

NO. 46357-1-II

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

STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Respondent,

v.

AIMEE MOSES,

Appellant.

ON APPEAL FROM THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE
STATE OF WASHINGTON FOR PIERCE COUNTY

The Honorable Stephanie A. Arend, Judge

REPLY BRIEF OF APPELLANT

JENNIFER WINKLER
Attorney for Appellant

NIELSEN, BROMAN & KOCH, PLLC
1908 E Madison Street
Seattle, WA 98122
(206) 623-2373

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
A. <u>ISSUES IN REPLY</u>	1
B. <u>ARGUMENTS IN REPLY</u>	1
1. THE STATE’S BRIEF MISSTATES THE LAW AS TO THE PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE.....	1
2. THE STATE’S BRIEF MISSTATES A NUMBER OF FACTS IN THE RECORD.....	3
C. <u>CONCLUSION</u>	4

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

WASHINGTON CASES

State v. Deal

128 Wn.2d 693, 911 P.2d 996 (1996)..... 2

State v. Evans

163 Wn. App. 635, 260 P.3d 934 (2011)..... 1

State v. Venegas

155 Wn. App. 507, 228 P.3d 813
review denied, 170 Wn.2d 1003 (2010) 1

RULES, STATUTES AND OTHER AUTHORITIES

11 Washington Practice: Washington Pattern Jury Instructions:
Criminal 4.01 (3d ed. 2008)..... 1

A. ISSUES IN REPLY

1. Does the State's brief mischaracterize the law as to the presumption of innocence?

2. Does the State's brief misstate a number of facts in the record?

B. ARGUMENTS IN REPLY¹

1. THE STATE'S BRIEF MISSTATES THE LAW AS TO THE PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE.

Aimee Moses argued in her opening brief that the trial court violated her right to the presumption of innocence by sustaining the State's objection to argument by defense counsel that evidence must be considered while presuming the innocence of the accused.

The presumption of innocence does not stop at the beginning of jury deliberations. Rather, it persists until the jury, after considering all the evidence, is satisfied the State has proved the charged crime beyond a reasonable doubt. State v. Evans, 163 Wn. App. 635, 644, 260 P.3d 934, 939 (2011); 11 Washington Practice: Washington Pattern Jury Instructions: Criminal 4.01 (3d ed. 2008).

¹ This brief refers to the verbatim reports as follows: 1RP – 2/24/14; 2RP – 2/25/14; 3RP – 2/26/14; 4RP – 3/14/14; 5RP – 4/4/14; 6RP – 4/21/14; 7RP – 4/22/14; 8RP – 4/23/14; 9RP – 4/28/14; 10RP – 4/29/14; 11RP – 4/30/14; 12RP – 5/1/14; 13RP – 5/5/14; 14RP – 5/6/14; 15RP – 5/7/14; 16RP – 5/8/14; 17RP – 5/12/14; 18RP – 5/13/14; 19RP – 5/14/14; and 20RP – 5/28/14.

Citing only State v. Deal,² however, the State argues — alarmingly — that the jury is not subject to any mandatory presumptions. Brief of Respondent (BOR) at 23. Observing that mandatory presumptions in favor of the *State* violate due process, Deal invalidated an instruction that improperly shifted the burden to the defense in a burglary case.³ 128 Wn.2d at 699, 704. Deal therefore stands for a proposition that is the opposite of the one the State cites it for.

Deal is not on point and does not support the State’s argument. Based on the authorities cited in Moses’s opening brief, this Court should reverse her conviction.

² 128 Wn.2d 693, 911 P.2d 996 (1996).

³ The Court held the following instruction invalid:

A person who enters or remains unlawfully in a building may be inferred to have acted with intent to commit a crime against a person or property therein *unless such entering or remaining shall be explained by evidence satisfactory to the jury to have been made without such criminal intent*. This inference is not binding upon you and it is for you to determine what weight, if any, such inference is to be given.

Deal, 128 Wn.2d at 697 (emphasis in original).

2. THE STATE'S BRIEF MISSTATES A NUMBER OF FACTS IN THE RECORD.

The State's brief also mischaracterizes a number of facts in the record at trial. First, the brief states M.A. and his sister are members of the Muckleshoot tribe. Rather, their mother is a member. 10RP 695, 699. Second, the brief refers to Vicki Jones as M.A.'s teacher. In fact, she was a family support specialist at his preschool. 10RP 619. Third, the brief refers to Christmas break of 2010. Instead, the holidays discussed at trial occurred in 2011-2012. 14RP 1321-22. Finally, the brief repeatedly refers to the Moses family as "foster parents" for M.A. and his sister. E.g., BOR at 13. Rather, they were a family placement within the tribe, not State-licensed foster parents like the children's previous placement. 11RP 743-47, 782-88; 13RP 1202.


C. CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above and in Moses's opening brief, and based on the additional arguments adopted by Moses, this Court should reverse her conviction and remand for a new trial..

DATED this 30th day of April, 2015.

Respectfully submitted,

NIELSEN, BROMAN & KOCH, PLLC

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Jennifer Winkler", is written over a horizontal line.

JENNIFER WINKLER,
WSBA No. 35220
Office ID. 91051

Attorneys for Appellant

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

STATE OF WASHINGTON)	
)	
Respondent,)	
)	
v.)	COA NO. 46357-1-II
)	
AMEE MOSES,)	
)	
Appellant.)	

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

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

THAT ON THE 30TH DAY OF APRIL 2015, I CAUSED A TRUE AND CORRECT COPY OF THE **REPLY BRIEF OF APPELLANT** TO BE SERVED ON THE PARTY / PARTIES DESIGNATED BELOW BY DEPOSITING SAID DOCUMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MAIL.

[X] AMEE MOSES
DOC NO. 374663
WASHINGTON CORRECTIONS CENTER FOR WOMEN
9601 BUJACHIC ROAD NW
GIG HARBOR, WA 98332

SIGNED IN SEATTLE WASHINGTON, THIS 29TH DAY OF APRIL 2015.

x Patrick Mayovsky

NIELSEN, BROMAN & KOCH, PLLC

April 29, 2015 - 5:58 PM

Transmittal Letter

Document Uploaded: 6-463571-Reply Brief.pdf

Case Name: Amee Moses

Court of Appeals Case Number: 46357-1

Is this a Personal Restraint Petition? Yes No

The document being Filed is:

Designation of Clerk's Papers Supplemental Designation of Clerk's Papers

Statement of Arrangements

Motion: _____

Answer/Reply to Motion: _____

Brief: Reply

Statement of Additional Authorities

Cost Bill

Objection to Cost Bill

Affidavit

Letter

Copy of Verbatim Report of Proceedings - No. of Volumes: _____

Hearing Date(s): _____

Personal Restraint Petition (PRP)

Response to Personal Restraint Petition

Reply to Response to Personal Restraint Petition

Petition for Review (PRV)

Other: _____

Comments:

No Comments were entered.

Sender Name: Patrick P Mayavsky - Email: mayovskyp@nwattorney.net

A copy of this document has been emailed to the following addresses:

PCpatcecf@co.pierce.wa.us