

RECEIVED  
SUPREME COURT  
STATE OF WASHINGTON  
CLERK'S OFFICE

Apr 28, 2016, 8:25 am

RECEIVED ELECTRONICALLY

S. Ct. No. 93051-1  
COA No. 31997-1-III

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

---

STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Respondent,

v.

ALAN ROSS HACKNEY,

Petitioner.

---

PETITION FOR REVIEW

---

Kenneth H. Kato, WSBA # 6400  
Attorney for Petitioner  
1020 N. Washington St.  
Spokane, WA 99201  
(509) 220-2237

 ORIGINAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. IDENTITY OF PETITIONER.....1

B. COURT OF APPEALS DECISION.....1

C. ISSUE PRESENTED FOR REVIEW.....1

    1. Was the State's evidence insufficient to support  
    the conviction for second degree assault of a child?.....1

D. STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....1

E. ARGUMENT WHY REVIEW SHOULD BE ACCEPTED.....6

F. CONCLUSION.....9

Table of Cases

*In re Winship*, 397 U.S. 358, 90 S. Ct. 1068,  
25 L. Ed.2d 368 (1970).....9

*Jackson v. Virginia*, 443 U.S. 307, 99 S. Ct. 2781,  
61 L. Ed.2d 560 (1979).....7

*State v. Carver*, 113 Wn.2d 591, 781 P.2d 1308 (1989).....8

*State v. Drum*, 168 Wn.2d 23, 225 P.3d 237 (2010).....7

*State v. Green*, 94 Wn.2d 216, 616 P.2d 628 (1980).....7, 8

*State v. Hutton*, 7 Wn. App. 726, 502 P.2d 1037 (1972).....7, 9

*State v. Peterson*, 73 Wn.2d 303, 438 P.2d 183 (1968).....9

Statute

RCW 9A.08.010(1)(a).....8

RCW 9A.36.021(1)(a).....7

RCW 9A.36.130.....7

Rules

RAP 13.4(b)(1).....7, 9

RAP 13.4(b)(2).....7, 9

RAP 13.4(b)(3).....7, 9

A. IDENTITY OF PETITIONER

Petitioner Alan Ross Hackney asks this Court to accept review of the Court of Appeals' decision terminating review designated in Part B of this petition.

B. COURT OF APPEALS DECISION

Petitioner seeks review of the unpublished decision of the Court of Appeals, filed on January 12, 2016. A copy of the decision is in the Appendix at pages A-1 through A-14.

C. ISSUE PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

1. Was the State's evidence insufficient to support the conviction for second degree assault of a child?

D. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Mr. Hackney was charged by information with one count of second degree assault of a child. (CP 6). The charge arose from a skull fracture suffered by his daughter, SH, when he dropped her on the floor. (CP 3). He voluntarily gave a statement to Detective Marcus Goodwater concerning the incident. (CP 56). Because the defense strategy was to have the statement admitted at trial and to contest its interpretation, no motion to suppress was made. (9/13/13 RP 31-32). The case proceeded to jury trial.

Robyn Herald is the mother of SH, who was born December 5, 2012. (9/17/13 RP 35). Mr. Hackney is the father. (*Id.* at 36). On January 3, 2013, SH was grumpy and possibly had a urinary tract infection. (*Id.* at 40). She needed to go to the hospital. (*Id.* at 45). When it was determined SH had a skull fracture, Mr. Hackney first told Ms. Herald that he had accidentally dropped the baby from about a foot off the floor. (*Id.* at 47). Ms. Herald said he later told her he had dropped SH from higher when he was standing up. (*Id.*). She said he had accidentally dropped SH on her head. (*Id.* at 52). SH had no bruises prior to January 4, 2013. (*Id.* at 54).

Doctor Karina Dierks, a pediatric hospitalist at Sacred Heart in Spokane, testified SH had a bilateral skull fracture. (9/17/13 RP 58-59). The doctor did not think it happened by SH's hitting her head on the changing table. (*Id.* at 71). She generally saw this type of injury in non-accidental trauma cases. (*Id.* at 72). Doctor Dierks did note the neurosurgeon, Dr. Gruber, said neither the skull fracture nor the intracranial bleed was significant. (*Id.* at 74-75).

Acting on a contact with CPS, Detective Goodwater was assigned to investigate the case on January 7, 2013. (9/17/13 RP 84-85). He asked Mr. Hackney to come to the police station and

talk with him. (*Id.* at 87). The jury watched the video of the interview. A transcript of the interview was later entered into the record. (CP 56).

Right after the interview on January 7, 2013, Detective Goodwater contacted Sacred Heart to let them know Mr. Hackney had attempted to reposition part of SH's skull, thus causing bruising. (9/18/13 RP 96). The detective wrote in his summary of the narrative police report that Mr. Hackney "threw [SH] hard to the floor." (*Id.* at 107). Throughout the interview, Detective Goodwater made it clear through his questioning that he believed this was no accident. (*Id.* at 109). On page 4 of the certificate of probable cause, he wrote that Mr. Hackney had lost control over his frustration and threw SH hard to the floor. (*Id.* at 110-11). But as it turned out, Detective Goodwater clarified that Mr. Hackney said no such thing, but had nodded in what he felt was agreement with his characterization of the incident. (*Id.* at 111).

James Hatley, a CPS investigator, got a referral from the doctors at Walla Walla Hospital about SH. (9/18/13 RP 164). He testified Mr. Hackney confessed in a phone call to him. (*Id.* at 182).

Dr. Michelle Messer, a Sacred Heart pediatric hospitalist and child abuse specialist, evaluated SH on January 6, 2013. (9/18/13

RP 191, 195). She said a baby SH's age could not injure herself. (*Id.* at 202). It took significant force to cause a skull fracture. (*Id.* at 203). Dr. Messer testified the story did not fit the injury. (*Id.*). She also said it took significant force to cause the bruises on SH's head. (*Id.* at 221).

After the State rested, the defense moved to dismiss. (9/18/13 RP 227). The court denied the motion without prejudice. (*Id.* at 236-37).

Mr. Hackney testified in his own defense. After the baby was born, he lived with SH, Ms. Herald, and her mother at the mother's house. (9/18/13 RP 239, 244). Both he and Ms. Herald took care of SH, but he was working and she was not, so she did most of the parenting. (*Id.* at 245). Mr. Hackney fed and changed SH and got up with her at night. (*Id.* at 246).

Mr. Hackney said he was swaddling SH when he lost his balance, fell to the floor, and she hit the ground on top of her head. (9/18/13 RP 257). Mr. Hackney did not intentionally drop SH and did not throw her to the ground. (*Id.* at 258). He saw something on her head that did not look right so he tried to fix it. (*Id.* at 258-59). Looking back, he should have taken her to the doctor. (*Id.* at 262).

SH later was more fussy than normal and her head was swelling. (*Id.* at 264-65). They went to the hospital. (*Id.* at 265).

From Walla Walla General, SH went to Sacred Heart fairly quickly. (9/18/13 RP 266-67). The doctors were questioning the cause of the injury and Mr. Hackney kept quiet. (*Id.* at 269). SH had a bilateral skull fracture to the back of her head. (*Id.* at 269). Mr. Hackney told Ms. Herald, Mr. Hatley, and then Detective Goodwater that he accidentally dropped SH to the floor and it was not intentional. (*Id.* at 273-74, 277).

Dr. Toomas Eisler, a neurologist, testified the force that caused the fracture to SH was insufficient to cause bleeding and damage to the brain itself. (9/18/13 RP 311). Dr. Eisler opined the force was equal to dropping the baby from one meter off the floor. (*Id.* at 314). And there was no evidence of collateral damage. (*Id.*). In his report, the doctor stated:

Your question was: what type of force could have produced the injury to [SH]?

On a more probable than not basis the medical record findings of injury are consistent with a force associated with dropping of a one month infant onto the vertex of her head. The opinion is supported by the finding of only fractured skull bones which require minimal force in a one month old infant.

On a more probable than not basis the medical record findings of injury are inconsistent with the force associated with the act of throwing an infant against the floor or other object. This opinion is supported by the absence of any fractures, other than skull bone fractures, to suggest significant force involved in the head injury to [SH] on January 4, 2013. (CP 40).

During deliberations, the jury sent a note asking to see the video of the interview conducted by Detective Goodwater and for a transcript of the trial. With agreement of the parties, the court allowed one viewing of the video and told the jury it would not get a transcript and to rely on their memory. (CP 193). The jury convicted Mr. Hackney of second degree assault of a child with a finding of domestic violence by special verdict. (CP 195, 196). The court sentenced Mr. Hackney to a standard range sentence and stayed it pending appeal. (CP 224).

The conviction was affirmed by the Court of Appeals in an unpublished decision filed on January 12, 2016. His motion for reconsideration was denied on March 29, 2016.

#### E. ARGUMENT WHY REVIEW SHOULD BE ACCEPTED

This case should be accepted for review under RAP 13.4(b)(1) and (2) because the decision of the Court of Appeals

conflicts with decisions of the Supreme Court and the Court of Appeals. Moreover, a significant question of constitutional law is involved, thus warranting review under RAP 13.4(b)(3).

In a challenge to the sufficiency of the evidence, the test is whether, viewing it in a light most favorable to the State, any rational trier of fact could find the essential elements of the crime beyond a reasonable doubt. *State v. Green*, 94 Wn.2d 216, 220-21, 616 P.2d 628 (1980). A claim of insufficient evidence admits the truth of the State's evidence and all reasonable inferences from it. *State v. Drum*, 168 Wn.2d 23, 25, 225 P.3d 237 (2010). The State must provide sufficient evidence to prove each element of the charged offense beyond a reasonable doubt. *Jackson v. Virginia*, 443 U.S. 307, 316, 99 S. Ct. 2781, 61 L. Ed.2d 560 (1979).

A defendant commits second degree assault of a child when he commits the crime of second degree assault on a victim who is less than 13 years old. RCW 9A.36.130. Second degree assault is committed when a person "[i]ntentionally assaults another and thereby recklessly inflicts substantial bodily harm." RCW 9A.36.021(1)(a). The challenge here is to the element of intent. A criminal assault requires intent, defined as acting "with the objective

or purpose to accomplish a result which constitutes a crime.” RCW 9A.08.010(1)(a).

The Court of Appeals viewed Mr. Hackney’s sufficiency challenge as urging the court to reweigh the evidence and make credibility determinations. But he did not ask the court to do what it cannot. *State v. Carver*, 113 Wn.2d 591, 604, 781 P.2d 1308 (1989). Rather, even when viewed in a light most favorable to the State, the evidence did not establish intent beyond a reasonable doubt. *State v. Green*, 94 Wn.2d 216, 221, 616 P.2d 628 (1980).

The State’s evidence did not prove beyond a reasonable doubt the intent element of the crime. Questions of credibility are determined by the trier of fact, but the existence of facts cannot be based on guess, speculation, or conjecture. *State v. Hutton*, 7 Wn. App. 726, 728, 502 P.2d 1037 (1972). The existence of facts purportedly establishing the element of intent here was based on just that. Indeed, the court’s opinion stated:

The State’s direct evidence of Mr. Hackney’s intent was the interview with Detective Goodwater, in which Mr. Hackney nodded when Detective Goodwater accused him of intentionally dropping S.H. (Op. at 11).

The nod was simply an acknowledgment by Mr. Hackney that he heard what the detective was saying. Moreover, his other


statements in the interview were consistent with his accidentally dropping SH. (See, e.g., CP 114). An accident is not intent. See *State v. Peterson*, 73 Wn.2d 303, 305-06, 438 P.2d 183 (1968). There was no evidence, direct or circumstantial, that Mr. Hackney “intended the *assault*, i.e., the drop, and was reckless as to the resulting harm.” (Op. at 12, italics in original). The jury’s determination to the contrary was not based on sufficient facts provided by the State, but was improperly grounded in guess, speculation, and conjecture. *Hutton, supra*.

The Court of Appeals decision conflicts with the rules established by appellate court decisions governing challenges to the sufficiency of the evidence, thus warranting review under RAP 13.4(b)(1), (2). The State was relieved of constitutional burden to prove every element of the offense. *In re Winship*, 397 U.S. 358, 364, 90 S. Ct. 1068, 25 L. Ed.2d 368 (1970). This court should also accept review under RAP 13.4(b)(3).

#### F. CONCLUSION


Based on the foregoing facts and authorities, Mr. Hackney respectfully urges this Court to grant his petition for review and reverse the conviction.

DATED this 28<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2016.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Kenneth H. Kato, WSBA # 6400  
Attorney for Petitioner  
1020 N. Washington St.  
Spokane, WA 99201  
(509) 220-2237

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on April 28, 2016, I served a copy of the petition for review by USPS on Alan R. Hackney, 319 S. Mill St., Milton-Freewater, OR 97862; and by email, as agreed by counsel, on Teresa Chen at [tchen@co.franklin.wa.us](mailto:tchen@co.franklin.wa.us).

  
\_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX

Renee S. Townsley  
Clerk/Administrator

(509) 456-3082  
TDD #1-800-833-6388

*The Court of Appeals  
of the  
State of Washington  
Division III*



500 N Cedar ST  
Spokane, WA 99201-1905

Fax (509) 456-4288  
<http://www.courts.wa.gov/courts>

January 12, 2016

Kenneth H Kato  
Attorney at Law  
1020 N Washington St  
Spokane, WA 99201-2237  
khkato@comcast.net

Teresa Jeanne Chen  
Attorney at Law  
PO Box 5889  
Pasco, WA 99302-5801  
tchen@co.franklin.wa.us

**E-mail**

James Lyle Nagle  
Office of the Pros Attorney  
240 W Alder St Ste 201  
Walla Walla, WA 99362-2807

CASE # 319971  
State of Washington v. Alan Ross Hackney  
WALLA WALLA CO SUPERIOR COURT No. 131000391

**Counsel:**

Enclosed please find a copy of the opinion filed by the Court today. A party need not file a motion for reconsideration as a prerequisite to discretionary review by the Supreme Court. RAP 13.3(b); 13.4(a). If a motion for reconsideration is filed, it should state with particularity the points of law or fact which the moving party contends the court has overlooked or misapprehended, together with a brief argument on the points raised. RAP 12.4(c). Motions for reconsideration which merely reargue the case should not be filed.

Motions for reconsideration, if any, must be filed within twenty (20) days after the filing of the opinion. Please file an original and two copies of the motion. If no motion for reconsideration is filed, any petition for review to the Supreme Court must be filed in this court within thirty (30) days after the filing of this opinion (may be filed by electronic facsimile transmission). The motion for reconsideration and petition for review must be received (not mailed) on or before the dates they are due. RAP 18.5(c).

Sincerely,

Renee S. Townsley  
Clerk/Administrator

RST:pb  
Enc.

c: **E-mail** Hon. John Lohrmann

c: Alan Ross Hackney  
319 S Mill St.  
Milton Freewater, OR 97862

**FILED**  
**Jan. 12, 2016**  
In the Office of the Clerk of Court  
WA State Court of Appeals, Division III

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON  
DIVISION THREE

STATE OF WASHINGTON,	)	No. 31997-1-III
	)	
Respondent,	)	
	)	
v.	)	UNPUBLISHED OPINION
	)	
ALAN ROSS HACKNEY,	)	
	)	
Appellant.	)	

LAWRENCE-BERREY, J. — Alan Hackney appeals his conviction for assault of a child in the second degree. He argues the State failed to present sufficient evidence to sustain the intent element of his assault conviction. We disagree and affirm.

FACTS

In December 2012, 20-year-old Alan Hackney and 18-year-old Robin Herald had a daughter, S.H., after having dated for several years. The family lived with Ms. Herald's mother. In early January 2013, S.H. had thrush, a urinary tract infection, and a fever. Consequently, S.H. was sleeping poorly and would wake up screaming in the middle of the night.

The night of January 3, 2013, Ms. Herald slept downstairs with S.H. to avoid disturbing her mother and Mr. Hackney, who both worked the next morning. At roughly 5:30 a.m. on January 4, Ms. Herald went and asked Mr. Hackney to help her care for S.H. Mr. Hackney cared for S.H., and Ms. Herald went upstairs to her bedroom and went to sleep. Ms. Herald awoke at 9:00 a.m. and “heard a very different cry.” Report of Proceedings (RP) at 43. Ms. Herald looked down the stairs and asked Mr. Hackney if everything was all right, and Mr. Hackney said S.H. was crying, she would not take a bottle, and her head was swollen. S.H. also had four oval-shaped bruises on her forehead, two oval-shaped bruises on her arm, and red petechial bruising on her neck.<sup>1</sup> Ms. Herald asked Mr. Hackney if he did something to S.H. Mr. Hackney denied harming S.H.

Ms. Herald and Mr. Hackney took S.H. to Walla Walla General Hospital, where Dr. Elizabeth McMurtry, the emergency room physician, examined her. Dr. McMurtry ordered a computerized tomography (CT) scan of S.H.’s head, which revealed two fractures on the sides of her skull. The CT scan also revealed a small subdural hematoma—a pocket of blood—on S.H.’s skull. Dr. McMurtry asked Ms. Herald and Mr. Hackney how S.H.’s injuries occurred. Ms. Herald did not know, so she told Dr. McMurtry that S.H. could have possibly hit her head on the back of her changing table.

---

<sup>1</sup> Petechial bruising looks like point red dots on the skin and is typically caused by

Mr. Hackney told Dr. McMurtry that he did not know how S.H.'s injuries occurred. Dr. McMurtry made a referral to Child Protective Services (CPS), and CPS investigator James Hatley went to Walla Walla General to investigate S.H.'s injuries. Ms. Herald and Mr. Hackney both told Mr. Hatley they did not know how S.H.'s injuries occurred.

Walla Walla General transported S.H. in an ambulance to Sacred Heart Medical Center in Spokane. Dr. Ryan Baker admitted her at Sacred Heart that night. Dr. Karina Dierks examined her on January 5, and Dr. Michelle Messer—a pediatric hospitalist specializing in child abuse—examined her on January 6. In addition to the skull fractures and hematoma, Dr. Baker, Dr. Dierks, and Dr. Messer also noted S.H.'s forehead bruises, the petechial rash around her neck, a bruise inside her elbow, a bruise on the back of her arm, and swelling on her scalp. The doctors asked how S.H.'s injuries occurred, and Ms. Herald restated that S.H. could have hit her head on the changing table. Mr. Hackney maintained that he did not know. Dr. David Gruber, a neurosurgeon, reviewed S.H.'s CT scans and concluded surgery was unnecessary to repair her skull fractures.

While Ms. Herald was at Sacred Heart on January 6, Dr. Messer told Ms. Herald that the story about S.H. hitting her head on the changing table was inconsistent with S.H.'s injuries, and she was recommending that CPS place S.H. in foster care. Ms.

---

capillaries breaking when there is trauma to the tissue.

Herald then called Mr. Hackney, who had gone back to Walla Walla for work. Ms. Herald told Mr. Hackney that CPS and the doctors needed a better explanation for S.H.'s injuries. Mr. Hackney admitted to Ms. Herald that he tripped while holding S.H. and accidentally dropped her on her head from one foot above the floor.<sup>2</sup> Ms. Herald said, "Well, you need to tell somebody." RP at 273. Mr. Hackney then called Mr. Hatley and left him a voicemail. In the voicemail, Mr. Hackney admitted the story about S.H. hitting her head against the changing table was not true, that he had dropped S.H. about one foot, and that was how S.H.'s injuries occurred.

Mr. Hatley told Detective Marcus Goodwater about Mr. Hackney's voicemail. In light of this new information, Detective Goodwater called Mr. Hackney and asked him to come to the police station for an interview. Throughout the interview, Mr. Hackney acknowledged he dropped S.H. "hard," but maintained he dropped her accidentally. Clerk's Papers (CP) at 107. Mr. Hackney stated that after he fractured S.H.'s skull, he attempted to reposition the skull back into place with his hands and that is what caused the bruises in S.H.'s forehead. Eventually, Detective Goodwater accused Mr. Hackney of purposely dropping S.H. Detective Goodwater stated, "Just this one moment, just the lack of sleep, all this frustration of life came down on this one moment. Just the

---

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Hackney later told Ms. Herald that he dropped S.H. from a standing position.

mountain just came crushing down on you, and she just happened to be in your arm. . . . That's what happened." CP at 111-12. Mr. Hackney nodded his head during Detective Goodwater's accusation, but never verbally agreed that he intentionally dropped S.H. Several minutes later, Mr. Hackney said, "I can tell you that her dropping, yeah, I was frustrated, and I dropped her." CP at 114. Detective Goodwater interpreted Mr. Hackney's nod and subsequent statement as a confession that he had intentionally thrown S.H. to the floor and relayed this conclusion to the prosecuting attorney.

The State charged Mr. Hackney with second degree assault of a child and domestic violence. At trial, the three doctors the State called testified S.H. could not have sustained her injuries from hitting her head against her changing table because a one-month-old child cannot generate enough force from throwing his or her body around to fracture bone. Dr. Messer testified that the oval-shaped bruises on S.H.'s forehead and arms were fingerprints, and were "left with a forceful hold or grabbing fingers."<sup>3</sup> RP at 199.

---

<sup>3</sup> It was disputed at trial whether S.H.'s arm bruises existed before January 4—Ms. Herald testified S.H. did not have arm bruises before January 4, whereas Mr. Hackney testified S.H.'s arm bruises existed before January 4. Dr. Messer testified that it is impossible to date bruises. On review, this court assumes the truth of the State's evidence.

The State also questioned Dr. Dierks, Dr. Baker, and Dr. Messer about S.H.'s petechial bruising. Dr. Dierks testified that petechial bruising can occur on a child's face due to strenuous coughing or vomiting, but it is not typical to see a child S.H.'s age with petechial bruising under his or her neck, and this was a "red flag." RP at 79. Dr. Baker testified petechiae on a person's neck can be caused by either "[f]orceful vomiting or strangulation injuries," but that he had "never seen petechia [sic] on the neck in a 30-day old from vomiting." RP at 151-52. Dr. Messer testified coughing or vomiting could cause petechiae on the face or chest but would not cause petechial bruising that is "limited to the neck." RP at 200. Dr. Messer testified that petechiae in a baby's neck fold is "fairly common for a choke, pressure being placed in that area. So grabbing somebody by the neck will cause those marks in that area." RP at 200.

The State asked its witnesses whether S.H.'s injuries were more consistent with an accidental dropping or intentional abuse. Dr. Dierks testified she had seen skull fractures similar to S.H.'s in her practice and "in infants they are usually in non-accidental trauma cases." RP at 72. However, Dr. Dierks acknowledged she did not have any medical evidence to differentiate between a parent dropping a child on his or her head intentionally from three or four feet versus a parent accidentally dropping that child from the same distance. Dr. Baker similarly testified that a parent "accidentally bonk[ing]" his

or her child on something does not generate enough force to fracture the child's skull. RP at 150. Dr. Baker also acknowledged he could "not necessarily" tell whether a parent accidentally or intentionally dropped his or her child, but "this depends on any other injuries that you might note." RP at 154. To this end, Dr. Baker testified that the location of the petechiae on S.H.'s neck, combined with the skull fractures and the bruise, raised concerns that the petechiae were created nonaccidentally. The prosecutor asked Dr. Messer whether her analysis was affected by Mr. Hackney's explanation that he accidentally dropped S.H. In response, Dr. Messer testified:

[I]f you are standing with a baby and you accidentally drop the baby, and the baby lands on her head, you can fracture the skull that way. And you can get two fractures right where these fractures are that way. However, you don't get the bruising, you don't get the petechiae and you don't get the arm bruise and you tend not to get a subdural hematoma with that, either.

RP at 204. Mr. Hatley also testified that Mr. Hackney's explanation that he dropped S.H. from one foot off the floor "just did not seem consistent with the injuries up around her face, around her neck, her arms. And after consulting with the doctor was not consistent with the skull fracture." RP at 171.

Mr. Hackney testified at trial. He said that he woke up early in the morning on January 4 and heard S.H. crying. He went downstairs and saw S.H. in her car seat next to Ms. Herald, who was asleep on the couch, and he took S.H. upstairs to the changing room

without waking Ms. Herald. He changed S.H. on the changing table, but lost his balance as he was moving S.H. from the table to her blanket on the floor. He “put [his] hands out and [he] fell to the floor above [S.H.], and she hit the ground. And . . . she hit the top of her head.” RP at 257. Mr. Hackney then saw “a little bit of a plate of her head sticking out a little bit,” and “pressed on it.” RP at 259. After rocking S.H. back to sleep, Mr. Hackney took S.H. back downstairs, put her back in her car seat next to Ms. Herald, and then “acted like [he] never actually did anything in the night.” RP at 262. Mr. Hackney acknowledged he initially lied about how S.H.’s injuries occurred because he was “more worried about [him]self and getting [his] baby taken away from [him] at the time,” that he was not “thinking correctly,” and that he felt guilty about having lied. RP at 293, 295. Finally, Mr. Hackney testified that his head nod during his interview with Detective Goodwater was only an acknowledgement the detective made a statement and was not an affirmative response to the detective’s accusation: “My nod of the head means all I’m doing is acknowledging that you said something. It’s not that I’m agreeing with you. . . . I do that a lot.” RP at 278.

Dr. Toomas Eisler testified as an expert for the defense. Dr. Eisler reviewed S.H.’s medical records from both hospitals and concluded that

the force that caused the injury to [S.H.] was probably of about the strength of a dropping of a baby about a meter off the floor, on to the floor.

No. 31997-1-III  
*State v. Hackney*

There is no evidence of collateral damage . . . that would indicate a throwing or even a lobbing of the baby on to the floor.

RP at 314.

The jury convicted Mr. Hackney of second degree assault of a child and also found that the assault was an act of domestic violence. Mr. Hackney appeals.

#### ANALYSIS

1. *Standard of review*

In a criminal case, the State must provide sufficient evidence to prove each element of the charged offense beyond a reasonable doubt. *Jackson v. Virginia*, 443 U.S. 307, 316, 99 S. Ct. 2781, 61 L. Ed. 2d 560 (1979). When a defendant challenges the sufficiency of the evidence, the proper inquiry is “whether, after viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the State, any rational trier of fact could have found guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.” *State v. Salinas*, 119 Wn.2d 192, 201, 829 P.2d 1068 (1992). “[A]ll reasonable inferences from the evidence must be drawn in favor of the State and interpreted most strongly against the defendant.” *Id.* Furthermore, “[a] claim of insufficiency admits the truth of the State’s evidence and all inferences that reasonably can be drawn therefrom.” *Id.*

In a challenge to the sufficiency of the evidence, circumstantial evidence and direct evidence carry equal weight. *State v. Goodman*, 150 Wn.2d 774, 781, 83 P.3d 410

(2004). This court's role is not to reweigh the evidence and substitute its judgment for that of the jury. *State v. Green*, 94 Wn.2d 216, 221, 616 P.2d 628 (1980). Instead, because the jurors observed the witnesses testify firsthand, this court defers to the jury's resolution of conflicting testimony, evaluation of witness credibility, and decision regarding the persuasiveness and the appropriate weight to be given the evidence. *State v. Thomas*, 150 Wn.2d 821, 874-75, 83 P.3d 970 (2004).

2. *Whether the State presented sufficient evidence to sustain the intent element of Mr. Hackney's second degree assault of a child conviction*

A person commits second degree assault when that person “[i]ntentionally assaults another and thereby recklessly inflicts substantial bodily harm.” RCW 9A.36.021(1)(a); see *State v. McKague*, 159 Wn. App. 489, 509, 246 P.3d 558 (“[S]econd degree assault comprises two discrete acts, each with its own mental state—intentional assault and reckless infliction of substantial bodily harm.”), *aff'd*, 172 Wn.2d 802, 262 P.3d 1225 (2011). A person commits second degree assault of a child when a person commits the crime of second degree assault, as defined above, on a victim who is less than 13 years old. RCW 9A.36.130. A criminal assault requires intent, which means acting “with the objective or purpose to accomplish a result which constitutes a crime.” RCW 9A.08.010(1)(a). “Intent is rarely provable by direct evidence, but may be gathered, nevertheless, from all of the circumstances surrounding the event.” *State v.*

*Gallo*, 20 Wn. App. 717, 729, 582 P.2d 558 (1978). Further, criminal intent may be inferred “from conduct that plainly indicates such intent as a matter of logical probability.” *State v. Abuan*, 161 Wn. App. 135, 155, 257 P.3d 1 (2011).

Here, Mr. Hackney only challenges the sufficiency of the State’s evidence insofar as the jury found he acted intentionally. The State’s direct evidence of Mr. Hackney’s intent was the interview with Detective Goodwater, in which Mr. Hackney nodded when Detective Goodwater accused him of intentionally dropping S.H.<sup>4</sup> Mr. Hackney contends his nod “could have meant many things, most innocuous and non-incriminating, *e.g.*, an acknowledgment by Mr. Hackney that he heard what the detective was saying.” Br. of Appellant at 8 (alteration in original). In arguing that his nod was simply an acknowledgment rather than an affirmative answer, Mr. Hackney asks this court to reweigh evidence and substitute its interpretation of Mr. Hackney’s nod for the jury’s findings. That is not this court’s role. Instead, this court reviews the evidence in the light most favorable to the jury’s verdict to determine whether any rational trier of fact could

---

<sup>4</sup> The jury watched Detective Goodwater’s interview with Mr. Hackney three times: once in its entirety while Detective Goodwater was on the stand, the short segment where Mr. Hackney nodded during the State’s closing argument, and once again in its entirety during deliberations.

have found Mr. Hackney acted intentionally. Here, a rational jury could have interpreted Mr. Hackney's nod as an affirmative response to Detective Goodwater's accusation.

Additional direct evidence of Mr. Hackney's intent was his statement later in the interview: "I can tell you that her dropping, yeah, I was frustrated, and I dropped her." CP at 114. Although Mr. Hackney goes on to say that he did not intend to *hurt* S.H., the statute does not require the State to prove that Mr. Hackney intended the actual harm—RCW 9A.36.021(1)(a) only requires the State to prove that Mr. Hackney intended the *assault*, i.e., the drop, and was reckless as to the resulting harm. *See McKague*, 159 Wn. App. at 509.


The State also introduced circumstantial evidence of Mr. Hackney's criminal intent through its expert witnesses, which carries the same weight as direct evidence. Dr. Messer testified that the fingerprint bruises on S.H.'s arms and forehead were "left with a forceful hold or grabbing fingers," and the petechial bruising on her neck is "fairly common for a choke . . . . So grabbing somebody by the neck will cause those marks in that area." RP at 199-200. Dr. Dierks testified that skull fractures similar to S.H.'s "are usually in non-accidental trauma cases." RP at 72. Dr. Baker, Dr. Messer, and Mr. Hatley all testified that the constellation of S.H.'s injuries—the skull fracture, the forehead and arm bruises, the neck petechiae, and the subdural hematoma—raised

No. 31997-1-III  
*State v. Hackney*


concerns that the injuries were created nonaccidentally. Although Mr. Hackney testified that he dropped S.H. accidentally and presented expert evidence to support this contention, the jury discredited the defense's evidence and found the testimony of the State's experts credible. Accordingly, viewed in the light most favorable to the State, and drawing all reasonable inferences in favor of the State, we conclude that the foregoing evidence was sufficient to permit a rational trier of fact to find, beyond a reasonable doubt, that Mr. Hackney intentionally assaulted S.H.


Affirmed.

A majority of the panel has determined this opinion will not be printed in the Washington Appellate Reports, but it will be filed for public record pursuant to RCW 2.06.040.

  
Lawrence-Berrey, J.

WE CONCUR:

  
Siddoway, C.J.

  
Fearing, J.

## OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK

---

**To:** Kenneth H. Kato  
**Cc:** Teresa Chen  
**Subject:** RE: petition for review in st v hackney, coa no. 319971

Received on 4/28/2016

Supreme Court Clerk's Office

Please note that any pleading filed as an attachment to e-mail will be treated as the original. Therefore, if a filing is by e-mail attachment, it is not necessary to mail to the court the original of the document.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Kenneth H. Kato [mailto:khkato@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 28, 2016 8:01 AM  
**To:** OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK <SUPREME@COURTS.WA.GOV>  
**Cc:** Teresa Chen <tchen@co.franklin.wa.us>  
**Subject:** petition for review in st v hackney, coa no. 319971

Dear Clerk: Please find attached for filing the petition for review in State v. Hackney, COA No. 31997-1-III. Thank you!  
Kenneth H. Kato, WSBA No. 6400; 1020 N. Washington St.; Spokane, WA 99201; tel: (509) 220-2237; email: khkato@comcast.net