

FILED
Court of Appeals
Division I
State of Washington
5/29/2018 4:33 PM

STA
BY

Supreme Court No. 95912-9

No. 76213-3-I

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Respondent,

v.

JASON PLANQUE,

Petitioner.

PETITION FOR REVIEW

JAN TRASEN
Attorney for Petitioner
WSBA # 41177

WASHINGTON APPELLATE PROJECT
1511 Third Avenue, Suite 610
Seattle, Washington 98101
(206) 587-2711

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. IDENTITY OF PETITIONER..... 1

B. COURT OF APPEALS DECISION 1

C. ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW 1

D. STATEMENT OF THE CASE..... 2

E. ARGUMENT WHY REVIEW SHOULD BE GRANTED 4

THIS COURT SHOULD GRANT REVIEW, AS THE COURT OF APPEALS DECISION IS IN CONFLICT WITH DECISIONS OF THIS COURT. RAP 13.4(b)(1)..... 4

1. The trial court’s exclusion of relevant evidence violated Mr. Planque’s right to present a defense..... 4

a. The Sixth Amendment guarantees an individual the right to present a defense4

b. The trial court’s limitation of a defendant’s cross-examination of a witness may violate the Sixth Amendment and Article I, Section 22.....5

c. Because the excluded evidence was relevant to Jonina’s bias, it was relevant and admissible.....6

d. The Court of Appeals decision should be reviewed by this Court.....7

2. Mr. Planque’s right to a fair trial was violated by prosecutorial misconduct.....8

a. Mr. Planque has the right to due process8

b. The prosecuting attorney committed misconduct by misstating the evidence and urging the jury to consider matters not in evidence.9

c. This Court should grant review.....	11
3. Mr. Planque requests this Court review each issue raised in his Statement of Additional Grounds.....	12
F. CONCLUSION.....	12

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Washington Supreme Court

State v. Crediford, 130 Wn.2d 747, 927 P.2d P.2d 1129 (1996) 9

State v. Darden, 145 Wn.2d 612, 41 P.3d 1189 (2002) 5, 7, 9

State v. Emery, 174 Wn.2d 741, 278 P.3d 653 (2012) 9, 11

State v. Huson, 73 Wn.2d 660, 440 P.2d 192 (1968), cert. denied, 393 U.S. 1096 (1969)..... 9

State v. Jones, 168 Wn.2d 713, 230 P.3d 576 (2010)..... 5, 7, 8

State v. Kilburn, 151 Wn.2d 36, 84 P.3d 1215 (2004). 6

State v. Kroll, 87 Wn.2d 829, 558 P.2d 173 (1976) 9

State v. Monday, 171 Wn.2d 667, 297 P.3d 551 (2011)..... 9

State v. Reed, 102 Wn.2d 140, 684 P.2d 699 (1984)..... 9

State v. Russell, 125 Wn.2d 24, 882 P.2d 747 (1994). 11

Washington Court of Appeals

State v. Echevarria, 71 Wn. App. 595, 860 P.2d 420 (1993)..... 9

State v. Fleming, 83 Wn. App. 209, 921 P.2d 1076, rev. denied, 131 Wn.2d 1018 (1997)..... 10

United States Supreme Court

Chambers v. Mississippi, 410 U.S. 284, 302, 93 S.Ct. 1038, 35 L.Ed.2d 297 (1973)..... 5

Chapman v. California, 386 U.S. 18, 87 S.Ct. 824, 17 L.Ed.2d 705 (1967) 7

Davis v. Alaska, 415 U.S. 308, 94 S.Ct. 1105, 39 L.Ed.2d 347 (1974) . 4, 7

<u>Delaware v. Van Arsdall</u> , 475 U.S. 673, 106 S.Ct. 1431, 89 L.Ed.2d 674 (1986).....	6
<u>Estelle v. Williams</u> , 425 U.S. 501, 96 S.Ct. 1691, 48 L.Ed.2d 126 (1976)	8
<u>In re Winship</u> , 397 U.S. 358, 90 S.Ct. 1068, 25 L.Ed.2d 368 (1970).....	9
<u>Olden v. Kentucky</u> , 488 U.S. 227, 109 S.Ct. 480, 102 L.Ed.2d 513 (1988),	5
<u>Pennsylvania v. Ritchie</u> , 480 U.S. 39, 107 S.Ct. 989, 94 L.Ed.2d 40 (1987)	5
<u>United States v. Neder</u> , 527 U.S. 1, 119 S.Ct. 1827, 144 L.Ed.2d 35 (1999)	7
<u>Washington v. Texas</u> , 388 U.S. 14, 87 S.Ct. 1920, 18 L.Ed.2d 1019 (1967)	5

Washington Constitution

Article I, section 3.....	8
Article I, section 21.....	8
Article I, section 22.....	8, 9

United States Constitution

Fifth Amendment.....	8
Sixth Amendment.....	8
Fourteenth Amendment.....	8

Rules

RAP 13.4(b)(1).	4, 8, 11, 12
-----------------------	--------------

A. IDENTITY OF PETITIONER

Jason Planque, appellant below, seeks review of the Court of Appeals decision designated in Part B.

B. COURT OF APPEALS DECISION

Mr. Planque appealed his Island County Superior Court convictions for two counts of felony harassment. The Court of Appeals affirmed in an unpublished decision on April 30, 2018. Appendix. This motion is based upon RAP 13.3(e) and 13.5A.

C. ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

1. The Sixth Amendment's guarantee of the right to present a defense and the Fourteenth Amendment guarantee of due process, along with similar guarantees of the Washington Constitution, are violated where a trial court bars a defendant from presenting relevant evidence. So long as evidence is minimally relevant, the refusal to admit it violates a defendant's rights unless the State can establish the relevance is outweighed by prejudice to the fairness of the fact-finding process. Where the trial court restricted defense cross-examination of the complaining witness, did the court violate Mr. Planque's rights under the federal and state Constitutions, and was the Court of Appeals decision therefore in conflict with decisions of this Court, requiring review? RAP 13.4(b)(1)?

2. The State's duty to ensure a fair trial precludes a prosecutor from employing improper argument and tactics during trial. Where the deputy prosecutor flagrantly misstated the evidence, was there a substantial likelihood that the comments affected the jury verdicts, and was the Court of Appeals decision therefore in conflict with decisions of this Court, requiring review? RAP 13.4(b)(1)?

3. Mr. Planque requests this Court review the issues raised in his Statement of Additional Grounds, in order to determine whether the Court of Appeals decision was in conflict with decisions of this Court, requiring review of his issues in his S.A.G. RAP 13.4(b)(1).

D. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Jason Planque lived for many years in Freeland, Washington, on Whidbey Island. RP 250.¹ When his grandfather died in 2012, Jason and his father Steven care for Jason's grandmother at the family's property in Okanogan County, until her death from Alzheimer's disease. RP 340-41. Shortly thereafter, Jason's father, Steven, died unexpectedly in October 2014. RP 341. These losses placed a great deal of responsibility and stress on Jason's shoulders, and he relapsed into alcoholism. RP 340.

¹ Due to the shared last name of the parties, first names are used when discussing family members; no disrespect is intended.

In 2016, a dispute arose between Jason and an estranged branch of the family, led by Dennis Planque, the half-brother of Steven. RP 236-38. Dennis and his daughter Jonina Planque – a younger cousin Jason had never met – contested Steven’s will and the quitclaim deed to the home in Okanogan County in which Jason and his mother were residing. Id.

Jonina’s claim that she was entitled to an “inheritance” from her grandparents and that her share had been “stolen” by her older cousin Jason led to a “civil battle” and to at least one “altercation” at a bar, as Jonina described it. RP 236-40.

On May 7, 2015, Jonina received several posts on her Facebook wall, purportedly from Jason. RP 224-25. She stated the posts made her feel afraid for her life and for her father Dennis’s life. RP 224, 235. After showing the posts to her father, Jonina called law enforcement. RP 224, 235.

Jason was charged with two counts of felony harassment, as well as two counts of bail jumping. CP 91-93; RP 342-43.²

At trial, Jonina testified to the ongoing “battle” between the cousins, and the “altercation” just before the Facebook posts of May 7th.

² Jason described the Stage Two wildfires near his Okanogan County home which prevented him from attending his July 27, 2015 Island County appearance. RP 342-43. He came to court two days later. Id.

RP 236-38. However, Jason was not permitted to cross-examine Jonina concerning this altercation. RP 240. Jonina also testified that she had been monitoring Jason's Facebook page, but the jury was not permitted to hear about Jonina's actions. RP 236-37.

The jury found Jason guilty as charged. CP 21-26, 9-20. He appealed, assigning error to the issues raised herein.³ On April 30, 2018, the Court of Appeals affirmed Mr. Planque's convictions and sentence. Appendix.

Mr. Planque seeks review in this Court. RAP 13.4(b)(1).

E. ARGUMENT WHY REVIEW SHOULD BE GRANTED

THIS COURT SHOULD GRANT REVIEW, AS THE COURT OF APPEALS DECISION IS IN CONFLICT WITH DECISIONS OF THIS COURT. RAP 13.4(b)(1).

1. The trial court's exclusion of relevant evidence violated Mr. Planque's right to present a defense.

a. The Sixth Amendment guarantees an individual the right to present a defense.

The Sixth Amendment guarantees a defendant the right to present a defense. Davis v. Alaska, 415 U.S. 308, 318, 94 S.Ct. 1105, 39 L.Ed.2d 347 (1974). A defendant must receive the opportunity to present his version of the facts to the jury so that it may decide "where the truth lies."

³ Mr. Planque does not seek this Court's review of the open courtroom issue raised in the Court of Appeals.

Washington v. Texas, 388 U.S. 14, 19, 87 S.Ct. 1920, 18 L.Ed.2d 1019 (1967); Chambers v. Mississippi, 410 U.S. 284, 294-95, 302, 93 S.Ct. 1038, 35 L.Ed.2d 297 (1973); State v. Jones, 168 Wn.2d 713, 720, 230 P.3d 576 (2010). “[A]t a minimum . . . criminal defendants have . . . the right to put before the jury evidence that might influence the determination of guilt.” Pennsylvania v. Ritchie, 480 U.S. 39, 56, 107 S.Ct. 989, 94 L.Ed.2d 40 (1987).

So long as evidence is minimally relevant, “the burden is on the State to show the evidence is to prejudicial as to disrupt the fact-finding process at trial.” Jones, 168 Wn.2d at 720 (quoting State v. Darden, 145 Wn.2d 612, 622, 41 P.3d 1189 (2002)).

b. The trial court’s limitation of a defendant’s cross-examination of a witness may violate the Sixth Amendment and Article I, Section 22.

A criminal defendant’s right to confront the witnesses against him is guaranteed by both the Sixth Amendment and Article One, Section 22.

The right to confrontation is violated where he is unreasonably precluded from cross-examining a witness on a subject that is probative of the witness’s motive to lie. Olden v. Kentucky, 488 U.S. 227, 231-32, 109 S.Ct. 480, 102 L.Ed.2d 513 (1988). The defendant must be allowed reasonable cross-examination on a subject relevant to the witness’s motive to lie, even if the subject matter is potentially inflammatory to the jury. Id.

Such cross-examination can expose a witness's motivation to testify and thereby "expose to the jury the facts from which jurors . . . could appropriately draw inferences relating to the reliability of the witness." *Id.* at 231 (quoting *Davis*, 415 U.S. at 316-17); *Delaware v. Van Arsdall*, 475 U.S. 673, 680, 106 S.Ct. 1431, 89 L.Ed.2d 674 (1986).

c. *Because the excluded evidence was relevant to Jonina's bias, it was relevant and admissible.*

The evidence relating to the prior altercation between Jonina and Jason was relevant to Jonina's bias, partiality, and credibility. Jonina had testified concerning the civil dispute over the Planque estate – the "battle," as Jonina called it – which was the context for the Facebook messages purportedly sent by Jason. An "altercation" between Jason and Jonina less than one week before the charged conduct was highly relevant to Jonina's accusation of harassment. As Jason argued below, this altercation in The Tap Room on Whidbey Island was discussed in Jonina's statement, so the State was on notice. RP 240.⁴

The trial court was required to apply the standard set forth in *Jones* – specifically, that the evidence regarding the prior altercation was

⁴ The prior altercation was also relevant to whether Jason's statements were "true threats" to kill. *State v. Kilburn*, 151 Wn.2d 36, 53, 84 P.3d 1215 (2004). The surrounding context must be considered when considering whether a reasonable person would interpret statements as serious threats, since an objective standard is applied in the First Amendment context. *Id.*

admissible, unless it was “so prejudicial as to disrupt the fairness of the fact-finding process at trial.” 168 Wn.2d at 720. The State did not meet that burden. Because Jonina was the State’s primary witness, it was even more important that Jason be permitted to explore the nature of her bias and partiality. See Davis, 415 U.S. at 316 (partiality “is always relevant as discrediting the witness”). “[T]he more essential the witness is to the prosecution's case, the more latitude the defense should be given to explore fundamental elements such as motive, bias, credibility, or foundational matters.” Darden, 145 Wn.2d at 619.

The State did not establish beyond a reasonable doubt the error “did not contribute to the verdict obtained.” Chapman v. California, 386 U.S. 18, 24, 87 S.Ct. 824, 17 L.Ed.2d 705 (1967); United States v. Neder, 527 U.S. 1, 9, 119 S.Ct. 1827, 144 L.Ed.2d 35 (1999).

d. The Court of Appeals decision should be reviewed by this Court.

The Court of Appeals determined that the trial court erred when it excluded cross-examination of Jonina concerning the altercation at the bar, as well as concerning her accusations toward Jason, on the grounds the trial court stated. Appendix at 9 (trial court sustained State’s objection that topics were beyond scope of direct). As the Court of Appeals agrees, evidence of a witness’s bias and partiality is “always relevant as

discrediting the witness and affecting the weight of his testimony.” Id.
(quoting Davis, 415 U.S. at 316).

The Court erred when it affirmed, however, finding the testimony would not have been relevant to Jonina’s bias. Appendix at 10. The altercation at the Tap Room involved Jason’s sister and Jonina; the claim is that Jonina was biased against Jason and his branch of the family.

Further, although the Court of Appeals finds that Jason was able to “argue in closing” concerning Jonina’s bias, it is axiomatic that arguments are not evidence. See WPIC 1.02 (“lawyers statements are not evidence”). It was error to limit defense counsel’s opportunity to present evidence that was relevant to Jonina’s bias.

Because the Court of Appeals decision affirming the jury’s verdict is in conflict with this Court’s decisions – primarily Jones and Darden – this Court should grant review. RAP 13.4(b)(1).

2. Mr. Planque’s right to a fair trial was violated by prosecutorial misconduct.

a. A criminal defendant’s due process can be violated by a prosecuting attorney’s conduct.

The Due Process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment protects the right of every criminal defendant to a fair trial. U.S. Const. amends. V, XIV; Const. art. 1 §§ 3, 21, 22. The right to a fair trial includes the presumption of innocence. Estelle v. Williams, 425 U.S. 501, 503, 96 S.

Ct. 1691, 48 L.Ed.2d 126 (1976); State v. Crediford, 130 Wn.2d 747, 759, 927 P.2d P.2d 1129 (1996); In re Winship, 397 U.S. 358, 364, 90 S.Ct. 1068, 25 L.Ed.2d 368 (1970).

A prosecutor's improper argument may deny a defendant his right to a fair trial, as guaranteed by the Sixth Amendment and by article I, section 22 of the Washington Constitution. State v. Monday, 171 Wn.2d 667, 676-77, 297 P.3d 551 (2011). A prosecutor, as a quasi-judicial officer, has a duty to act impartially and to seek a verdict free from prejudice and based upon reason. State v. Echevarria, 71 Wn. App. 595, 598, 860 P.2d 420 (1993) (citing State v. Kroll, 87 Wn.2d 829, 835, 558 P.2d 173 (1976)); State v. Huson, 73 Wn.2d 660, 663, 440 P.2d 192 (1968), cert. denied, 393 U.S. 1096 (1969) (citation omitted); see also State v. Reed, 102 Wn.2d 140, 147, 684 P.2d 699 (1984). A defendant must show that a prosecutor's comments were improper and that there is a "substantial likelihood" the comments affected the jury. State v. Emery, 174 Wn.2d 741, 756, 278 P.3d 653 (2012) (internal citations omitted).

b. The prosecuting attorney committed misconduct by misstating the evidence and urging the jury to consider matters not in evidence.

Three times during closing argument, the deputy prosecutor misstated the threats that Jason allegedly made to Jonina and her father on May 7th. RP 378, 409. By arguing that Jason made threats that were

inaccurate and beyond the actual admitted evidence, the State committed misconduct.

Although Jason did not object to these misstatements, the Court can infer that the State's conduct was flagrant and intentional since the State repeated the same (inaccurate) statement three separate times in its closing argument.⁵ See State v. Fleming, 83 Wn. App. 209, 213, 921 P.2d 1076, rev. denied, 131 Wn.2d 1018 (1997).

The Court of Appeals concludes the remarks were not improper in the context of the entire argument. Appendix at 12-13. The Court states, "the prosecutor did not tell the jury that Jason actually posted that exact phrase on Jonina's Facebook page." Id. The Court urges that the prosecutor "drew a reasonable inference" about Jason's "overall message" to his cousin, based upon all of the messages he allegedly posted. Id. The Court relies heavily upon the fact that the presence of quotation marks around the so-called message cannot be relied upon, since the marks may have been added later by the transcriptionist. Appendix at 12-13.

However, the presence or lack of quotation marks were not the gravamen of the argument in the Court of Appeals, appearing only in a

⁵ The prosecuting attorney argued that Jason wrote the following: "I am for real. I've got nothing to lose. I have the means to kill you. And I'm in exactly the state of mind to carry it out."

RP 377, 378, 409 (using this phrase three separate times in argument).

footnote. Brief of Appellant at 23 n.9. As discussed at length in the earlier briefing, the prosecutor – not once, but three separate times – misquoted the “message” sent by Jason Planque. RP 377, 378, 409. The Court’s determination that counsel’s failure to object is erroneous, as the State’s repetition of the prosecutorial error is indicative of its flagrancy and intentionality. State v. Russell, 125 Wn.2d 24, 86, 882 P.2d 747 (1994).

c. This Court should grant review.

The effect of the prosecutorial misconduct substantially affected the jury’s verdict, violating Mr. Planque’s right to receive a fair trial. Emery, 174 Wn.2d at 756.

The misstatements of the evidence were egregious – three identical misstatements, each of them informing the jury (incorrectly) that Jason had stated, “I’ve got nothing to lose. I have the means to kill you. And I’m in exactly the state of mind to carry it out.” RP 377, 378, 409. The prosecutor repeated this language three times. The State concedes that Jason never made these statements, and yet the prosecutor seemed to quote him numerous times.

Because the Court of Appeals decision found this argument did not constitute misconduct under our case law, this Court should grant review under RAP 13.4(b)(1).

3. Mr. Planque requests this Court review each issue raised in his Statement of Additional Grounds.

Mr. Planque requests that this Court review each and every issue raised in his pro se Statement of Additional Grounds.

F. CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, the Court of Appeals decision should be reviewed, as it is in conflict with decisions of this Court. RAP 13.4(b)(1).

DATED this 29th day of May, 2018.

Respectfully submitted,



JAN TRASEN (WSBA 41177)
Washington Appellate Project
Attorneys for Petitioner

APPENDIX



RECEIVED

APR 30 2018

Washington Appellate Project

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE OF WASHINGTON,)	
)	No. 76213-3-1
Respondent,)	
)	DIVISION ONE
v.)	
)	UNPUBLISHED OPINION
JASON PLANQUE,)	
)	FILED: <u>April 30, 2018</u>
Appellant.)	

FILED
COURT OF APPEALS DIV 1
STATE OF WASHINGTON
2018 APR 30 AM 9:37

SPEARMAN, J. — Jonina Planque received a series of threatening messages posted to her Facebook account. The posts were sent from the Facebook account of her cousin, Jason Planque. Jason was charged with two counts of felony harassment and two counts of bail jumping. A jury convicted him as charged. On appeal, Jason contends that (1) unrecorded sidebars violated his right to a public trial; (2) limits on cross-examination of the complaining witness violated his constitutional right to present a defense; and (3) prosecutorial misconduct violated his right to a fair trial. His statement of additional grounds asserts further errors. We affirm.

FACTS

Jason Planque was engaged in a bitter dispute with his cousin Jonina Planque and her father Dennis Planque over a contested will.¹ Jonina felt that her family's share had been "stolen." Verbatim Report of Proceedings (VRP) at 236. Although Jason and

¹ Due to the shared last names of the parties, first names are used throughout when discussing members of the family.

Jonina are cousins, and both lived on Whidbey Island, Jonina had not seen Jason in person since she was very young.

On the morning of May 7, 2015, Jonina discovered a series of threatening posts on her Facebook page.² The posts, which were sent from Jason's Facebook account earlier that morning, included the following language:

"I will beat you in public...and go to jail for a second...if you ever come close to my mother, her property, my sister.... [G]et your chunky, pasty little wannabe bitch slut emo ass off of this rock before I call an order..." Plaintiff's Exhibit 20 at 18-19.

"I WILL FUCKING REMOVE YOUR SLUT CUNT ASS OFF OF THIS ROCK BEFORE YOU RUIN OUR NAME CUNT. AND I WANT TO SEE ALL OF YOUR LITTLE ADMIRERS PEE THEY'RE PANTS WHEN IT GOES DOWN." Plaintiff's Exhibit 22.

"You have no clue who you are fucking with...I will fuck you up. period. I am not as nice as the rest...and have NO patience for your petty bitch bullshit. I have the reality of means to make you and daddy disappear... and nobody will care...Got it? I have no problem taking you out of the gene pool stupid little girl." Plaintiff's Exhibit 18.

"[B]ring dad on over when he gets out so I can shoot both of you in the face... It's what I do..." Plaintiff's Exhibit 19.

"So how much does my father's life owe You...One shot." Plaintiff's Exhibit 19.

"I will personally gut your father for what he has said about our grandmother, my mother, and my father..." Plaintiff's Exhibit 19.

"You fuck with my family...I fuck you." Plaintiff's Exhibit 17.

"Fuck again with mom or sis and I will track you down... pistol whip you...and make you feel beautiful... and pee on your face." Plaintiff's Exhibit 17.

"Reasonable people don't go after a legacy that has nothing to do with them. Or they get shot. Or misplaced...where did we put that little cunt...who cares." Plaintiff's Exhibit 17.

² The messages were posted on Jonina's Facebook "timeline," where any of her Facebook "friends" could see them. VRP (11/15/16) at 230.

"I Can fuck with you at grandpas any time... Just sayin...." Plaintiff's Exhibit 22.

"Some people call me nuts.... I just handle shit." Plaintiff's Exhibit 22.

Jonina said that the posts caused her to fear for her life and that of her father, Dennis. She read the posts to Dennis, then contacted law enforcement. Later that day, Deputy Leif Haugen of the Island County Sheriff's Office arrested Jason. Deputy Haugen testified that at the time of arrest, Jason cursed him, threatened a neighbor, and threatened to kill Jonina.

Jason was charged with two counts of felony harassment. Upon his release from custody prior to trial, Jason twice failed to appear for court hearings, resulting in two additional counts of bail jumping.

At trial, the State produced Facebook records and testimony showing the series of messages posted on Jonina's Facebook account. Jonina and Dennis both testified regarding the nature of the threats in the context of the family dispute, and their fear that Jason would actually carry them out. The State also produced letters that Jason wrote in jail. He mailed them to judges and court personnel. In one of the letters, Jason explained that "all I was attempting to do is protect my family and our rightful inheritance. I will admit that my actions were disgusting and unacceptable [sic], but you must understand we have been under such duress and strain." Plaintiff's Exhibit 15. In another letter, he stated that his "alleged actions" were "made under unimaginable stress, anger and confusion" and that they "were unexcusable." Plaintiff's Exhibit 15.

Jason testified that in the hours before the messages were posted, he consumed large quantities of alcohol and became "blackout drunk." VRP (11/16/16) at 342. He

No. 76313-3-1/4

asserted that he had no memory of posting the messages and was unaware he committed the crime. Defense counsel argued that the State had not conclusively proved that Jason authored the posts, and that Jonina was biased due to the family dispute. Defense counsel also argued that the State failed to prove that Jason knowingly made the threats due to his level of intoxication.

The jury convicted Jason on all counts. He appealed.

DISCUSSION

Public Trial Right

Jason argues that his public trial right was violated where the trial court conducted three unreported sidebars. Criminal defendants have the right to a public trial. U.S. Const. amends. I, IV; Wash. Const. art. 1, §§ 10, 22. Whether a defendant's public trial right has been violated is question of law reviewed de novo. State v. Smith, 181 Wn.2d 508, 513, 334 P.3d 1049 (2014). "[N]ot every interaction between the court, counsel, and defendants will implicate the right to a public trial, or constitute a closure if closed to the public." State v. Slett, 181 Wn.2d 598, 603, 334 P.3d 1088 (2014), quoting State v. Sublett, 176 Wn.2d 58, 71, 292 P.3d 715 (2012). To determine whether this right has been violated, the court asks (1) whether the proceeding implicates the public trial right, (2) if so, whether the proceeding was closed, and (3) if so, whether the closure was justified. State v. Whitlock, 188 Wn.2d 511, 520, 396 P.3d 310 (2017).

In Smith, the Washington Supreme Court held that proper sidebars do not implicate the public trial right at all because "they have not historically been open to the public and because allowing public access would play no positive role in the proceeding." Smith, 181 Wn.2d at 511. Because the sidebar did not implicate the public

No. 76313-3-1/5

trial right, there was no need to determine whether the proceedings were closed or whether the closure was justified. “[E]videntiary rulings that are the subject of traditional sidebars do not invoke any of the concerns the public trial right is meant to address regarding perjury, transparency, or the appearance of fairness.” Id. at 518, citing Sublett, 176 Wn.2d at 77. Other proper sidebars include proceedings that “deal with the mundane issues implicating little public interest[,]... done only to avoid disrupting the flow of trial, and ... either ... on the record or ... promptly memorialized in the record.” Whitlock, 188 Wn.2d at 522 (quoting Smith, 181 Wn.2d at 516 & n.10). “Typical examples of such mundane issues are scheduling, housekeeping, or decorum.” Whitlock, 188 Wn.2d at 513.

Jason, citing Whitlock, argues that the unreported sidebars are a structural error requiring reversal. In Whitlock, the Washington Supreme Court held that an in-chambers conference concerning the proper extent of cross-examination of a confidential informant during a bench trial, which was not memorialized in the record until much later in the transcript, violated the defendant’s right to a public trial. Id. at 522-23. Jason contends that the violation in his case is even more problematic than that in Whitlock because the sidebars in his case were never memorialized. But the Whitlock court held that the conference in question was not a sidebar, but rather an intentional courtroom closure. Therefore, unlike the sidebar in Smith, the proceeding in Whitlock implicated the public trial right. Whitlock, 188 Wn.2d at 522-23.

Here, the first sidebar occurred during the testimony of Island County Clerk Debra Van Pelt. The prosecutor and defense counsel asked to approach the bench for a sidebar. When the conference was over, the court said “We’re going to have a break.”

No. 76313-3-1/6

VRP (11/16/16) at 296-97. The second instance occurred during direct examination of Jason. Defense counsel asked him to “tell the jury a little bit about the recent loss you suffered within your family.” The prosecutor objected on grounds of relevance and asked for a sidebar. When the conference was over, the court stated, “your objection is overruled.” VRP (11/16/16) at 340. The third instance occurred during cross-examination of Jason. The State asked him whether he had ever apologized for threatening Jonina. Defense counsel objected on the ground that the question was “outside the scope.” The court sustained the objection, and the State asked for a sidebar. Following the sidebar, the court stated “[t]he objection is overruled,” and permitted the State to continue this line of questioning. VRP (11/16/16) at 345-46. In all three instances, the only record of the sidebar is the following notation: “Whereupon, a bench conference was had off the record and out of the hearing of the jury.” VRP (11/16/16) at 296-97, 340, 346.

The State argues that the content of the sidebars can be inferred from the record, and that it is unlikely the sidebars implicated a public trial right. According to the State, the sidebar during the testimony of Debra Van Pelt was most likely simply about taking a break, which is a mundane issue not implicating the public trial right. The State further argues that the other two sidebars, which were followed by evidentiary rulings on the record, most likely focused on legal arguments concerning the admissibility of evidence, also a proper matter for sidebars.

Notably, in Smith the sidebars held proper were “contemporaneously memorialized and recorded, thus negating any concern about secrecy.” 151 Wn.2d at 518. Here, it is not possible to determine the exact content of the sidebars because

neither Jason nor the State memorialized them on the record. Nonetheless, we agree with the State. Although it would have been preferable for the court to place a detailed notation regarding the sidebar on the record, here, it is abundantly evident that the first sidebar involved whether to take a recess and the latter two addressed typical evidentiary rulings, the types of issues that Smith held do not implicate the right to a public trial.³

Right to Cross-Examine Witnesses

Jason argues that the trial court's exclusion of relevant evidence violated his Sixth Amendment right to present a defense. A trial court's ruling on the admissibility of evidence is reviewed for abuse of discretion. State v. Fisher, 165 Wn.2d 727, 750, 202 P.3d 937 (2009). The 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).

The right to confront and cross-examine adverse witnesses is guaranteed by both the federal and state constitutions. U.S. Const. amend. 6; Wash. Const. art. I, §22. "A defendant's right to an opportunity to be heard in his defense, including the rights to examine witnesses against him and to offer testimony, is basic in our system of jurisprudence." State v. Jones, 168 Wn.2d 713, 720, 230 P.3d 576 (2010). However, "the right to cross-examine adverse witnesses is not absolute." State v. Darden, 145 Wn.2d 612, 620, 41 P.3d 1189 (2002). Trial courts "retain wide latitude insofar as the Confrontation Clause is concerned to impose reasonable limits on such cross-

³ Jason asks us to reverse on the ground that structural error occurred because the trial court failed to make a contemporary record of what was discussed during the sidebars. We reject the invitation because, as we have noted, the nature of the sidebars is apparent from the record.

No. 76313-3-1/8

examination based on concerns about, among other things, harassment, prejudice, confusion of the issues, the witnesses' safety, or interrogation that is repetitive or only marginally relevant." State v. Lee, 188 Wn.2d 473, 490, 396 P.3d 316 (2017) (quoting Delaware v. Van Arsdall, 475 U.S. 673, 679, 106 S. Ct. 1431, 89 L. Ed. 2d 674 (1986)).

Prior to trial, the State moved to "limit testimony of all witnesses to a brief description of the nature of the [family] dispute."⁴ Clerk's Papers (CP) at 104. The State argued that:

The Defendant and the victims are engaged in a complicated but unrelated civil dispute involving a contested will. The existence of this dispute is only relevant to the current charges, to the extent that it forms the Defendant's motive for the charged crimes. Additionally, defense counsel may argue that the existence of the dispute shows potential bias on the part of the State's witnesses. Regardless, exhaustive detail about the civil dispute is not relevant to this criminal case and would be a distraction for the jury. ER 401; ER 403. The State asks the court to limit testimony of all witnesses to a brief description of the nature of the dispute. This criminal trial is not an opportunity to litigate, or re-litigate, issues such as the proper distribution of an estate, how often each family member visited Steven or Yvonne Planque before their deaths, or the details of past arguments between the individual factions of the Planque family.

CP at 103-04.

At trial, Jonina testified briefly on direct examination about the dispute, describing the circumstances as a "civil battle" and claiming that her grandparents' estate had been "stolen." VRP (11/16/16) at 236-37. On cross-examination, defense counsel stated, "And prior to this incident on May the 7th there was a kind of an altercation when..." VRP (11/16/16) at 238. At that point, the State objected "on grounds of relevance, but also beyond the scope of Direct. Whatever incident defense counsel is trying to get into here

⁴ The State notes that defense counsel raised no objection to this argument during pre-trial motions. However, after reviewing the record, it does not appear that the trial court actually ruled on this motion.

No. 76313-3-I/9

was not discussed on Direct. I only went into, as I argued in the Trial Brief, what I thought was the limited, but necessary explanation of circumstances, which was the general nature of the dispute – civil dispute over an estate.” VRP (11/15/16) at 239. Defense counsel responded that she wanted to bring up “an incident that is in Ms. Jonina Planque’s statement that happened the week before this incident. It goes to bias as there was a bit of an altercation at the Tap Room,⁵ and I wanted to bring that up as this is cross-examination for impeachment purposes. It goes to bias.” VRP (11/15/16) at 240. The court ruled that the question was beyond the scope of direct, and sustained the objection. VRP (11/15/16) at 240.

Jason contends that the trial court erred in preventing counsel from cross-examining Jonina about the alleged incident at the Tap Room. He argues that the evidence relating to the altercation was relevant to Jonina’s bias, partiality, and credibility, as well as to Jonina’s accusations towards Jason. He asserts that the evidence should have been admissible because the State failed to show it was “so prejudicial as to disrupt the fairness of the fact-finding process at trial.” State v. Jones, 168 Wn.2d 713, 720, 230 P.3d 576 (2010) (quoting State v. Darden, 145 Wn.2d 612, 622, 41 P.3d 1189 (2002)).

The trial court erred in excluding this testimony on the ground that the question was beyond the scope of direct. Evidence of a witness’ bias and partiality “is subject to exploration at trial, and is ‘always relevant as discrediting the witness and affecting the weight of his testimony.’” Davis v. Alaska, 415 U.S. 308, 316, 94 S. Ct. 1105, 39 L. Ed. 2d 347 (1974) (quoting 3A J. Wigmore, Evidence § 940, p. 775 (Chadbourn rev. 1970)).

⁵ The Tap Room is a bar on Whidbey Island.

No. 76313-3-I/10

However, this court “may affirm on any correct legal basis.” State v. Barnes, 54 Wn. App. 536, 541, 774 P.2d 547 (1989) (citing Sprague v. Sumitomo Co. Ltd., 104 Wn.2d 751, 758, 709 P.2d 1200 (1985)). We affirm the trial court because the constitutional rights to cross examination and to present a defense do not extend to irrelevant evidence. Jones, 168 Wn.2d at 720 (citing State v. Gregory, 158 Wn.2d 759, 786, n.6, 147 P.3d 1201 (2006)).

Here, Jason failed to establish that the testimony was relevant to the witness’ bias. It does not appear to be in dispute that Jason was not a party to the altercation with Jonina. It involved either his mother or sister. Thus, other than his bald claim that the testimony went to Jonina’s bias, Jason did not explain to the trial court, or on appeal, why or how the testimony would demonstrate her partiality. Nor did he offer any explanation of how excluding the testimony impaired his ability to argue his theory of defense. Indeed, limited testimony regarding the contested will and the bitter dispute between Jason and Jonina was admitted, and Jason made use of it to argue in closing that Jonina’s attitude about the family estate went to her prejudice and bias. Absent some explanation of the relevancy of Tap Room incident, the trial court did not err in excluding it. Jason’s constitutional right to present a defense was not violated.

Prosecutorial Misconduct

Jason argues that the prosecutor’s statements during closing arguments amounted to prosecutorial misconduct. This court reviews claims of prosecutorial misconduct for abuse of discretion. State v. Ish, 170 Wn.2d 189, 195-96, 241 P.3d 389 (2010). “In a prosecutorial misconduct claim, the defendant bears the burden of proving that the prosecutor’s conduct was both improper and prejudicial.” State v. Emery, 174

No. 76313-3-I/11

Wn.2d 741, 756, 278 P.3d 653 (2012) (citing State v. Thorgerson, 172 Wn.2d 438, 442, 258 P.3d 43 (2011)). The prosecutor's challenged statements are evaluated "within the context of the prosecutor's entire argument, the issues in the case, the evidence discussed in the argument, and the jury instructions." State v. Dhaliwal, 150 Wn.2d 559, 578, 79 P.3d 432 (2003). "A prosecutor has wide latitude in closing argument to draw reasonable inferences from the evidence and to express such inferences to the jury." State v. Boehning, 127 Wn. App. 511, 519, 111 P.3d 899 (2005) (citing State v. Hoffman, 116 Wn.2d 51, 94-95, 804 P.2d 577 (1991)). "But a prosecutor commits reversible misconduct by urging the jury to decide a case based on evidence outside the record." State v. Pierce, 169 Wn. App. 533, 553, 280 P.3d 1158 (2012).

Here, Jason argues that the prosecutor committed reversible misconduct by telling the jury three times during closing arguments that Jason stated: "I am for real. I've got nothing to lose. I have the means to kill you. And I'm in exactly the state of mind to carry it out." VRP (11/16/2016) at 377, 378, 409. Because the evidence presented at trial did not show that this phrase was among the messages that Jason was alleged to have posted on Jonina's Facebook page, Jason contends that the prosecutor improperly urged the jury to decide the case based on evidence that did not exist in the record.

Defense counsel at trial did not object to the prosecutor's statements. If defense counsel fails to object to an improper remark, it waives the error "unless the remark is so flagrant and ill-intentioned that it causes an enduring and resulting prejudice that could not have been neutralized by an admonition to the jury." State v. Russell, 125 Wn.2d 24, 86, 882 P.2d 747 (1994).

No. 76313-3-I/12

We conclude that the prosecutor's remarks were not improper. When evaluated in the context of the entire argument, it is apparent that the prosecutor did not tell the jury that Jason actually posted that exact phrase on Jonina's Facebook page. Rather, the prosecutor drew a reasonable inference about the overall message that Jason intended to impress upon Jonina, based on all of the messages that Jason posted.

Jason Planque did a lot more than just say he was going to kill someone. He really went the extra mile to make sure that he got his point across.

And his point was to deliver a message. One message.

The message was this: "I am for real. I've got nothing to lose. I have the means to kill you. And I'm in exactly the state of mind to carry it out."

That was the message.

That was the message that Jason Planque sent to Jonina on May 7th, 2015. It took him many words to send that message. He did it over the course of numerous Facebook posts and comments on his posts....

So was that message received? You bet it was. Loud and clear.

VRP (11/16/16) at 377-78 (emphasis added).

Defense counsel indicates that Dennis Planque doesn't – doesn't remember – doesn't remember anything important about those threats because he couldn't restate the exact words written in the threats.

What did Dennis Planque remember? Dennis Planque remembered the message.

VRP at 409.

Jason suggests that the presence of quote marks around the "message" in the transcript shows that the prosecutor indicated to the jury that he was quoting Jason. But the State denies that the prosecutor made any gesture at trial to indicate that the

No. 76313-3-I/13

language was a direct quote, and Jason admits that it is not possible to know how the transcriptionist elected to employ punctuation. A review of the transcript suggests that the transcriptionist was not consistent in the use of quotation marks. See, e.g. VRP (11/16/16) at 386 (no quotation marks placed around a direct quote from the Facebook posts read by the prosecutor to the jury).

Moreover, if defense counsel had objected below, the judge could have easily neutralized any prejudice by admonishing the jury to disregard the prosecutor's "message" language because there was no evidence that Jason used those exact words. Jason has not shown that reversal is required.

Statement of Additional Grounds

Jason filed a pro se statement of additional grounds for review (SAG), consisting mostly of a detailed description of his perspective on the civil dispute involving Jonina and Dennis. But the vast majority of this information is not in the record before this court. "Only documents that are contained in the record on review should be attached or referred to in the statement." RAP 10.10(c).

Jason argued that defense counsel was incommunicative, inexperienced, or may have intentionally conspired with the prosecutor to help build his conviction rate. To prevail on a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel, a defendant must establish both ineffective representation and resulting prejudice. State v. McNeal, 145 Wn.2d 352, 362, 37 P.3d 280 (2002). Jason's SAG does not make this showing. Jason further argues that his attorney provided an inadequate defense for refusing to incorporate evidence of the family dispute into her defense strategy. "[D]eficient performance is not shown by matters that go to trial strategy or tactics." State v. Studd, 137 Wn.2d 533, 551, 973

No. 76313-3-I/14

P.2d 1049 (1999) (quoting State v. Hendrickson, 129 Wn.2d 61, 77-78, 917 P.2d 563 (1996)). Defense counsel was not deficient for failing to make arguments based on inadmissible evidence. And the record shows that defense counsel did make use of admissible evidence regarding the family dispute to argue bias and prejudice.

Jason contends that his accusers provided false testimony at trial and that he was unfairly prevented from presenting evidence of the family dispute, which he claims would have proved they were perjuring themselves. Again, this argument relies on his version of events as described in his SAG. “[I]ssues that involve facts or evidence not in the record are properly raised through a personal restraint petition, not a statement of additional grounds.” State v. Calvin, 176 Wn. App. 1, 26, 316 P.3d 496 (2013) (citing State v. Alvarado, 164 Wn.2d 556, 569, 192 P.3d 345 (2008)).

Jason claims that the trial court commenced trial even though both the prosecutor and defense counsel said they were not ready. The decision to grant or deny a motion for continuance rests with the trial court. State v. Downing, 151 Wn.2d 265, 272, 87 P.3d 1169 (2004). The record shows that on the eve of trial, defense counsel asked for a continuance because Jason suddenly wanted new counsel. The trial court heard Jason's arguments and denied the motion. The record does not support Jason's assertion that any other continuances occurred in the manner he describes.

Jason contends that the police officer who described his arrest was untruthful. But this court defers to the trier of fact on issues of testimony, credibility of witnesses, and the persuasiveness of the evidence. State v. Bencivenga, 137 Wn.2d 703, 708-09, 974 P.2d 832 (1999).

Jason argues that the prosecutor improperly used evidence of his past criminal record in the arguments and instructions to the jury. The record does not support this claim. Similarly, the record does not support Jason's argument that he was prejudiced by the State's introduction of a highlighted version of the Facebook posts. The record shows that defense counsel did object to the highlights, and the court responded that it would have the exhibit copied over again to make it "clearer." VRP (11/16/2016) at 335-36. There is no indication that prejudice occurred.

Jason points out that an Island County Sheriff testified that he could not say with 100 percent certainty that Jason is the individual who posted the Facebook messages. To the extent that this assertion could be read to imply that the evidence was not sufficient to support the verdict, we reject it. To the extent that Jason's SAG may imply other errors, they are insufficiently articulated to permit review. "[T]he appellate court will not consider a defendant's statement of additional grounds for review if it does not inform the court of the nature and occurrence of alleged errors." RAP 10.10(c).

Affirm.

Speciman, J.

WE CONCUR:

Tricksey, J.

Becker, J.

DECLARATION OF FILING AND MAILING OR DELIVERY

The undersigned certifies under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that on the below date, the original document **Petition for Review to the Supreme Court** to which this declaration is affixed/attached, was filed in the **Court of Appeals** under **Case No. 76213-3-I**, and a true copy was mailed with first-class postage prepaid or otherwise caused to be delivered to the following attorney(s) or party/parties of record at their regular office or residence address as listed on ACORDS:

respondent Michael Safstrom, DPA
Island County Prosecutor's Office
[ICPAO_webmaster@co.island.wa.us]

petitioner

Attorney for other party



MARIA ANA ARRANZA RILEY, Legal Assistant
Washington Appellate Project

Date: May 29, 2018

WASHINGTON APPELLATE PROJECT

May 29, 2018 - 4:33 PM

Transmittal Information

Filed with Court: Court of Appeals Division I
Appellate Court Case Number: 76213-3
Appellate Court Case Title: State of Washington, Respondent v. Jason Lee Planque, Appellant
Superior Court Case Number: 15-1-00094-3

The following documents have been uploaded:

- 762133_Petition_for_Review_20180529163308D1940007_9845.pdf
This File Contains:
Petition for Review
The Original File Name was washapp.052918-09.pdf

A copy of the uploaded files will be sent to:

- ICPAO_webmaster@co.island.wa.us
- m.safstrom@co.island.wa.us

Comments:

Sender Name: MARIA RILEY - Email: maria@washapp.org

Filing on Behalf of: Jan Trasen - Email: jan@washapp.org (Alternate Email: wapofficemail@washapp.org)

Address:
1511 3RD AVE STE 701
SEATTLE, WA, 98101
Phone: (206) 587-2711

Note: The Filing Id is 20180529163308D1940007