. 70000-3		, ,, , ,,,
IN THE COURT OF Appeals OF The	le state of WASHING	DN BY
	Couse# 75468-8-1	
Appellant	King County Cause# 15-1-047.17	EA
LAVELL DEMEATIONS Lewis		
	PETITION FOR	
Respondant	Review	
	RAP 13.4 (A)	
NOTONIAZAW FO OF OLD SAT	1 2	A I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I
J.		
		NASH CO
	1	NG C
		S CN I
Comes Now Appellant as Pro	n-SE REDIGET THAT	
THIS COURT Grow'T MOT TON & FINDS 2°HT		
AND DESMISS with fre Tradice	- TIOS AIFARD DIEGODA	
The Abouve Case Number		
THIS MOTION IS Based ON T	- 50/25 possion	
`		
The Attached memorandum	OF HOW INITED	
vill be supplemented		<del> </del>
	-th,	
	This 12th day	-
	TIME 2018	-
		<del> </del>
	2019 Limos House	<b> </b>
		,

	pase#2
Memorandum of Law	
A Facts	
. On may 26th of 2006 Lavell Lewis occepted	
AND Plead TO A BIFORD Plea IN OPEN COURT &	
THE Prosecutor was BENTamin Ganen.	
2. Mr Levis was provided Appeal After being DEN	(C)
by The superior court of walkington to with-	
Draw His Glear	
3. The Apointed counsel Jared Stood This	
Neilson Broman and Kocth. Filed Anders Brief	
Claiming Nothing in Transcripts were Found	
To warrent Apeal	
4. May 14th OF 2018 Appeals court growted	
Anders Breif FOR The Appointed Altorney To	
withdaw	
Arginnent	
THE State OF Washington veolated (FSIA)	
Foreign Soveriegn Immunities act OF 1976 90 STA	<del>-</del>
2891 28 USC Sec 1330 1332(a) 1391(f)	
AND 1601-1611 herein After The FSIA	
The DeF-udant must be OF A Foreign State or politice	
SubDivision, As Defined in Section 1603 The act NOT	
4 agency of instamentality of Foreign State (To be SE	lved

į	
THE US DEPORTMENT OF STATE DOES NOT Serve NOTWORL PERSON UNDER THE FSIA	Page 3
and Argument	
State of washington violated State at	
Large XV Rights OF American Citezensin	
Large XV Rights OF American Citezensin Foreign States 1 U.S.C. & 72 and 4 U.S.C. 110-	
116 Buckact	
I was not properly served when I was charge	2
with miscrime, under THE us Legal System THE	
Scope of Foreign Stats immunity is determin	67
by Judicil, Rather Than executive Authorit	1cs.
A party To a Lawson't in cluding a Foreign	
State or A Agency or instrumentality is Reduced	
TO PREVENT DEFENSES SUCH as Sovereign immuni	
Directly to the court in withis pending	
3R2 Argamut	
THE immunity of A State From Jaristiction	
OF THE CONSTS OF Another State? SA undis-	
puted principal of custimary international	
Law.	
Conclution	
For THE REWOODS Stated Herein And	
Based on The Record Hereing THE Appetel	
Bespect Fully Bequest That THES PETITION	
FOR Review Begrowted	
- July Providence of the second secon	

heliet Pagett Je Dismissed with pretudice T Lavell D Lewis under THE PENALTY
OF PERTURY SWEAR That Everything in
THIS Atatateted Brick 15 TRUE and correct Submited 1 Day OF June 2018 Pro-SE Lavell Lewis PPendix

## IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE OF WASHINGTON,		) No. 75400 0 I	cour STAT 2018
	Respondent,	) No. 75468-8-I )	RT OF ATE OF
v.		) DIVISION ONE	AFFE WAS
LAVELL LEWIS,		) UNPUBLISHED OPINION )	ALS OF
	Annellant	) FILED: May 14, 2018	45 54 54 54

PER CURIAM – Lavell Lewis appeals from the judgment and sentence entered after he pleaded guilty to communication with a minor for immoral purposes. Lewis's court-appointed attorney has filed a motion to withdraw on the ground that there is no basis for a good faith argument on review. Pursuant to <u>State v. Theobald</u>, 78 Wn.2d 184, 470 P.2d 188 (1970), and <u>Anders v. California</u>, 386 U.S. 738, 18 L. Ed. 2d 493, 87 S. Ct. 1396 (1967), the motion to withdraw must:

[1] be accompanied by a brief referring to anything in the record that might arguably support the appeal. [2] A copy of counsel's brief should be furnished the indigent and [3] time allowed him to raise any points that he chooses; [4] the court—not counsel—then proceeds, after a full examination of all the proceedings, to decide whether the case is wholly frivolous.

State v. Theobald, 78 Wn.2d at 185 (quoting Anders v. California, 386 U.S. at 744).

This procedure has been followed. Lewis's counsel on appeal filed a brief with the motion to withdraw. Lewis was served with a copy of the brief and informed of the right to file a statement of additional grounds for review. Lewis did not file a statement of additional grounds for review.

## No. 75468-8-1/2

The facts are accurately set forth in counsel's brief in support of the motion to withdraw. The court has reviewed the briefs filed in this court and has independently reviewed the entire record. The court specifically considered the following potential issues raised by counsel:

- 1. Whether the trial court erred in granting Lewis's motion to proceed pro se?
- 2. Whether the trial court erred in finding Lewis competent to stand trial and plead guilty.
  - 3. Whether Lewis's guilty plea was knowing, intelligent, and voluntary?
- 4. Whether the trial court erred in denying Lewis's motion to withdraw his guilty plea?

The potential issues raised by counsel are wholly frivolous. Counsel's motion to withdraw is granted and the appeal is dismissed.

Cox, J.

Becker,

For the court: