 341 (2005)..... 4

Campbell & Gwinn, 146 Wn.2d 1,  
43 P.3d 4 2002)..... 3

Cosmopolitan Engineering Group, Inc. v.  
Ondeo Degremont, Inc., 159 Wn.2d 292,  
149 P.3d 666 (2006)..... 4

State v. Beaver, 148 Wn.2d 338,  
60 P.3d 586 (2002)..... 2

State v. Gonzalez, 168 Wn.2d 256,  
226 P.3d 131 (2010)..... 1

State v. Heiskell, 129 Wn.2d 113,  
916 P.2d 366 (1996)..... 4

State v. Jacobs, 154 Wn.2d 596,  
115 P.3d 281 (2005)..... 2

State v. Keller, 143 Wn.2d 267,  
19 P.3d 1030 (2001)..... 2, 10

State v. Lilyblad, 163 Wn.2d 1,  
177 P.3d 686 (2008)..... 1

State v. Neher, 112 Wn.2d 347,  
771 P.2d 330 (1989)..... 2

State v. Roggenkamp, 153 Wn.2d 614,  
106 P.3d 196 (2005)..... 2

State v. Torres, 151 Wn. App. 378,  
212 P.3d 573 (2009)..... 3

<u>State v. Turner</u> , 98 Wn.2d 731, 658 P.2d 658 (1983).....	4
--	---

Statutes

Washington State:

HB 2427, 61 <sup>st</sup> Leg. Reg. Sess. (Wash.2010) .....	8
HB 2777, 61 <sup>st</sup> Leg. Reg. Sess. (Wash.2010) .....	8, 9
HB 2778, 61 <sup>st</sup> Leg. Reg. Sess. (Wash.2010) .....	8
Laws of 2010, ch. 274, § 402 .....	3
RCW 9.94A.535 .....	1, 2, 5
RCW 10.99.020.....	2
SB 5208, 61 <sup>st</sup> Leg. Reg. Sess. (Wash.2009).....	5, 7, 8, 9

Other Authorities

ROB MCKENNA, WASH. STATE OFFICE OF ATT'Y GEN., DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SENTENCING REFORM: ENHANCED PENALTIES FOR REPEAT/SERIAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE OFFENDERS 2 (2009), 34 Seattle U. L. Rev. 963 (2011) .....	4
Sentencing Reform Act .....	3, 6
<i>TAKING IT SERIOUSLY: REPAIRING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SENTENCING IN WASHINGTON STATE,</i> 34 Seattle U. L. Rev. 963 (2011) .....	9

**A. ISSUE PRESENTED**

Whether this Court should reject Sweat's proposed interpretation of RCW 9.94A.535(3)(h)(i) because it is contrary to legislative intent.

**B. ARGUMENT**

**SWEAT'S PROPOSED STATUTORY INTERPRETATION IS CONTRARY TO LEGISLATIVE INTENT AND ABSURD.**

This Court requested supplemental briefing regarding the legislative intent and history for the 2010 amendments to the aggravating factor for a pattern of domestic violence with multiple victims. It is clear that the legislature's intent was to expand the aggravator beyond the victim of the crime charged to address serial domestic violence abusers that harm many women.

**1. The Plain Language Is Unambiguous And Expanded The Pattern Of Abuse Aggravator From "The Victim" To "A Victim Or Multiple Victims."**

Issues of statutory construction are reviewed de novo. State v. Lilyblad, 163 Wn.2d 1, 6, 177 P.3d 686 (2008). If the plain words of a statute are unambiguous, the Court need not inquire further. State v. Gonzalez, 168 Wn.2d 256, 263, 226 P.3d 131 (2010). The

legislature is presumed to use only essential words and each word must be accorded meaning and interpreted so that no portion of the statute is rendered meaningless or superfluous. State v. Beaver, 148 Wn.2d 338, 343, 60 P.3d 586 (2002); State v. Roggenkamp, 153 Wn.2d 614, 624, 106 P.3d 196 (2005). A statute is considered ambiguous only if it is susceptible to more than one reasonable interpretation. State v. Jacobs, 154 Wn.2d 596, 600-01, 115 P.3d 281 (2005). A court should not adopt an interpretation that renders any portion meaningless. State v. Keller, 143 Wn.2d 267, 277, 19 P.3d 1030 (2001). Strained meanings and absurd results should be avoided. State v. Neher, 112 Wn.2d 347, 351, 771 P.2d 330 (1989).

The plain language of RCW 9.94A.535(3)(h)(i) includes victims that are beyond the direct result of the crimes charged:

(h) The current offense involved domestic violence, as defined in RCW 10.99.020, and one or more of the following was present:

(i) The offense was part of an ongoing pattern of psychological, physical, or sexual abuse of a victim or multiple victims manifested by multiple incidents over a prolonged period of time.

RCW 9.94A.535(3)(h)(i) (emphasis added).

The legislature amended the statute in 2010. The pattern of abuse aggravator originally applied to "the victim." The legislature changed that language to "a victim or multiple victims." Laws of 2010, ch. 274, § 402. The legislature clearly intended the additional language to have meaning beyond the SRA's definition of "victim" as tied to a particular charged case. The Court need not look any further than the plain language of the statute.

**2. The Legislative History Shows The 2010 Amendment To The Statute Was Intended To Target Serial Domestic Violence Abusers.**

Since the plain language of the statute is clear the Court need not look to the legislative history. Only when the plain, unambiguous meaning cannot be derived through such an inquiry will it be appropriate for a reviewing court to resort to aids to construction, including legislative history. State v. Torres, 151 Wn. App. 378, 388, 212 P.3d 573 (2009) (citing Campbell & Gwinn, 146 Wn.2d 1, 12, 43 P.3d 4 2002)). Should the court look at the legislative history it is not surprising that it too supports the plain meaning of the statute that the pattern of abuse of different victims can support an exceptional sentence.

This Court can consider a broad range of evidence probative of the legislature's intent, including testimony offered to a committee, Cosmopolitan Engineering Group, Inc. v. Ondeo Degremont, Inc., 159 Wn.2d 292, 304, 149 P.3d 666 (2006); committee staff's explanations of a bill's effects, Brown v. State, 155 Wn.2d 254, 265-66, 119 P.3d 341 (2005); discussion among committee members, State v. Heiskell, 129 Wn.2d 113, 119, 916 P.2d 366 (1996); and committee staff memoranda, State v. Turner, 98 Wn.2d 731, 737-38, 658 P.2d 658 (1983). Several such sources from the 2009-2010 legislative sessions are available.

In 2009, Washington State Attorney General Rob McKenna proposed legislation to increase sentencing for repeat felony domestic violence offenders in Washington State. ROB MCKENNA, WASH. STATE OFFICE OF ATT'Y GEN., DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SENTENCING REFORM: ENHANCED PENALTIES FOR REPEAT/SERIAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE OFFENDERS 2 (2009), *available at* [http://www.sgc.wa.gov/Minutes/11\\_Nov\\_08\\_DV\\_Sentencing\\_ReformPackage.pdf](http://www.sgc.wa.gov/Minutes/11_Nov_08_DV_Sentencing_ReformPackage.pdf) (attached as appendix A), see also 34 Seattle U. L. Rev. 963, 964 (2011). His proposal included an aggravating factor for serial domestic violence batterers with different victims. The reason for the proposal was:

The current [aggravating] factor for a history of domestic violence only allows for exceptional sentences for a history of domestic violence with one victim. We constantly see recidivists who move from victim to victim engaging in battering. We should not limit exceptional sentences to the same victim, and should formally recognize the serial batter.

Id. at 8. Mr. McKenna's proposal was ultimately adopted as the "multiple victims" language in RCW 9.94A.535(3)(h)(i).

Domestic violence sentencing reform was initially proposed in 2009 in SB 5208. SB 5208 at 24, 61<sup>st</sup> Leg. Reg. Sess. (Wash.2009). The bill sought to reform sentencing in domestic violence cases in three ways: first, it included prior domestic violence misdemeanors in a felony offender score; second, it created multipliers to score prior domestic violence felonies; and third, it expanded the aggravator for the pattern of domestic violence abuse from "the victim" to "a victim or multiple victims." Id. at 12, 18, 24. The Senate Bill Report indicates "[t]his bill allows us to look at a chronic violent offender with multiple victims." S.B. Rep. on SB 5208 at 3-4, 61<sup>st</sup> Leg. Reg. Sess. (Wash.2009). The report specifically notes "[t]he bill modifies the aggravating factor so that it applies in situations with *different* victims." Id. (emphasis added).

During testimony at the Judiciary Committee, the bill's sponsor Senator Brandland described the purpose of the bill to address offenders that go from "victim to victim" and move from one victim to another. The bill allows the law to address the "chronic offender." Test. of Brandland, January 23, 2009 Senate Judiciary Committee at 1:30pm at 5:50-6:15 (testimony can be viewed at [http://www.tvw.org/index.php?option=com\\_tvwplayer&eventID=2009011149](http://www.tvw.org/index.php?option=com_tvwplayer&eventID=2009011149)).

At the same hearing David Martin from the King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office testified. Mr. Martin pointed out that the Sentencing Reform Act (SRA) fails to hold "serial" domestic violence batterers accountable. He cited an example of Damon Overby, an offender with many prior misdemeanor incidents with multiple victims, specifically noting that Overby had no contact orders with five different victims. Test. of David Martin, January 23, 2009 Senate Judiciary Committee at 1:30pm at 19:30-20:06. Mr. Martin testified that the pattern of abuse aggravator should be modified because the old version was limited to a single victim and would not apply to offenders like Overby because he abused many different women. Id. at 21:13-23:29.

There was only one speaker in opposition to the bill. Darron Morris spoke on behalf of the Washington Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers and the Washington Defender Association. Test. of Darron Morris, January 23, 2009 Senate Judiciary Committee at 1:30pm at 39:20-39:27. Mr. Morris argued that the exceptional sentences available were a better alternative to deal with recidivist offenders than changing the offender score calculations. 40:55-40:15. He specifically noted that the aggravating factor for the pattern of abuse “could be changed to include not just the same victim but other victims.” Id. at 42:13-42:32.

The discussion of the “multiple victims” language in SB 5208 demonstrates that the legislature was aware that the prior language was limited to a single victim of the charged offense and the proposed amendment expanded the aggravator to include past victims of the offender. The “multiple victims” proposal was not particularly controversial and even the Washington Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers argued that the proposed scoring changes were not necessary because the expansion of the pattern of abuse aggravator to multiple victims gave the courts discretion to punish the chronic, serial offenders that were the target of the bill.

Looking at the testimony and comments of the bill's sponsor as a whole, it was clear that the "multiple victims" language was understood to expand the aggravating factor to include other different victims of the offender to address the chronic, serial domestic violence offender. Furthermore, the record is also clear that this "multiple victims" language was not opposed by anyone, including WACDL. However, the proposed scoring changes did prompt further debate and consideration, and SB 5208 was not brought to a vote in the legislature in 2009.

The following year, in 2010, several bills were proposed to reform domestic violence sentencing. See HB 2777, 61<sup>st</sup> Leg. Reg. Sess. (Wash.2010), HB 2778, 61<sup>st</sup> Leg. Reg. Sess. (Wash.2010), and HB 2427, 61<sup>st</sup> Leg. Reg. Sess. (Wash.2010). The bills varied when addressing the scoring of prior domestic violence felonies and misdemeanors, but the "multiple victims" aggravator was included in each proposal in the identical form as SB 5208. HB 2777 at 23, HB 2778 at 26, HB 2427 at 24. Ultimately, HB 2777 was enacted by the legislature with the amendment to the pattern of abuse aggravator with the "multiple victims" language. The bill reports and committees for each bill focused primarily on the changes to the scoring of prior domestic violence convictions and

there was little discussion of the multiple victims. The notion that a serial domestic violence abuser that that harms many women over time should be punished more severely did not generate much controversy in the legislature. There is nothing to indicate the purpose of the language was any different from the proposal in SB 5208.

Scholars that have looked at the amendment of the statute also interpret the plain meaning to apply to serial domestic violence abusers of different victims. Patricia Scully wrote:

Prior to HB 2777, there was no aggravating factor for a general history of domestic violence if the same victim was not implicated. HB 2777 changed the aggravating-factor scheme, allowing for "multiple victims" as opposed to only the current victim of domestic violence. This serial-offender aggravator recognizes the danger of serial batterers and allows all past domestic violence history to be considered as a factor in sentencing. Under the serial-offender aggravator, domestic violence offenders can now be held accountable for their prior abuse if they (1) would have qualified for the "history of domestic violence" aggravator with a past victim but have been charged with a crime against a new victim or (2) would not have qualified for the history of domestic violence aggravator with any single victim but have a history of abuse across multiple victims.

*TAKING IT SERIOUSLY: REPAIRING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE*

*SENTENCING IN WASHINGTON STATE*, 34 Seattle U. L. Rev.

963, 979-80 (2011).

Sweat's argument that the definition of victim limits the aggravator to only those harmed as a direct result of the crime charged is contrary to the legislature's clear intent to punish serial domestic violence offenders more severely. Furthermore, his interpretation would lead to absurd results. If an offender harmed multiple victims as a direct result of the crime charged they would each be "a victim" under the prior law and could be the basis for an exceptional sentence. The amendment to add "multiple victims" would have no effect at all. A court should not adopt an interpretation that renders any portion meaningless. State v. Keller, 143 Wn.2d 267, 277, 19 P.3d 1030 (2001). As discussed above, it would thwart the legislature's intent to address serial domestic violence abusers that move from one victim to the next.

The plain meaning of the "multiple victims" over a prolonged period of time allows the courts to impose an exceptional sentence for an offender that abuses many different women. The legislature clearly amended the statute to address serial domestic violence batterers, like Sweat, that move from one victim to the next.

**C. CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, and the reasons stated in the Brief of Respondent, Sweat's exceptional sentence should be affirmed.

DATED this 29<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2012.

Respectfully submitted,



DANIEL T. SATTERBERG  
King County Prosecuting Attorney

By:   
JEFFREY C. DERNBACH, WSBA #27208  
Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorney  
Attorneys for Respondent  
Office WSBA #91002

## **APPENDIX A**

# DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SENTENCING REFORM

ENHANCED PENALTIES FOR REPEAT/SERIAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE OFFENDERS



WASHINGTON STATE OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL  
BOB MCKENNA



2009 LEGISLATIVE SESSION


## DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SENTENCING REFORM

### FELLOW WASHINGTONIANS,

Serial domestic violence offenders pose an unacceptable threat to our communities. For years victims and their allies have complained that our state requires more severe punishments for serial car thieves and drug dealers than for serial domestic abusers.

"I've witnessed the plight of hundreds of domestic violence victims who no longer cooperate with law enforcement or the courts because their experience has taught them that their abusive partners will not be held accountable, even after multiple convictions," says Keith Galbraith, the director of Family Renewal Shelter, a domestic violence shelter in Tacoma.

David Martin, head of the King County Prosecutor's Office Domestic Violence Unit, agrees. He points to offenders like Damon Overby, who accumulated eight domestic violence convictions for assaults on four women over 18 years. Yet after receiving his latest felony conviction for a brutal attempt to suffocate a girlfriend, Overby was sentenced to only 12 months of work release.



On the pages that follow, you will find more examples of abusers who have escaped the kinds of prison terms that would more appropriately match our collective disgust of domestic abuse. At the same time, these shockingly short sentences have robbed victims of a chance to move on and rebuild their lives.

In February 2007, I convened my domestic violence advisory committee. This task force of leading prosecutors, police officers and victim advocates is recommending new solutions to protect the victims of chronic abusers. The task force asserts that sentencing rules for chronic abusers have proved inadequate because they do not require judges to take into account the previous misdemeanor domestic violence convictions of the most dangerous offenders. This demands immediate action.

The legislation they have drafted offers relief to the victims of domestic violence, brings abusers to justice, and treats serial domestic violence with the seriousness it deserves.

Thank you to the dedicated public servants and advocates who have served on our task force over the past two years. Their counsel has led to the most important proposed update to our domestic violence protections since the Domestic Violence Prevention Act first became law some 25 years ago.

I look forward to working with you to guide these proposals successfully through the legislative process in 2009.

Sincerely,

Rob McKenna



2009 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SENTENCING REFORM

SANCTIONS WORKGROUP MEMBERS

**Susan Adams**

Executive Director  
Crystal Judson Family Center

**Keith Galbraith**

Executive Director  
Family Renewal Shelter

**Dennis McCurdy**

Deputy Prosecutor  
King County

**Tracy Bahm**

Assistant Attorney General  
Attorney General's Office

**Ed Holm**

Prosecutor  
Thurston County

**Andy Miller**

Prosecutor  
Benton County

**Camara Banfield**

Unit Coordinator- DV Prosecution  
Clark County

**Chris Johnson**

Policy Director  
Attorney General

**Patti Powers**

Senior Deputy Prosecutor  
Yakima County

**Claire Bradley**

Senior Deputy Prosecutor  
Kitsap County

**Andrew King-Reis**

Professor- School of Law  
University of Montana

**Paul Stern**

Deputy Prosecutor  
Snohomish County

**Stephanie Collins**

Head of DV Unit  
Spokane County

**Diane Clarkson**

Deputy Prosecutor  
Pierce County

**Jennifer Weiler**

Deputy Prosecutor  
Thurston County

**Mike Davis**

Sergeant  
Vancouver Police Dept.

**David Martin**

Senior Deputy Prosecutor  
King County

**Lana Weinmann**

Division Chief, Criminal Justice- Seattle  
Attorney General's Office

## WORK GROUPS

### ATTORNEY GENERAL'S DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ADVISORY GROUP:

**Susan Adams**  
Executive Director  
Crystal Judson Family Center

**Tracy Bahm**  
Assistant AG/DV Liaison  
Attorney General's office

**Randall Carroll**  
Chief of Police, Ret.  
City of Bellingham

**Stephanie Collins**  
Head of DV Unit  
Spokane Co. Prosecutor's  
Office

**Pam Crone**  
Leg. Consultant & Lobbyist  
NW Women's Law Ctr. &  
WSCADV

**Mike Davis**  
Sergeant  
City of Vancouver PD

**Elisa Elliot**  
Sheriff's aid  
King Co. Sheriff's office

**Anne-Marie Evans**  
Victim Advocate  
City of Lakewood

**Kevin L. Forrester**  
Corporal, Training Division  
Washington State Patrol

**Keith Galbraith**  
Executive Director  
Family Renewal Shelter

**Bonnie Glenn**  
Deputy Chief of Staff  
King Co. Prosecutor's Office

**Seth Grant**  
Deputy, Criminal Law Instructor  
WA CJTC

**Ed Holm**  
Prosecutor  
Thurston County

**Grace Huang**  
Public Policy Coordinator  
WSCADV

**Chris Johnson**  
Policy Director  
Attorney General's Office

**Terri Kimball**  
Director, Sexual Assault & DV  
Programs  
City of Seattle

**Dee Koester**  
Executive Director  
Women Spirit Coalition

**Barbara Langdon**  
Executive Director  
Eastside DV Program

**David Martin**  
Sr. Deputy Prosecutor, DV Unit  
King Co. Prosecutor's Office

**Shannon Meyer Ph.D.**  
Victim Specialist  
Federal Bureau of Investigation

**Cynthia North-Jones**  
Deputy  
Spokane County Sheriff's Office

**Sue Parrott**  
Program Supervisor  
Bellingham/Whatcom County  
Commission Against DV

**Sue Rahr**  
Sheriff  
King County

**Dan Satterberg**  
Prosecutor  
King County

**Sue Shultz**  
Lieutenant  
Bainbridge Island PD

**Paul Stern**  
Deputy Prosecutor  
Snohomish Co. Prosecutor's  
Office

**Jennifer Weiler**  
Deputy Prosecutor  
Thurston Co. Prosecutor's  
Office

**Patty Wheeler**  
Program Director  
Spokane YWCA



2009 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

## DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SENTENCING REFORM

ENHANCED PENALTIES FOR REPEAT/SERIAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE OFFENDERS.

Over the past thirty years the criminal justice response to domestic violence has stressed accountability for domestic violence offenders and safety for victims. From training to dedicated police, advocates, courts, and prosecutors the criminal justice system has made domestic violence a priority. That commitment, however, is not reflected in the sentencing of repeat felony domestic violence offenders. The hard work of pursuing and prosecuting repeat domestic violence offenders too often results in weak sentences that fail to protect the victim or to properly account for prior domestic violence convictions. The result is multifold. Repeat offenders become indifferent to legal consequences of their actions. The cycle of domestic violence continues unabated. Victims are put at greater risks due to the ineffective intervention of the criminal justice system. And many victims lose hope and motivation. In short, the message to the community about domestic violence is diluted and even contradictory. The sentencing of repeat domestic violence offenders requires immediate attention.

### HISTORY:

In 1979, the Washington State legislature passed the Domestic Violence Prevention Act (DVPA) RCW 10.99, Washington's official response to the problem of domestic violence. The law recognized domestic violence as a "serious crime and intended to provide maximum protection from abuse for victims of domestic violence." RCW 10.99.010. The purpose of the DVPA was not to establish new crimes, but to ensure that existing statutes would be fully and equally enforced in domestic violence situations. RCW 10.99.010, and Roy v. City of Everett, 118 Wn. 2d 352, 358 (1992).

A few years later the Sentencing Reform Act (SRA) was enacted. No sentencing changes were made for repeat domestic violence offenders or consideration given to scoring domestic violence misdemeanor convictions. The SRA followed the lead of the DVPA, domestic violence sentences were to be treated just like other crimes. Since the enactment of the SRA in 1984, there have been multiple Legislative amendments to the SRA that specifically deal with repeat offenders for certain types of crimes. Felony domestic violence crimes have not been a part of those changes. The protection of victims and society in the domestic violence arena remains a high priority. Criminal sanctions for repeat domestic violence offenders need to change to properly reflect the danger to society, the danger to victims and more accurately the criminal conduct of repeat abusers.

### CURRENT EXAMPLES:

The lack of tough sentences allows serial domestic violence offenders to continue to commit these dangerous and damaging offenses with limited consequence. For example, in a recent King County case State v. Gary Ruffcorn the defendant was charged with Assault in the Second degree domestic violence for a brutal assault upon his girlfriend.

Ruffcorn had a long documented history of misdemeanor domestic violence abuse: six prior convictions for Assault in the Fourth degree domestic violence, three convictions for violation of a no contact order, and two felony drug



# WASHINGTON STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL - ROB MCKENNA

convictions. Ruffcorn's legacy of domestic violence was well known to dozens of police and prosecutors throughout east King County. Even though his nine misdemeanor domestic violence convictions appear significant, when it came time to impose punishment, none of his convictions counted towards his offender score. Instead, his standard range was calculated only by adding a point for each of his non-violent drug convictions. The resulting standard range was little different than what he faced for a misdemeanor.<sup>1</sup>

Other examples of repeat domestic violence offenders are found throughout the state. In a recent Thurston county case, State v. Marvin Greene, a repeat DV defendant had five misdemeanor domestic violence convictions (including twice for Assault 4 DV) involving the same victim. When he was convicted of a felony domestic violence charge for tampering with that victim he was sentenced as a first time felony offender with no consideration to his long DV history. In essence, the defendant faced less time for committing a felony domestic violence crime than for his prior misdemeanor domestic violence crimes.

In a Pierce county case, State v. L.A. Johnson, the defendant had a history of domestic violence involving the same victim and her children. He was recently convicted of a number of misdemeanor domestic violence crimes, including stalking, for his obsessive behavior. Once out of custody the defendant broke into the victim's home. The victim came home from work, put the children to bed, and found the defendant hiding under her bed. His constant harassment and stalking of the victim and her children left her terrified. The defendant's standard range does not consider his lengthy domestic violence history providing a sentence range less than a misdemeanor.

In a recent Snohomish county case, State v. Sam Cornish, the defendant had an extensive domestic violence relationship with his ex-wife. In the late 1990s he was convicted of five violations of no contact and felony stalking, and upon release pursued his ex-wife for several years. From 2000 to 2008 he was convicted of five additional domestic violence felony violations of no contact order. After ten years of criminal domestic violence offenses involving the same victim (eleven total) he faced a sentence commensurate with a third time burglar or car thief.

Unlike other repeat offenders whose prior convictions count more heavily when their current offense is for the same or similar conduct the repeat domestic violence felon faces no such concerns. The bottom line is prior domestic violence felony convictions are not multiplied and prior misdemeanor domestic violence convictions are not scored, no matter how many or if those involve the same victim or victim's children. The failure to consider prior convictions has led to widening gaps for repeat domestic violence felons and other repeat criminal felons--all while domestic violence cases are an increasing priority for prosecutors throughout Washington.<sup>2</sup>

## PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Over the past two years the concern to appropriately sentence repeat domestic violence offenders has been a focus of the Washington State Attorney General's Domestic Violence task force, and the Washington Association of Prosecuting Attorneys.<sup>3</sup> Within the Attorney General's Domestic Violence task force, a sanctions work group for repeat offenders formed consisting of representatives from several county prosecutors' offices: Benton, Snohomish, Kitsap, Thurston, Spokane, Yakima, Pierce, Clark, and King; as well as representatives from the Attorney General's Office, University of Montana School of Law, Crystal Judson Family Justice Center, and other advocacy organizations. The working group focused on repeat domestic violence felons and developed legislation to reform sentencing of repeat domestic violence felony offenders.<sup>4</sup> The legislation described below has been adopted by the Attorney General's Office and by the Washington Association of Prosecuting Attorneys:

1. Washington does have an exceptional sentence provision for history of domestic violence, and it was used against Mr. Ruffcorn with success, but it does not mitigate the systemic lack of a multiplier or failure to score misdemeanor convictions. Many other offenses such as sex, drugs, violent, and economic crimes also carry exceptional sentences in addition to a multiplier and other sentencing enhancements. Finally, exceptional sentences are unreliable having been subject to attack on appeal and only recently allowed. The statewide application is limited, and in 2006 was used in less than a dozen cases.
2. The Legislature has added additional penalties for certain offenses, including longer sentences for offenses committed with a firearm or another deadly weapon, longer sentences for drug offenses committed in a "protected" zone and for drug offenses committed while confined in a jail or prison. There are no such additional penalties for domestic violence.
3. The task force helped bring about the Assault 2 strangulation legislation among other domestic violence changes.
4. The work group also examined several states that have aggravated punishment for cases with repeated prior incidences of domestic violence. Some states "stack" domestic violence offenses (increase penalties from misdemeanor to felony for repeated conduct) including: Alaska (\$18,66,990, and 12.55), Alabama (\$12-25-31), Arkansas (\$5-26-303 to 309), Idaho (\$18,918), Kansas (\$12-3412), Louisiana (\$14.35 and 14.79), Maryland (\$14,101), Michigan (\$750,81), Minnesota (\$609,224), Mississippi (\$97-3-7), Missouri (\$565,070-074), Montana (\$45-5-626), New Mexico (\$31-18-15), Nevada (\$200,485), North Carolina (\$508-4.1), Ohio (\$2919.25), Oklahoma (\$22,60.6), Texas (\$22.01), Utah (\$77,36.1.1), Virginia (\$18.2). While some states also increase the class of the crime for repeat domestic violence offenders. See Missouri, New Mexico and Arkansas.

## A. SCORE PRIOR MISDEMEANOR DOMESTIC VIOLENCE HISTORY

Repeat felony domestic violence offenders often begin their behavior as misdemeanor domestic violence offenders. These misdemeanor domestic violence convictions are not just important in sentencing repeat offenders, but are often just as meaningful to a victim and the victim's children as a felony.<sup>5</sup> Though misdemeanors are generally not included in offender score calculations exceptions are made when they are particularly relevant such as felony traffic offenses (Vehicular Homicide, Vehicular Assault, Hit and Run Injury Accident.)<sup>6</sup> This legislation proposes counting a certain class of prior domestic violence misdemeanor convictions in a felony domestic violence offender's score:

The scoring of a certain class of domestic violence misdemeanor offenses is modeled after the scoring of misdemeanors for felony traffic offenses and car thieves (e.g. DUI, Reckless, and Vehicle Prowl). RCW 9.94A.030(36) provides for specific "serious traffic offenses" in the offender score. Creating a category of "serious domestic violence" misdemeanors would count as one point towards a felony domestic violence offender score. A "serious domestic violence offense" would be defined as:

*(a) Nonfelony domestic violence assault (RCW 9A.36.041), nonfelony domestic violence violation of a court order (No contact order under RCW 10.99, domestic violence protection order issued under RCW 26.09, 26.10, 26.26, or 26.50), nonfelony domestic violence harassment (RCW 9A.46.020), and nonfelony domestic violence stalking (RCW 9A.46.110); or (b) Any federal, out-of-state, county, tribal court, military, or municipal conviction for an offense that under the laws of this state would be classified as a serious domestic violence offense under (a) of this subsection.*

The scoring of domestic violence misdemeanors would accomplish a critical step in sentencing repeat domestic violence offenders by officially recognizing hard fought misdemeanor domestic violence convictions. The domestic violence designation of a prior "serious domestic violence" conviction will have to be plead and proven in order to score the conviction (note, any change in penalty for domestic violence crimes will require this step to comply with *Blakely v. Washington* 542 U.S. 296 (2004).) Many prosecutors currently do not plead and prove DV allegations, and this will create an issue that will necessitate jurisdictions making a change.

## B. MULTIPLY REPEAT DOMESTIC VIOLENCE FELONY CONVICTIONS.

The lack of a multiplier is a critical problem in holding the most egregious and dangerous domestic violence offenders (those with prior felony domestic violence convictions) accountable. Unlike drug, sex, burglaries, car theft, and felony traffic offenses where multiplying penalties significantly increase an offender's sentence, the SRA does not multiply offender scores for felony crimes of domestic violence. As a result, the penalties for repeat domestic violence, a behavior so wide spread it is well recognized in professional literature as the "cycle of violence," is among the lowest in felony criminal justice. The Sentencing Guidelines Commission commentary in the SRA on the role of criminal history is informative:

*[T]he grid places an accelerated emphasis on criminal history for the repeat violent offender...[t]hus, a criminal history with serious violent crime convictions counts most heavily when the current offense is also a serious violent offense; previous convictions for violent offenses count more heavily when the current offense is violent; prior burglary convictions count more heavily when the current offense is a burglary; prior drug offenses count more heavily when the current offense is a drug offense; and prior violent felony traffic offenses count more heavily when the current offense is a felony traffic offense. The Legislature has subsequently provided for counting sex offenses more heavily when the current offense is a sex offense. Adult Sentencing Manual 2007 II-118*

5. It is important to note that misdemeanor domestic violence convictions are often times more difficult to obtain than felony domestic violence convictions given the absence of obvious trauma or other physical evidence.

6. The Sentencing Guidelines commission recommended the following information for the scoring of misdemeanors in the comments to the SRA. *Misdemeanors: The Commission decided not to include misdemeanors in the offender score for two reasons: 1) the emphasis of the legislation was on felonies, and 2) the reliability of court records varies greatly throughout the state. An exception to this policy was made in the case of felony traffic offenses. The Commission decided that for these crimes, previous serious driving misdemeanors are relevant in establishing the offender's history of similar behavior. The Commission anticipates that in some instances an offender's history of misdemeanors may be used by the court in selecting a sentence within the standard sentence range or in departing from the range to administer an exceptional sentence. Adult Sentencing Manual 2007 II-118*

This legislation proposes multiplying or counting more heavily a certain class of prior domestic violence felony convictions. Designating a limited class of specific felony domestic violence convictions to be multiplied by adding to RCW 9.94A.525 (offender score calculation) the following language:

*If the present conviction is for a felony domestic violence offense, count priors as in subsections (7) through (11) and (12) through (17) of this section; however count two points for each adult and juvenile prior conviction for Felony Violation No Contact Order/Protection Order (assault), Felony Harassment Domestic Violence, Felony Stalking Domestic Violence, Burglary 1: Domestic Violence, Kidnapping 1 and 2 Domestic Violence, Unlawful Imprisonment Domestic Violence, Robbery 1 and 2 Domestic Violence, Assault 2 and 3 Domestic Violence, or Arson 1 and 2 Domestic Violence; count one point for Felony Violation of a No Contact Order (two priors), Residential Burglary Domestic Violence; count one point for each serious domestic violence offense, other than those convictions that are an element of the offense being scored*

*In addition, amend 9.94A.030 (Sentencing Reform Act definitions) to add "domestic violence" defined as a criminal offense committed between a defendant and a victim having a relationship as defined in RCW 10.99.020 or 26.50.010.*

This narrowly drawn multiplier for domestic violence felony crimes would not act as a blanket multiplier and instead focus on core domestic violence felonies. As above, the multiplier requires pleading and proving the domestic violence designation. The multiplier excludes domestic violence property crimes, Felony Violation of a No Contact Order (two prior offenses), and Residential Burglary domestic violence. The multiplier recognizes domestic violence as a distinct crime with punishment for repeat offenders of core offenses.

### C. PLEAD AND PROVE DOMESTIC VIOLENCE DESIGNATION

In order to have domestic violence sentencing reform Blakely requires the domestic violence designation be plead and proven. Today being labeled a crime of "domestic violence" does not affect punishment. Appellate courts have found the current label of domestic violence means nothing.<sup>7</sup> Any designation change will impact misdemeanor DV prosecutions. Jurisdictions will need to plead and prove designation where before they did not need to. The benefit of pleading and proving domestic violence is significant as history at the felony level would be given new meaning and repeat offenders would have tough sentences. There are also evidentiary advantages to pleading and proving domestic violence. In Kitsap County, they have plead and proven domestic violence for several years, without impact on their prosecutions.<sup>8</sup> Further, even if one fails to prove the domestic violence designation the sentences would simply revert back to the sentencing structure currently in place.

7. See *State v. Spencer*, 128 Wn. App. 132 (1-2005); *State v. Felix*, 125 Wash.App. 575, 105 P.3d 427 (2005). See also *State v. Clark*, unpublished opinion at 127 Wash.App. 1039 (2005).

8. In Pierce County, per domestic violence prosecutors Mary Robnett and Diane Clarkson, the prosecutor's office pleads domestic violence in the charging document. In District Court prosecutors prove it to the jury while in Superior Court the practice has been to ask the judge to make the finding after trial.

## D. INTENT

The intent section of any legislation should continue the theme from the Domestic Violence Prevention Act that states victims of DV will receive "the maximum protection from abuse which the law and those who enforce the law can provide." (RCW 10.99). This section should recognize that sentences for repeat domestic violence felons should not be equal to non-domestic violence crimes, but reflect the seriousness, recidivism, and lethality that underlie such crimes. Constitutional protections, preventing later equal protection challenges, is a critical part. This section should clarify that recidivist felony domestic violence sentences are intended to be consistent with other recidivist sentencing schemes. This is taking the language of 10.99 about equality with non-domestic violence crimes a step further, calling for equality in recidivist sentencing. Finally, it should express the intent that the State deal strongly with repeat felony DV offenders who engage in a pattern of serial "domestic violence" and make offenses involving greater harm to DV victims and society result in greater punishment. The following intent language should be included in the definition of "domestic violence" within RCW 9.94A.030 (Sentencing Reform Act definitions):

*The legislature recognizes the substantial and great impact upon society, families, children and the victims of offenses committed within a domestic relationship. The legislature recognizes the continuing nature of domestic violence, and the lasting psychological trauma caused by such violence. The legislature finds that the prevention of domestic violence, and the proper punishment for such offenses, is a compelling state interest that is not met under current sentencing provisions. Towards this end, this legislation is necessary to ensure that domestic violence offenders are punished accordingly, and an end to domestic violence can be achieved.*

## F. ADDITIONAL AGGRAVATING FACTORS

The current aggravating factor for a history of domestic violence only allows for exceptional sentences for a history of domestic violence with one victim. We constantly see recidivists who move from victim to victim engaging in battering. We should not limit exceptional sentences to the same victim, and should formally recognize the serial batterer:





OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL  
ROB MCKENNA

15125 Washington St. SE  
P.O. Box 40100  
Olympia, WA 98504  
360-753-6200  
[www.atg.wa.gov](http://www.atg.wa.gov)

Certificate of Service by Mail

Today I deposited in the mail of the United States of America, postage prepaid, a properly stamped and addressed envelope directed to Oliver Davis, the attorney for the appellant, at Washington Appellate Project, 701 Melbourne Tower, 1511 Third Avenue, Seattle, WA 98101, containing a copy of the Supplemental Brief of Respondent, in STATE V. RICHARD SWEAT, Cause No. 66836-6-I, in the Court of Appeals, Division I, for the State of Washington.

I certify under penalty of perjury of the laws of the State of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Name  
Done in Seattle, Washington

08/29/12  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date 8/29/12