68158-3 68158-3

To court of Apeals
From Jeffery kinzle
Apeal case # 68158-3-1

COURT OF APPEALS DIV I
STATE OF WASHINGTON
2012 AUG -9 AM 11:27

Re: Statement of ADitional grounds

I belive That I am rite around if Not Just over My Time limit but I Would Sincerly Request That These Final pages of My ADitional grounds be ADDed To The rest of the letter of statemen. of ADitional grounds I have prieviously Submited to your court.

I Do Apolijize for sending it in 3 letters instead of all at once And also that it has taken so long and far Apart
So please consider that I hav many phisical impairments and [illegible] That Make it extriemly Dificult to write legibly and with a Clear line of thought for Any lengh Time And also My Many mente helth Disibilities including the A[illegible] of [illegible] Reasoning,

AttN Span, Reading and comprehentio
Along with bolth long term And short term Memory
So Do to the facts that I
Not only have sever problems in Many
Arieas Nesesary to write these
statements but am also
severly underMedicated by
this Jail So My problems
Are compounded by this

So I beg you to please
consider this And Ask you
to please inclood These
Last pages of issues #4 & #5
AS My Final letter of

Statement of ADitional grounds
of Apeal.
for My case please.

Respectfully

Jeffery M. Kinzle
DoB [illegible]-1983
[illegible]/**/79[illegible]
Snohomish County Jail CiN #351613

Dated 8-4-12

ISSue #4

The court Granting MR Hunters motion At the [illegible] day of the trial to Not be Able to present or Alude to evidence And or have a whitness/victim testify At My trial for Me To The fact that MR Nathan Wood had [illegible] sexual Asulted A Store clear K in a place called lovers boutique witch is only 50 feet [illegible] Mazlatan Store And As this hapened at 4:30 pm - Not even an hour before My Alleged Asualt This combined with the fact that [illegible] victims Storys were almost IDentical except for the first victim was able to also kick And punch MR. Wood And [illegible] she would [illegible] As he was fleeing the Store on 3-13-11 at 4:30pm

So This is a Verry brief explanation of the evidence And the first clear was [illegible] to this at my trial

So All that said the court
Violated my rite to [illegible]
trial And [illegible] my rite [illegible]
present evidence in my own
defence And [illegible] showed [illegible]
clear bias And persumption [illegible]
guilt by Not [illegible]
[illegible] my Attorney or myself [illegible]
Regarding [illegible] hunter [illegible]
but also by [illegible] granting
That [illegible] No [illegible]
investigation of the [illegible]
of my [illegible] or
even [illegible] question of what
[illegible] Asked/stated
by my evidence — he had No clou
about what this was [illegible] —
instead the [illegible] Automatically
in [illegible] granted
MR hunter's motion and stated [illegible]
[illegible] hunter As
"prior bad [illegible]"
Now how can this be a prior [illegible]
[illegible] Aleged [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
but As for this issue my rites were clearly [illegible]

[illegible] = [illegible]

MPD [illegible] Arest [illegible] without [illegible]

[illegible]

This [illegible] pre[illegible] [illegible] and [illegible]

[illegible] A[illegible]

[illegible] 1 MPD

[illegible] 2 MPD

[illegible] Turned [illegible]

[illegible] Asked [illegible]

[illegible] so [illegible]

[illegible] And [illegible] Denied [illegible]

that [illegible] Not [illegible]

3 [illegible]

A[illegible] Drove
me [illegible]
and [illegible] said [illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]. Then let me go

So My issue [illegible] To
Argue what [illegible]
[illegible], but simply put [illegible]
MPD [illegible]
[illegible]
And [illegible]
[illegible], Fear, Nervousness. My phica
Apearance & [illegible]
That [illegible]
To [illegible]
[illegible] During my [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] ested [illegible]
There

by Deningme the rite to A fair and unbias trial

So having stated All that My Reasoning is Very simple here by first violating My rites on 3-13-11 And then testifing at my trial to the things they observed while they were violating My rites They gave a testamoney that would reasonably be expected to have a Mager afect on a Jurys Decision of guilt or inocence
but that said if they had followed the law and Abided My rites MpD would Not have had the reason or legal Ability to testify to these things at My trial
So saying that My reasoning here is being as testamony is considered evidence by alowing this the cour violated the same rites and law that pertain to a cop ilegaly search a person or place And even if something of consiquince is found i can not be used in court because it was obtained illegaly by the police while in violation of that person rites and the laws the legal system ha [illegible] Justice. —Please consider My resoning