

SUPREME COURT NO. 93776-1

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Respondent,

v.

CHAD STANDS,

Petitioner.

FILED
OCT 28 2016
WASHINGTON STATE
SUPREME COURT

ON DISCRETIONARY REVIEW FROM THE COURT OF APPEALS,
DIVISION TWO

Court of Appeals No. 46791-7-II
Pierce County No. 13-1-02821-4

PETITION FOR REVIEW

CATHERINE E. GLINSKI
Attorney for Petitioner

GLINSKI LAW FIRM PLLC
P.O. Box 761
Manchester, WA 98353
(360) 876-2736

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS..... i

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ii

A. IDENTITY OF PETITIONER..... 1

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

C. ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW 1

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

E. ARGUMENT WHY REVIEW SHOULD BE GRANTED 4

THE COURT OF APPEALS’ DECISION CONFLICTS WITH A
DECISION OF THIS COURT AND PRESENTS AN ISSUE OF
SUBSTANTIAL PUBLIC IMPORTANCE. RAP 13.4(b)(1), (4). 4

F. CONCLUSION..... 6

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Washington Cases

State v. Canfield, 154 Wn.2d 698, 116 P.3d 391 (2005)..... 5

State v. Ellison, 186 Wn. App. 780, 346 P.3d 853, 855 (2015)..... 5

Statutes

RCW 9.94A.500(1)..... 5

Rules

RAP 13.4(b)..... 4, 6

A. IDENTITY OF PETITIONER

Petitioner, CHAD STANDS, by and through his attorney, CATHERINE E. GLINSKI, requests the relief designated in part B.

B. COURT OF APPEALS DECISION

Stands seeks review of the June 21, 2016, Ruling Affirming Judgment and Sentence and the September 15, 2016, Order Denying Motion to Modify of Division Two of the Court of Appeals affirming his sentence.

C. ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

Stands was sentenced following a negotiated plea agreement. At sentencing he asked the court to consider a mitigation package prepared during negotiations for settlement of the case. The court refused, stating negotiations for settlement were not presented to the court. Where a criminal defendant has the right to present any information to the court in mitigation of sentence, did the court's ruling deny Stands his right of allocution?

D. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The Pierce County Prosecuting Attorney charged Stands with two counts of attempting to elude a pursuing police vehicle, three counts of second degree assault, and one count of third degree assault. CP 26-29. The State notified Stands that a conviction of any of the second degree

assault charges would be a third strike, subjecting him to sentencing as a persistent offender. 1RP¹ 8.

After having communication difficulties with two appointed attorneys, Stands moved to proceed pro se. 1RP 6-7, 10-11. The court granted his request to represent himself and also his request to have appointed counsel serve as standby counsel. 1RP 14. While he was representing himself, Stands worked with the Department of Assigned Counsel to prepare a mitigation package. 2RP 5. He subsequently asked the court to re-appoint counsel, and the court granted his motion. 2RP 10-12.

The parties then negotiated a plea agreement under which Stands pled guilty to two counts of third degree assault, one count of first degree malicious mischief, and one count of attempting to elude. CP 53-55, 57-66. Stands stipulated that the offenses were “separate course of conduct.” CP 65; 3RP 6. He also stipulated to an exceptional sentence based on the fact that his prior unscored misdemeanors and other current offenses would result in a presumptive sentence that is clearly too lenient in light of the purposes of the SRA. CP 65; 3RP 6. The agreed sentence recommendation was for 60 months on each of the two assault counts, 40 months on the malicious mischief count, and 20 months on the attempt to

¹ The Verbatim Report of Proceedings is contained in 5 volumes, designated as follows: 1RP—10/25/13; 2RP—1/30/14; 3RP—8/20/14; 4RP—10/17/14; 5RP—10/22/14.

elude count, with all counts running consecutively, for a total of 180 months confinement. CP 60; 3RP 3. The recommended sentences on counts III and IV were below the standard range, but run consecutively to the other counts. 4RP 7-8.

After the court accepted Stands' plea, defense counsel asked the court to set sentencing over because Stands wanted various members of the public and his tribe to be present. Counsel said he had advised Stands that these people would not typically be allowed to speak at sentencing, but they could file written information with the court. 3RP 7. The court indicated that it would review information submitted prior to sentencing. 3RP 8-9.

At the sentencing hearing Stands asked for a continuance so that he could submit his mitigation package for the court to review. 4RP 6-7. Defense counsel told the court that the mitigation package had been prepared for settlement of the third strike charge, which was a wholly different purpose than sentencing, and counsel did not want to present materials inconsistent with the plea agreement. 4RP 4. Counsel therefore submitted an edited copy to the court for review. 4RP 5; CP 1-25.

Stands told the court that the mitigation package had been prepared for this case, and he believed it could be used for more than one purpose. 4RP 6. The court said it was willing to consider information for

sentencing, and it would hear from the prosecutor, defense counsel, and Stands, but it would not allow Stands to submit for sentencing the mitigation package which was prepared for settlement. 4RP 7. The prosecutor and defense counsel then made the agreed sentence recommendation. 4RP 7-10.

When Stands was given the opportunity to speak, he told the court he was still not satisfied with the court's denial of his request to submit the mitigation package. He repeated that, even though it was prepared for negotiating the plea, it could be used for more than one purpose, and since the agreed sentence includes two sentences below the standard range, it was appropriate to present mitigating factors to the court. 4RP 11.

The court responded that negotiations for settlement are not presented to the court. 4RP 12. It indicated that it had considered the edited mitigation materials presented by defense counsel. 4RP 12. It then imposed the agreed upon sentence. 4RP 13; CP 72-74, 82. Stands appealed, arguing that the court denied him his right of allocution. CP 92.

E. ARGUMENT WHY REVIEW SHOULD BE GRANTED

THE COURT OF APPEALS' DECISION CONFLICTS WITH A DECISION OF THIS COURT AND PRESENTS AN ISSUE OF SUBSTANTIAL PUBLIC IMPORTANCE. RAP 13.4(b)(1), (4).

Washington State has afforded criminal defendants the right of allocution since its inception. State v. Canfield, 154 Wn.2d 698, 703, 116

P.3d 391 (2005). The right of allocution is guaranteed by RCW 9.94A.500(1), which states that “[t]he court [shall] ...allow arguments from ... the offender... as to the sentence to be imposed.” State v. Ellison, 186 Wn. App. 780, 346 P.3d 853, 855 (2015). In Canfield, this Court specified that “[a]llocution is the right of a criminal defendant to make a personal argument or statement to the court before the pronouncement of sentence. It is the defendant's opportunity to plead for mercy and present any information in mitigation of sentence.” Canfield, 154 Wn.2d at 701; Ellison, 346 P.3d at 855.

In this case, although Stands was permitted to address the court at sentencing, Stands also asked the court to review his mitigation package before pronouncing sentence. The court refused to do so. The court's objection was not that Stands was seeking to submit written materials. It told Stands it would consider certain written information. The court refused to consider the mitigation package offered by Stands on the basis that the package was prepared for negotiation and settlement of the charges. Allocution is the defendant's opportunity to present *any information* in mitigation of sentence, however. Canfield, 154 Wn.2d at 701; Ellison, 346 P.3d at 855. Stands had worked with DAC to prepare the mitigation package, and it was his desire that the court consider that information before sentencing him. The court's refusal to consider, or

even to let Stands submit, the mitigation package denied Stands his right of allocution. The Court of Appeals' decision to the contrary conflicts with the decision in Canfield and presents an issue of substantial public importance which this Court should address. RAP 13.4(b)(1), (4).

F. CONCLUSION

Stands is not seeking to withdraw his plea, and the challenge raised on appeal does not breach the plea agreement. Although Stands stipulated to the exceptional sentence as agreed, he did not waive his right to allocution. For the reasons discussed above, this Court should grant review and reverse Stands's sentence.

DATED this 15th day of October, 2016.

Respectfully submitted,

GLINSKI LAW FIRM PLLC




CATHERINE E. GLINSKI
WSBA No. 20260
Attorney for Petitioner

Certification of Service by Mail

Today I caused to be mailed a copy of the Petition for Review in
State v. Chad Stands, Court of Appeals Cause No. 46791-7-II, as follows:

Chad Stands/DOC#707597
Monroe Correctional Complex-WSR
PO Box 777
Monroe, WA 98272

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



Catherine E. Glinski
Done in Manchester, WA
October 15, 2016

GLINSKI LAW FIRM PLLC

October 15, 2016 - 10:50 AM

Transmittal Letter

Document Uploaded: 2-467917-Petition for Review.pdf

Case Name:

Court of Appeals Case Number: 46791-7

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: ____

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: Catherine E Glinski - Email: glinskilaw@wavecable.com

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

pcpatcecf@co.pierce.wa.us