

RECEIVED
SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
Apr 02, 2015, 1:49 pm
BY RONALD R. CARPENTER
CLERK

E CRF
RECEIVED BY E-MAIL

No. 91394-3

COA 31298-4-III

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF
WASHINGTON

STATE OF WASHINGTON, Respondent,

v.

ERIK RAMOS CARRASCO, Petitioner.

ANSWER TO PETITION FOR REVIEW

Tamara A. Hanlon, WSBA #28345
Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
Attorney for Respondent

JOSEPH BRUSIC
Yakima County Prosecuting Attorney
128 N. 2d St. Rm. 329
Yakima, WA 98901-2621

 ORIGINAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
A. IDENTITY OF RESPONDENT	1
B. COURT OF APPEALS DECISION	1
C. ISSUE PRESENTED FOR REVIEW	1
D. STATEMENT OF THE CASE	1
E. ARGUMENT WHY REVIEW SHOULD BE DENIED	3
F. CONCLUSION	17

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page</u>
Cases	
<u>State v. Boot</u> , 89 Wn. App. 780, 950 P.2d 964 (1998)	3,4
<u>State v. Camarillo</u> , 115 Wn.2d 60, 794 P.2d 850 (1990).....	14
<u>State v. Campbell</u> , 78 Wn. App. 813, 901 P.2d 1050 (1995)	3,4,12,13
<u>State v. Dennison</u> , 115 Wn.2d 609, 801 P.2d 193 (1990).....	3
<u>State v. Fiser</u> , 99 Wn. App. 714, 995 P.2d 107 (2000).....	13
<u>State v. Galisia</u> , 63 Wn. App. 833, 822 P.2d 303 (1992).....	14
<u>State v. Kilgore</u> , 147 Wn.2d 288, 53 P.3d 974 (2002).....	4
<u>State v. Powell</u> , 126 Wn.2d 244, 893 P.2d 615 (1995).....	4
<u>State v. Salinas</u> , 119 Wn.2d 192, 829 P.2d 1068 (1992)	14
<u>State v. Stevenson</u> , 128 Wn. App. 179, 114 P.3d 699 (2005).....	13,14
<u>State v. Thomas</u> , 150 Wn.2d 821, 83 P.3d 970 (2004).....	14
<u>State v. Yarbrough</u> , 151 Wn. App. 66, 210 P.3d 1029 (2009).....	3,4
Rules	
ER 401	4
ER 404(b).....	1,10,17
RAP 13.4(b).....	1,17

A. IDENTITY OF RESPONDENT

The Respondent is the State of Washington.

B. COURT OF APPEALS DECISIONS

At issue is the unpublished court of appeals decision filed on February 3, 2015 in Division Three of the Court of Appeals.

C. ISSUE PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

1. Does the unpublished court of appeals decision meet the criteria for review under RAP 13.4(b)?

D. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Erik Carrasco was charged with second degree murder, five counts of second degree assault, and second degree unlawful possession of a firearm. Two gang-related sentencing aggravators were also alleged. The charges stem from the following facts:

Five documented Vario Sureño Loco (VSL) gang members and associates were driving around in rival Norteño territory in Yakima. After an exchange of words, Carrasco, a self-admitted Norteño gang member shot at the Sureños, killing one of them and injuring another. Carrasco gave a statement to detectives in which he explained that the reason he shot at them had to do with them being Sureños.

During pretrial hearings, the court considered the State's proposed 404(b) evidence and admitted it after a proper balancing of probative

value versus prejudice was done on the record. Trial commenced and witnesses testified that after an exchange of words between Carrasco and a group of five Sureño gang members, Carrasco ran down the street and opened fire at the Sureños as they drove away from him. One male was hit in the back of the head and killed and another was hit in the arm. No one saw any of the Sureños display a weapon. Afterwards, Carrasco bragged to an associate that he was happy about earning his first stripe by killing a Sureño. (3 RP 195, 198). In a jail phone call, Carrasco had a “green light” put on a witness in hopes that they would not testify.

Carrasco testified at trial that the Sureños yelled out their gang name and “fuck you, fuck your hood.” (6 RP 538). He testified that this behavior is disrespectful to a Norteño gang member and would make a Norteño really angry. (6 RP 538). He said that the Sureños knew what part of Yakima they were in and what they were getting themselves into. (6 RP 540). He testified that respect within the gang is “pretty important” and that when someone disrespects you, action needs to be taken. (6 RP 540-41).

He claimed self-defense but the jury rejected that claim and he was found guilty of second degree murder, four counts of first degree assault and unlawful possession of a firearm in the second degree. (CP 311-321). The jury also returned special verdicts for counts 1-5 for being armed with

a firearm along with special verdicts for counts 1-6 for two gang-related aggravating factors. (CP 322-338).

He appealed and the Court of Appeals upheld his convictions and sentence. Carrasco filed a petition for review.

E. ARGUMENT WHY REVIEW SHOULD BE DENIED

1. The Court of Appeals correctly found that the trial court did not err by admitting gang evidence.

Evidence of gang affiliation is admissible as evidence of other crimes or bad acts under ER 404(b) as proof of motive and intent. See State v. Yarbrough, 151 Wn. App. 66, 210 P.3d 1029 (2009) (gang evidence admissible as to motive); State v. Boot, 89 Wn. App. 780, 788-90, 950 P.2d 964 (1998) (admissible as to motive, premeditation); State v. Campbell, 78 Wn. App. 813, 821, 901 P.2d 1050 (1995) (premeditation, motive, and intent).

In applying ER 404(b), a trial court is required to engage in a three-step analysis: (1) determine the purpose for which the evidence is offered; (2) determine the relevance of the evidence; (3) balance on the record the probative value of the evidence against the prejudicial effect. Campbell, 78 Wn. App. at 821 (citing State v. Dennison, 115 Wn.2d 609, 628, 801 P.2d 193 (1990)). Relevant evidence is “evidence having any

tendency to make the existence of any fact that is of consequence to the determination of the action more probable or less probable than it would be without the evidence.” ER 401. The trial court does not have to conduct a hearing to take testimony. State v. Kilgore, 147 Wn.2d 288, 292, 53 P.3d 974 (2002).

An appellate court will review a trial court’s ER 404(b) for abuse of discretion. Id. A trial court abuses its discretion when its decision is manifestly unreasonable or based on untenable grounds or reasons. State v. Powell, 126 Wn.2d 244, 258, 893 P.2d 615 (1995).

In State v. Campbell, the Court of Appeals affirmed the trial court’s conclusion that gang evidence was highly probative of the State’s theory and provided a motive for Campbell’s actions, namely that Campbell was a gang member who responded with violence to challenges to his status. 78 Wn. App. at 822. Likewise, in State v. Boot, 89 Wn. App. 780, 789-90, the court held that the admission of gang evidence that was probative of motive was not an abuse of discretion. Admission of gang-related evidence was affirmed as well in State v. Yarbrough, 151 Wn. App. 66, 81, where the evidence was relevant to prove the defendant’s motive and mental state with respect to a charge of first degree murder. As illustrated by these cases, courts have regularly admitted gang affiliation evidence to establish the motive for a crime. In

each instance, there was a connection between the gang's purposes or values and the offense committed.

In this case, prior to trial, and outside the presence of the jury, the State made a lengthy and detailed offer of proof that consisted of both a verbal and written offer of proof. The State made a verbal offer of proof on the record, (2 RP 92-94), and in the State's Supplemental Motions in Limine; Trial Memorandum, (CP 121-148). The written offer of proof including the following testimony from witness Ricardo Vasquez:

Mr. Vasquez will testify that the Defendant bragged about earning his first stripe because of this shooting. Mr. Vasquez will testify that in the gang culture, a stripe earns someone great respect within the gang and that shooting a rival gang member earns the highest form of respect within the gang. He will also testify that if a gang member is disrespected by a rival gang member, that he has to retaliate or his reputation will suffer within the gang.

(CP 121-148). The State indicated that Detective Shaw would testify as a gang expert as well to those facts. (CP 121-148).

The State also outlined a list of additional facts that would be elicited at trial pertaining to Carrasco's gang-related motive to shoot at the Sureños:

1. Five documented VSL, Vario Sureño Loco, gang members/associates were driving around in rival territory in the victim vehicle. They were way out of their territory and Mr. Baldomero Camacho admitted to YPD Sgt. Cortez that they had driven into the area looking for trouble or problems. He and Mr. Lopez says that they even stopped at a market in the rival territory to take pictures of themselves in the rival territory. Baldomero stated that they yelled at several Norteños in the rival gang territory and there was an exchange of words just prior to a Norteño gang member brandishing a gun. Mr. Lopez also admitted that there was a verbal altercation with rival gang members immediately prior to the shooting.
2. Several subjects standing in front of a known Norteño gang house reported that the occupants of the victim vehicle yelled something about Sureños prior to the gun shots being heard. Subjects also reported a beer can being thrown out of the victim vehicle towards the Defendant.
3. The deceased victim went by "Baby Puppet" or "Plex" and the others vehicle occupants went by the names of Lil' Spider, Downer, Casper, and Listo.
4. The Defendant is a documented and self-admitted La Raza gang member, a rival gang to the Sureño gang. His tag name is "Hate." He disposed of the gun with another La Raza gang member, "Lil' Silent." He confessed to a La Raza gang member, Mr. Vasquez.
5. At the time of the shooting, witnesses described the Defendant as wearing a red belt or bandana, a Norteño color.

6. The Defendant in his verbal interview with police, is asked “Why did you shoot?” and eventually admits that he felt a threat. The Defendant’s explanation for why he shot has to do with the fact that the victims were Sureños. He said that they “drove by and threatened us with that they were gonna shoot ‘em them at us.” When asked what they (the victims) say, he replies, “Oh, they’re like Sureños, VSL gang. I’m like what the fuck? Last time you guys ducked and that’s when the fires, that’s when the guns went off and...”
7. A search of the Defendant’s room revealed gang-related letters.
8. Expert gang testimony will be relevant to explain why witnesses are not cooperating, are minimizing, or recanting. The no-snitch policy is highly relevant to explain witness behavior in this case.
9. Expert gang testimony will be relevant to explain territories and to explain when gang members retaliate and why.
10. Expert gang testimony will explain the principle of respect and what constitutes disrespect to a gang member.
11. Expert gang testimony will explain the significance of colors to the gang, and explain the significance of a red belt or bandana.
12. Expert gang testimony will be relevant to explain the term “Green light” which was used by the Defendant in a jail phone call.
13. The Defendant signed his letter to Eva Montes de Oca under the words “Ene Soldado” which means “Northern Soldier” in English. This letter contains a confession to the crime. Expert testimony will explain that by signing his name under Ene Soldado,

he is pledging himself to being a Norteño gang member.

(CP 121-148).

In deciding whether a nexus exists between the crime alleged and gang affiliations, the trial court also considered the transcript of Carrasco's verbal interview with police, Exhibit 22, and his written statement that he gave to Detective Shaw, Exhibit 24. (1 RP 87).

Carrasco brought up the issue of gang affiliation in his own written statement to Detective Shaw where he said he saw a car drive past him with 2 people in it and said that they looked like "rival gang members." (Exhibit 24). He said, "so with this, it got me a little more cautious." (Id.). In his interview with the detective, he initially denied firing any shots at the Sureños. But later on, when the detective asked him what they (the persons in the other car) said to him, he replied:

"Oh, they're like Sureños, VSL gang. I'm like what the fuck. Last time you guys ducked and that's when the fires, that's when the guns went off and."

(CP 121-148).

After considering the State's offer of proof and Carrasco's verbal and written statements, the trial court found that the State's proposed gang evidence was relevant to motive and intent. In fact, the trial court stated that the evidence is "critical, essential and undeniably probative on the

issues of motive and intent.” (2 RP 95). The court found that “you can’t excise the gang evidence and testimony from the circumstances of this particular homicide.” (Id.). The homicide was “motivated by the animosity between the two” gangs. (Id.).

A weighing was done on the record of the probative versus the prejudicial effect of the evidence. The trial court noted that the evidence “has some obviously prejudicial effect” because of the strong probative value of the evidence and the fact that it “permeates this particular event.” (Id.). The court found that the “probative value *significantly* outweighs any prejudicial effect.” (Id.) (emphasis added).

Here, there is a strong connection between Carrasco’s gang affiliation and the offense, making gang-related evidence highly relevant to the case. It would be impossible to try this case without reference to the Carrasco’s gang, a Norteño gang, and the victims’ gang, a Sureño gang. The State’s theory at trial was that Carrasco shot at the victims in this case because they were rival gang members in his territory—in essence, that Carrasco was defending his “turf.” The State’s theory was supported by the proffer and Carrasco’s very own statements. The victims were rival Sureño gang members or associates driving in a Norteño neighborhood.

The Sureños exchanged words with the Norteños just prior to the shooting. (CP 121-148, Exhibit 22).

In Carrasco's interview with Detective Shaw, he said prior to the shooting, that the car's occupants said, "Sureños, VSL gang." (Exhibit 22). Based on the names being yelled out in rival territory, there was an undeniable gang-related motive for Carrasco to shoot at the victims in this case. He was disrespected by rival gang members who were in his territory looking for trouble. As a result of the disrespect, he had to retaliate in order to maintain his reputation with the gang. He retaliated by shooting them, which earned him his first "stripe," a badge of honor within the gang that he was proud of and bragged about to his fellow gang member, Vasquez.

Given the law dealing with 404(b) gang evidence, this type of evidence was clearly admissible at trial. This evidence directly supported the State's case theory and was the basis for moving for the admission of this information. The State had the right and requirement to introduce information regarding Carrasco's motive and intent. This evidence also directly rebutted his self-defense claim.

Carrasco claims that the State did not need gang evidence to prove its case. This ignores the statements made by Carrasco himself, and the eye-witnesses who testified about the shooting. These facts alone are

overwhelming. The gang-related evidence, as indicated above, did not convict Carrasco, it did however allow the jury to consider the fact that this was not a crime of self-defense but a shooting motivated by the Carrasco's gang affiliation and his need to protect his Norteño neighborhood from being "disrespected" by rival gang members. It was also motivated by his desire to earn his first "stripe," which allows him to move up in the gang.

The trial court did not allow nor did the State attempt to elicit some generalized information about gangs and the overall aspect of that subculture. The evidence admitted was narrowly tailored to the facts of the case. It was specific information that could only be explained to a lay jury through expert testimony and witnesses who could explain this culture and the actions that would motivate Carrasco to commit this crime.

This is not a case where the trial was replete with hours of extensive or duplicative testimony that this was a gang-motivated killing. It was a portion of the trial, however it was not the continuous theme of the trial. This was a gang-motivated crime. There is no other way to describe what occurred. Carrasco's own statements acknowledged that this case was interwoven with gang motives. To present this case without the use of this gang information would have been the equivalent of the parties presenting a lie to the jury. The reality is that in the gang culture,

disrespect requires action or retaliation, often involving violent behavior. This is not a belief within the knowledge of your typical, law-abiding juror. To present this case without any information coming in about the gang affiliations and gang territories would be like trying a domestic violence case without explaining the domestic relationship between the parties.

The State's lengthy proffer was considered, along with Carrasco's own statements, thereby allowing the trial court to come to the correct decision that the testimony about gangs was admissible. The jury was then charged with listening and considering all of the evidence, direct and circumstantial, and handing down a just verdict based on the totality of that information. And that is precisely what they did in this case.

Carrasco claims in his petition for review that the admission of gang evidence violates his First Amendment Right to Association. This was not argued at the Court of Appeals and is being raised for the first time in his petition for review. As such, it should be denied as it was never raised below.

Nonetheless, the issue of gang evidence and the First Amendment right to association was dealt with in State v. Campbell:

Campbell's argument that the gang testimony infringed on his First Amendment

right to association is also without merit. The First Amendment does not erect an absolute bar to the admission of associational evidence. Dawson v. Delaware, 503 U.S. 159, 164-67, 117 L. Ed. 2d 309, 112 S. Ct. 1093 (1992). Association evidence is only inadmissible when it proves nothing more than a defendant's abstract beliefs. Dawson, 503 U.S. at 164-67. This evidence is admissible when relevant to an issue in a case. See Dawson, 503 U.S. at 164-67; United States v. Robinson, 978 F.2d 1554, 1565 (10th Cir. 1992), cert. denied, 113 S. Ct. 2938 (1993). As discussed above, evidence of Campbell's gang affiliation was relevant to show motive. Thus, its admission did not violate Campbell's First Amendment rights.

78 Wn. App. 813, 822-823, 901 P.2d 1050 (1995). Here, there was no violation of Carrasco's First Amendment right to association. The evidence of his gang affiliation was highly relevant and properly admitted by the trial court.

2. The Court of Appeals correctly held that a reasonable juror could find that the State disproved self-defense beyond a reasonable doubt.

A challenge to the sufficiency of the evidence is ordinarily reviewed for substantial evidence. State v. Fiser, 99 Wn. App. 714, 718, 995 P.2d 107 (2000). Substantial evidence is evidence sufficient to persuade a fair-minded, rational person that a finding is true. State v.

Stevenson, 128 Wn. App. 179, 193, 114 P.3d 699 (2005). In a review for substantial evidence, an appellate court views all evidence and reasonable inferences in a light most favorable to the State. State v. Thomas, 150 Wn.2d 821, 874, 83 P.3d 970 (2004) (quoting State v. Salinas, 119 Wn.2d 192, 201, 829 P.2d 1068 (1992)). Credibility determinations are not subject to review. State v. Camarillo, 115 Wn.2d 60, 71, 794 P.2d 850 (1990). The appellate court defers to the trier of fact on issues of conflicting testimony, witness credibility, and overall weight of the evidence. Thomas, 150 Wn.2d at 874-75.

Evidence is sufficient to support a conviction if, viewed in the light most favorable to the prosecution, it permits any rational trier of fact to find the essential elements of the crime beyond a reasonable doubt. State v. Salinas, 119 Wn.2d 192, 201, 829 P.2d 1068 (1992). “A claim of insufficiency admits the truth of the State’s evidence and all inferences that reasonably can be drawn therefrom.” Id. In reviewing the sufficiency of the evidence, an appellate court need not be convinced of guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, but must determine only whether substantial evidence supports the State’s case. State v. Galisia, 63 Wn. App. 833, 838, 822 P.2d 303 (1992).

Here, there was substantial evidence to support all of the elements of the crimes charged. On appeal, Carrasco claimed that the State did

nothing to disprove self-defense beyond a reasonable doubt. As support for his self-defense argument, Carrasco's main claim is that he saw what he thought was a pistol prior to his shooting at the victims. However, on cross-examination, he fully admitted that he didn't know if what he saw was a gun:

- Q: You don't know if it was a gun, do you?
A: I don't know if it was a gun.
Q: What did you see exactly?
A: A shine
...
Q: So you had no idea whether this was a gun or not, did you?
A: I did not have no idea.
Q: So it could have been a beer can?
A: It could have been another beer can.

(6 RP 546).

Later during cross-examination, Carrasco was asked again about the gun and whether there were any threats made:

- Q: On that date, no one ever pointed a gun at you, did they?
A: Not to my recollection.
Q: No one said they were going to kill you or made threats they were going to kill you, did they?
A: Nobody did.

(6 RP 549). And again, Carrasco admitted the following on re-cross:

- Q: You had no reason to believe that the shiny object was a gun, did you?
A: No.

(6 RP 554-555).

Based on this evidence, Carrasco's testimony consisted of him getting hit with a beer can by rival gang members, seeing a shiny object in the car, and then opening fire into the vehicle while chasing it down the road. Not a single witness saw a gun in the victim's vehicle. Even Carrasco's own gang associate, Ricardo Vasquez, testified that Carrasco shot into the car but that there was no weapon displayed by the victims. (3 RP 188-192). Carrasco's many conflicting versions of what happened, his fleeing the scene of the crime and disposing of the murder weapon, and his placing a "green light" on witnesses so they don't testify support the reasonable inference that this was not a case of self-defense.

While the jury was instructed on self-defense, there was very little to support a jury instruction on self-defense, given Carrasco's concessions on cross-examination. It was entirely proper for the jury to discount his self-defense claim given his testimony and all of the evidence to the contrary of his claim. As such, there was substantial evidence to support the jury's verdict and the Court of Appeals correctly held that a reasonable juror could find that the State met its burden of disproving self-defense beyond a reasonable doubt.

F. CONCLUSION

The decision at hand does not meet any of the criteria in RAP 13.4(b). First of all, the decision is not in conflict with a decision of the Supreme Court or another decision of the Court of Appeals. Second, a significant question of law under the Constitution of the State of Washington or of the United States is not involved. Lastly, the petition does not involve an issue of substantial public interest that should be determined by the Supreme Court.

The trial court made a well reasoned decision with regard to the 404(b) evidence. There was also sufficient evidence to support the crimes Carrasco was convicted of and the aggravating factors that were found by the jury. As such, his petition for review should be denied.

Respectfully submitted this 2nd day of April 2015,


TAMARA A. HANLON, WSBA # 28345
Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
Yakima County, Washington

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

I, Tamara A. Hanlon, state that on April 2, 2015, by agreement of the parties, I emailed a copy of STATE'S ANSWER TO PETITION FOR REVIEW to Mr. Kenneth H. Kato at khkato@comcast.net.

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

DATED this 2nd day of April, 2015 at Yakima, Washington.



TAMARA A. HANLON, WSBA
#28345
Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
Yakima County, Washington
128 N. Second Street, Room 329
Yakima, WA 98901
Telephone: (509) 574-1210
Fax: (509) 574-1211
tamara.hanlon@co.yakima.wa.us

OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK

To: Tamara Hanlon
Cc: Kenneth H. Kato
Subject: RE: State v. Erik Ramos Carrasco 913943

Rec'd 4/2/15

From: Tamara Hanlon [mailto:Tamara.Hanlon@co.yakima.wa.us]
Sent: Thursday, April 02, 2015 1:44 PM
To: OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK
Cc: Kenneth H. Kato
Subject: State v. Erik Ramos Carrasco 913943

Attached for filing is the State's Answer to Petition for Review.

- case name: State of Washington v. Erik Ramos Carrasco
- case number: 913943

Sincerely,

Tamara A. Hanlon
Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
Appellate Unit
Yakima County Prosecuting Attorney's Office
(509)574-1210
WSBA 28345
Tamara.hanlon@co.yakima.wa.us