No. 75230-8-I

COURT OF APPEALS, DIVISION I
STATE OF WASHINGTON

---

STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Respondent,

vs.

ARTURO SPENCER MARTIN,

Appellant.



---

On Appeal from the Pierce County Superior Court
Cause No. 12-1-00649-2
The Honorable Frank Cuthbertson, Brian Tollefson,
Jerry Costello and Stanley Rumbaugh, Judges

---

# SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF OF APPELLANT

---

STEPHANIE C. CUNNINGHAM
Attorney for Appellant
WSBA No. 26436

4616 25th Avenue NE, No. 552
Seattle, Washington 98105
Phone (206) 526-5001

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### CASES



### OTHER AUTHORITIES

## I. SUPPLEMENTAL ISSUE

1. Should this Court deny any future request for appellate costs where Arturo Martin does not have the ability to repay the costs, he has previously been found indigent, and there is no evidence of a change in his financial circumstances?

## II. SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Recently, in State v. Sinclair, 192 Wn. App. 380, 389-90, 367 P.3d 612 (2016), this Court held that "it is appropriate for [the Court of Appeals] to consider the issue of appellate costs in a criminal case during the course of appellate review when the issue is raised in an appellant's brief."

## III. SUPPLEMENTAL ARGUMENT & AUTHORITIES

Under RCW 10.73.160, this Court may order a criminal defendant to pay the costs of an unsuccessful appeal. And RAP 14.2 provides that "[a] commissioner or clerk of the appellate court will award costs to the party that substantially prevails on review, unless the appellate court directs otherwise in its decision terminating review." But imposition of costs is not automatic even if a party establishes that they were the "substantially prevailing party" on review. State v. Nolan, 141 Wn.2d 620, 628, 8 P.3d 300 (2000). In Nolan, our highest Court made it clear that the

imposition of costs on appeal is "a matter of discretion for the appellate court," which may "decline to order costs at all," even if there is a "substantially prevailing party." Nolan, 141 Wn.2d at 628.

In fact, the Nolan Court specifically rejected the idea that imposition of costs should occur in every case, regardless of whether the proponent meets the requirements of being the "substantially prevailing party" on review. 141 Wn.2d at 628. Rather, the authority to award costs of appeal "is permissive," the Court held, so that it is up to the appellate court to decide, in an exercise of its discretion, whether to impose costs even when the party seeking costs establishes that they are the "substantially prevailing party" on review. Nolan, 141 Wn.2d at 628.

Should the State substantially prevail in Martin's case, this Court should exercise its discretion and decline to award any appellate costs that the State may request. First, Martin owns no property or assets, and has no job and no income. (Sup CP 486-87) The trial court did not order Martin to pay discretionary LFOs, but did order Martin to pay mandatory LFOs and restitution totaling $3,512,47. (CP 350-51) There was no evidence below, and no evidence on appeal, that Martin has or will have the ability to repay additional appellate costs.

Furthermore, the trial court found that Martin is indigent and entitled to appellate review at public expense. (CP 465-66) This Court should therefore presume that he remains indigent because the Rules of Appellate Procedure establish a presumption of continued indigency throughout review:

> A party and counsel for the party who has been granted an order of indigency must bring to the attention of the trial court any significant improvement during review in the financial condition of the party. The appellate court will give a party the benefits of an order of indigency throughout the review unless the trial court finds the party's financial condition has improved to the extent that the party is no longer indigent.

RAP 15.2(f).

In State v. Sinclair, this Court declined to impose appellate costs on a defendant who had previously been found indigent, noting:

> The procedure for obtaining an order of indigency is set forth in RAP Title 15, and the determination is entrusted to the trial court judge, whose finding of indigency we will respect unless we are shown good cause not to do so. Here, the trial court made findings that support the order of indigency.... We have before us no trial court order finding that Sinclair's financial condition has improved or is likely to improve. ... We therefore presume Sinclair remains indigent.

192 Wn. App. 380, 393, 367 P.3d 612 (2016); see also State v.

Blazina, 182 Wn.2d 827, 839, 344 P.3d 680 (2015) ("if someone does meet the GR 34 standard for indigency, courts should seriously question that person's ability to pay LFOs").

Similarly, there has been no evidence presented to this court, and no finding by the trial court, that Martin's financial situation has improved or is likely to improve. Martin is presumably still indigent, and this Court should decline to impose any appellate costs that the State may request.

## IV. CONCLUSION

This Court should decline any future request to impose appellate costs.

DATED: May 24, 2016

Stephanie Cunningham

STEPHANIE C. CUNNINGHAM
WSB #26436
Attorney for Arturo S. Martin

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I certify that on 05/24/2016, I caused to be placed in the mails of the United States, first class postage pre-paid, a copy of this document addressed to: Arturo S. Martin #388945, Airway Heights Corrections Center, P.O. Box 1899, Airway Heights, WA 99001-1899.

Stephanie Cunningham

STEPHANIE C. CUNNINGHAM, WSBA #26436