

FILED
Court of Appeals
Division II
State of Washington
6/26/2020 12:25 PM

FILED
SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
6/29/2020
BY SUSAN L. CARLSON
CLERK

SUPREME COURT NO. 98696-7

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Respondent,

v.

ANTHONY SMITH,

Petitioner.

ON DISCRETIONARY REVIEW FROM THE COURT OF APPEALS,
DIVISION TWO

Court of Appeals No. 51946-1-II
Pierce County No. 16-1-03561-4

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..... | 2 |
| E. ARGUMENT WHY REVIEW SHOULD BE GRANTED | 8 |
| 1. The Court of Appeals’s determination that the legal efficacy of an allegedly forged document is a question for the trial court presents a significant constitutional question and an issue of substantial public importance which this Court should review. | 8 |
| 2. Whether failure to give a proposed instruction on legal efficacy impacts the constitutional right to due process is a significant constitutional question this Court should address..... | 12 |
| 3. The Court of Appeals’ holding that defense evidence was properly excluded conflicts with a decision of this Court and presents a significant constitutional question this Court should address..... | 14 |
| 4. Trial counsel’s failure to request a limiting instruction denied smith effective representation. | 17 |
| F. CONCLUSION..... | 20 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Washington Cases

| | |
|---|--------|
| <i>State v. Aitken</i> , 79 Wn.App. 890, 905 P.2d 1235 (1995)..... | 11 |
| <i>State v. Allen</i> , 101 Wn.2d 355, 678 P.2d 798 (1984)..... | 13 |
| <i>State v. Benn</i> , 120 Wn.2d 631, 845 P.2d 289, <i>cert. denied</i> , 510 U.S. 944 (1993)..... | 18 |
| <i>State v. Bradshaw</i> , 3 Wn. App. 2d 187, 414 P.3d 1148, <i>review denied</i> , 191 Wn.2d 1007 (2018)..... | 9 |
| <i>State v. Brown</i> , 132 Wn.2d 529, 940 P.2d 546 (1997), <i>cert. denied</i> , 523 U.S. 1007 (1998)..... | 13 |
| <i>State v. Burke</i> , 163 Wn.2d 204, 181 P.3d 1 (2008)..... | 18 |
| <i>State v. Clinkenbeard</i> , 130 Wn. App. 552, 123 P.3d 872 (2005) | 18 |
| <i>State v. Crowder</i> , 103 Wn. App. 20, 11 P.3d 828 (2000), <i>review denied</i> , 142 Wn.2d 1024, (2001) | 14 |
| <i>State v. Dickenson</i> , 48 Wn. App. 457, 740 P.2d 312, <i>review denied</i> , 109 Wn.2d 1001 (1987)..... | 18 |
| <i>State v. George</i> , 161 Wn. App. 86, 249 P.3d 202, <i>review denied</i> , 172 Wn.2d 1007 (2011)..... | 12 |
| <i>State v. Ginn</i> , 128 Wn. App. 872, 177 P.3d 1155 (2005), <i>review denied</i> , 157 Wn.2d 1010 (2006)..... | 12 |
| <i>State v. Green</i> , 157 Wn.App. 833, 239 P.3d 1130 (2010) | 11 |
| <i>State v. Hancock</i> , 109 Wn.2d 760, 748 P.2d 611 (1988)..... | 19 |
| <i>State v. Hill</i> , 184 Wn. App. 1017, Cause No. 70742-6-I, WL 5465369 (Oct. 27, 2014) | 10, 11 |
| <i>State v. Hudlow</i> , 99 Wn.2d 1, 659 P.2d 514 (1983) | 14 |
| <i>State v. Johnson</i> , 40 Wn. App. 371, 699 P.2d 221 (1985)..... | 19 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| <i>State v. Meyers</i> , 133 Wn.2d 26, 941 P.2d 1102 (1997) | 19 |
| <i>State v. Miller</i> , 156 Wn.2d 23, 123 P.3d 827 (2005) | 11 |
| <i>State v. Pitts</i> , 62 Wn.2d 294, 382 P.2d 508 (1963) | 19 |
| <i>State v. Pouncy</i> , 168 Wn.2d 382, 229 P.3d 678 (2010) | 13 |
| <i>State v. Redmond</i> , 150 Wn.2d 489, 78 P.3d 1001 (2003) | 12 |
| <i>State v. Ring</i> , 191 Wn. App. 787, 364 P.3d 853 (2015) | 9, 10, 13 |
| <i>State v. Scoby</i> , 117 Wn.2d 55, 810 P.2d 1358 (1991) | 9, 10 |
| <i>State v. Scott</i> , 110 Wn.2d 682, 757 P.2d 492 (1988) | 13 |
| <i>State v. Smith</i> , 72 Wn. App. 237, 864 P.2d 406 (1993) | 9 |
| <i>State v. Thacker</i> , 94 Wn.2d 276, 616 P.2d 655 (1980) | 16 |
| <i>State v. Thomas</i> , 109 Wn.2d 222, 743 P.2d 816 (1987) | 13, 17, 18 |
| <i>State v. Walker</i> , 136 Wn.2d 767, 966 P.2d 883 (1998) | 12 |
| <i>State v. Williams</i> , 132 Wn.2d 248, 937 P.2d 1062 (1997) | 12 |
| <i>State v. Wittenbarger</i> , 124 Wn.2d 467, 880 P.2d 517 (1994) | 14 |

Federal Cases

| | |
|--|--------|
| <i>Apprendi v. New Jersey</i> , 530 U.S. 466, 120 S.Ct. 2348, 147 L.Ed.2d 435 (2000) | 9 |
| <i>Crane v. Kentucky</i> , 476 U.S. 683, 106 S.Ct. 2142, 90 L.Ed.2d 636 (1986) | 14, 17 |
| <i>Strickland v. Washington</i> , 466 U.S. 668, 104 S.Ct. 2052, 80 L.Ed.2d 674 (1984) | 17 |

Statutes

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| RCW 9A.60.010(6) | 9 |
| RCW 9A.60.010(7) | 9 |

RCW 9A.60.020..... 9

Constitutional Provisions

U.S. Const. amend. V..... 14

U.S. Const. amend. VI..... 14, 17

U.S. Const. amend. XIV..... 9, 14

Wash. Const. art. I, § 22..... 17

Wash. Const. art. I, § 3..... 10

Rules

ER 607 18

ER 613 18

RAP 13.4(b)(3) 12, 14, 17, 20

RAP 13.4(b)(4) 12

A. IDENTITY OF PETITIONER

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

B. COURT OF APPEALS DECISION

Smith seeks review of the May 27, 2020, part published decision of Division Two of the Court of Appeals affirming his convictions.

C. ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

1. Where legal efficacy is the definition of an element the State must prove in order to convict, is the legal efficacy determination a question of fact for the jury?

2. Where the common law meaning of “instrument” as applied to the crime of forgery is outside the word’s common usage, did the court’s refusal give the defense proposed instruction defining that term violate Smith’s constitutional right to present a defense?

3. The State impeached a witness with prior inconsistent statements, and the defense sought to call a witness to explain the source of the prior statements. The trial court excluded the offered testimony, erroneously concluding that the prior statements were not in evidence. Did the court’s abuse of discretion impact Smith’s right to present a defense?

4. Did trial counsel's failure to seek limiting instructions on the use of prior inconsistent statements constitute ineffective assistance of counsel?

D. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Anthony Smith was charged with two counts of forgery, one count of first degree theft, and one count of money laundering. CP 7-10. He was tried with co-defendant Adrian Broussard, his half-brother, who was charged with theft and forgery involving different transactions, as well as three counts of unlawful possession of a controlled substance with intent to deliver. The State's theory was that both defendants participated in an overarching scheme with a third half-brother, Derek James, who pled guilty to a series of transactions separate from the ones Smith and Broussard were charged with. 2RP¹ 133.

Evidence at trial showed that James, Broussard, and Smith each registered businesses with the Secretary of State in the spring of 2016. 5RP 628, 658, 674. They opened bank accounts for their businesses using social security numbers that were not theirs. 4RP 456-60, 569, 579. James and Broussard applied for loans to purchase cars from these businesses. The loan proceeds were not used to purchase the cars but were deposited

¹ The Verbatim Report of Proceedings is contained in eleven volumes, designated as follows: 1RP—4/23/18; 2RP—4/24/18; 3RP—4/26/18; 4RP—4/20/18; 5RP—5/1/18; 6RP—5/2/18; 7RP—5/8/18; 8RP—5/10/18; 9RP—5/14/18 and 5/15/18; 10RP—5-24-18; 11RP—1/23/18.

into the business accounts and then withdrawn. 4RP 470, 480, 498, 509-10, 530-31, 545; 5RP 625-58.

The charges against Smith arose from transactions related to his business accounts. Smith opened accounts at Wells Fargo Bank for A.J. Motors on June 23, 2016. 4RP 569, 574. The tax identification number Smith provided was actually a social security number belonging to another person. 5RP 660. A check for \$14,840 drawn on Inspirus Credit Union was deposited into the A.J. Motors checking account through an ATM on June 29, 2016. The check was payable to A.J. Motors and referenced Derek James. 4RP 570-71. On July 1, 2016, Smith closed the Wells Fargo accounts and transferred the balance to new accounts at Wells Fargo in the name of A.J. Motors. 4RP 578-79. The new account applications used the same information as the original applications. 4RP 579; 5RP 665. Smith withdrew the funds in two transactions on July 11, 2016. 4RP 579; 5RP 667.

Smith explained that he had purchased a credit privacy number to use as a tax identification number for his business, and that was the number he gave when he opened the accounts at Wells Fargo. 8RP 1085. He did not know the number was a social security number belonging to someone else. 8RP 1095-96.

Smith also testified that when he discovered a deposit of \$14,840 had been made to his account, he immediately told the teller that he didn't know where the money came from and asked if the check could be stopped and the funds returned to the source. 8RP 1098-99. The solution proposed by the account manager was to close the existing accounts and transfer the funds into new accounts, so that's what he did. 8RP 1102-03. The account manager confirmed that Smith reported the unauthorized deposit and asked if the check could be stopped. 8RP 1155. When the account manager determined that was not possible, he set up a lost and stolen transfer for Smith, opening new accounts using all the information from the old accounts, and then closing the old accounts. 8RP 1157-58.

b. The jury heard evidence of James's guilty plea statements.

Prior to trial Smith moved to exclude James's guilty plea statement, arguing that the contents were hearsay and irrelevant. Counsel argued that no one should discuss the statement unless James testified and could be cross examined about it. 2RP 127-29. The State responded that it did not intend to use the statement unless James testified inconsistently with it. 2RP 130. It maintained that the overall scheme involving James, Broussard, and Smith was relevant to the charges in the case, however.

2RP 133. The court granted the motion to preclude reference to the plea statement, contingent on James's testimony. 2RP 137.

At trial the State presented documentary exhibits establishing James's transactions. The court admitted them conditionally, subject to the State connecting them to the offenses Smith and Broussard were charged with. 4RP 475, 500, 534, 554. Although the State planned to establish this connection through testimony from James, that did not happen. James admitted registering a business and opening accounts. 6RP 877-78. He testified that he pleaded guilty to four counts each of identity theft, forgery, and theft. 6RP 896. But he denied that Smith had anything to do with the transactions he was involved in. 6RP 913.

When James would not answer questions about specific transactions, the State questioned him about his plea statement. 6RP 896. James testified that his attorney prepared the statement and he initialed and signed it so that he could enter the plea and start serving his sentence. 6RP 897-900. James acknowledged that the plea statement indicates, "The judge has asked me to state in my own words what makes me guilty of this crime. This is my statement." 6RP 898. But he maintained that none of the facts in the plea statement were true. 6RP 898.

The State then read the statements contained in the plea form, asking James if he initialed next to those statements. 6RP 901-05. The

prosecutor established that James initialed statements that he used social security numbers belonging to others to obtain vehicle loans for vehicles he didn't intend to purchase, that he created purchase agreements using those social security numbers, and he took the purchase agreements to banks to obtain loans. Although James repeatedly testified that those statements were not true, he acknowledged initialing them on the plea form. 6RP 901-05.

The prosecutor then asked, "You and Mr. Smith and Mr. Broussard made multiple withdrawals from both the U.S. Bank account and from the Wells Fargo accounts, correct?" 6RP 906. "You each knew what the other two was doing, correct?" 6RP 906. "And the three of you were all working together to get the money, weren't you?" 6RP 907. When James denied each of these statements, the prosecutor responded, "Except that's all contained within the plea statement that you signed, correct?" 6RP 907. James acknowledged that he initialed and signed the plea form containing those assertions but again testified that those facts did not come from him. 6RP 907.

Following James's testimony denying the truth of the statements in the plea form, which was prepared by his attorney, Broussard served a subpoena on James's attorney. 8RP 1005-06. Smith joined in the request to call James's attorney as a witness. 8RP 1010. The Defense argued that

the attorney's testimony was necessary because the contents of the plea form were before the jury, and there was evidence that those contents were dictated to the attorney by the prosecutor. 8RP 1007-08, 1010. Counsel argued that James had testified that Smith and Broussard knew nothing about his crimes, and the State attempted to impeach him by reading the plea form and asking if he made those statements. The prior statements were therefore before the jury. 8RP 1010-11. The jury should be allowed to hear that those statements actually came from the prosecutor in an email to James's attorney. 8RP 1011.

The State acknowledged that it asked James about the contents of the plea form to impeach his trial testimony. It argued, however, that the origin of the statements was not material. 8RP 1012.

The court responded that "There's no evidence admitted in front of this jury regarding the substantive content of that plea form. The only evidence in front of this jury is Mr. James acknowledging that he pled guilty followed by his repeated denial that those were his words." 8RP 1014. The court denied the defense request to allow the attorney to testify. 8RP 1015. Defense counsel did not request an instruction limiting the jury's use of James's prior statements to impeachment, and no limiting instruction was given. *See* CP 218-33, 244-58, 274-336.

c. **The court declined to instruct the jury on the definition of “instrument” as to the forgery charges.**

Counsel argued that case law establishes that the common law definition of “instrument” is applicable to a charge of forgery, and he proposed the following instruction:

“Written instrument” means any paper, document or other instrument containing written matter or its equivalent.

An instrument is something, which, if genuine, may have legal effect or be the foundation of legal liability.

CP 224; 9RP 1210. The court instructed the jury on the definition of “written instrument” but declined to define “instrument.” CP 301; 10RP 1212. The defense took exception to the court’s ruling. 9RP 1211-12.

E. ARGUMENT WHY REVIEW SHOULD BE GRANTED

1. The Court of Appeals’s determination that the legal efficacy of an allegedly forged document is a question for the trial court presents a significant constitutional question and an issue of substantial public importance which this Court should review.

Smith was charged with two counts of forgery on the theory that he provided a social security number that was not his own when completing two business account applications at Wells Fargo bank. 9RP 1233. To convict Smith, the State had to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that, with intent to defraud, Smith offered or put off as true two written instruments

which he knew had been falsely completed. CP 300, 304; RCW 9A.60.020.

A “forged instrument” is defined by statute as “a written instrument which has been falsely made, completed, or altered.” RCW 9A.60.010(6). The statute further defines “written instrument” as “[a]ny paper, document, or other instrument containing written or printed matter or its equivalent...” RCW 9A.60.010(7). While the statute does not define the term “instrument,” Washington courts have recognized that the common law definition applies, holding that an “instrument is something, which, if genuine, may have legal effect or be the foundation of legal liability.” *State v. Scoby*, 117 Wn.2d 55, 57-58, 810 P.2d 1358 (1991); *State v. Bradshaw*, 3 Wn. App. 2d 187, 191, 414 P.3d 1148, *review denied*, 191 Wn.2d 1007 (2018); *State v. Ring*, 191 Wn. App. 787, 792, 364 P.3d 853 (2015) (certificate of insurance constituted written instrument); *State v. Smith*, 72 Wn. App. 237, 240-43, 864 P.2d 406 (1993) (unsigned check was not a written instrument for forgery charge because it could not be the basis of liability).

A criminal defendant has the constitutional right to a jury determination of guilt beyond a reasonable doubt as to every element of a charged crime. *Apprendi v. New Jersey*, 530 U.S. 466, 476-77, 120 S.Ct. 2348, 147 L.Ed.2d 435 (2000); U.S. Const. amend. XIV; Wash. Const. art.

I, § 3. While legal efficacy is not a separate element of the offense of forgery, it is a definitional aspect of “instrument,” an element which must be proved to the jury beyond a reasonable doubt. *Ring*, 191 Wn. App. at 793.

In this case Smith requested an instruction on the definition of instrument to inform the jury of the legal efficacy requirement. The trial court refused the proposed instruction, and Smith challenged the ruling on appeal. The Court of Appeals held in the published portion of its opinion that the legal efficacy of the account applications was a question of law for the trial court and therefore Smith was not entitled to the requested instruction. Slip Op. at 10-15.

Division One of the Court of Appeals addressed this issue in *State v. Hill*, 184 Wn. App. 1017, Cause No. 70742-6-I, WL 5465369 (Oct. 27, 2014). Although that case is unpublished, the reasoning is sound. The *Hill* court noted that prior case law establishes that the question of legal efficacy is for the trier of fact, because that question is inextricably part of the trier of fact's inquiry into whether an instrument was proved to exist. *Hill*, at 7 (citing *State v. Smith*, 72 Wn.App. 237, 864 P.2d 406 (1993) (forgery conviction reversed for insufficient evidence where the allegedly forged document was not legally efficacious); *Scoby*, 117 Wn.2d at 63 (upholding forgery conviction where State's evidence sufficient to prove

instrument within common law definition); *State v. Aitken*, 79 Wn.App. 890, 892-95, 905 P.2d 1235 (1995) (upholding forgery conviction where evidence was sufficient to establish that withdrawal slip defendant signed was a written instrument)).

Further, the *Hill* Court held that the question of legal efficacy is not appropriately within the court's gate-keeping function, distinguishing *State v. Miller*, 156 Wn.2d 23, 123 P.3d 827 (2005). *Hill*, at 7. In *Miller*, this Court held that the existence of a domestic violence no contact order is an element of the crime of violating such an order, but the validity of the order the defendant is charged with violating is a question of law for the trial court. 156 Wn.2d at 24, 31. The *Hill* Court emphasized that unlike a domestic violence no contact order, an alleged forged instrument is not an order issued by a court based upon facts found at a proceeding with due process protections. Without such protections, the court's gate-keeping function cannot properly be expanded to determining the existence of something the State is required to prove. *Hill*, at 7 (citing *State v. Green*, 157 Wn.App. 833, 850-51, 239 P.3d 1130 (2010) (declining to expand court's gate-keeping function to determination of whether notice of trespass is lawful in prosecution for violation of such notice)).

The Court of Appeals's determination in this case, that the legal efficacy determination is part of the court's gate keeping function, impacts

the constitutional right to a jury determination of guilt, because that determination is inextricably linked to whether an element of the offense has been established. The proper allocation of this determination is an issue of substantial public importance. This Court should grant review. RAP 13.4(b)(3)(4).

2. Whether failure to give a proposed instruction on legal efficacy impacts the constitutional right to due process is a significant constitutional question this Court should address.

The accused's constitutional right to due process includes the right have the jury instructed on his theory of the case if supported by the evidence. *State v. Redmond*, 150 Wn.2d 489, 493, 78 P.3d 1001 (2003); *State v. Williams*, 132 Wn.2d 248, 259, 937 P.2d 1062 (1997); *State v. George*, 161 Wn. App. 86, 100, 249 P.3d 202, *review denied*, 172 Wn.2d 1007 (2011); *State v. Ginn*, 128 Wn. App. 872, 878, 177 P.3d 1155 (2005), *review denied*, 157 Wn.2d 1010 (2006). The refusal to so instruct is reversible error. *Redmond*, 150 Wn.2d at 495; *Williams*, 132 Wn.2d at 260. This Court reviews a trial court's decision not to give a defendant's proposed instruction *de novo* if the refusal is based on a ruling of law. *State v. Walker*, 136 Wn.2d 767, 771-72, 966 P.2d 883 (1998).

In addition to instructing the jury as to the elements of the charged offense, the court should define any technical words or expressions. *State*

v. Pouncy, 168 Wn.2d 382, 389, 229 P.3d 678 (2010); *State v. Scott*, 110 Wn.2d 682, 689-90, 757 P.2d 492 (1988) (referring to the “long-recognized” technical term rule); *State v. Allen*, 101 Wn.2d 355, 361-62, 678 P.2d 798 (1984). A term is technical if its meaning differs from common usage. *State v. Brown*, 132 Wn.2d 529, 611, 940 P.2d 546 (1997), *cert. denied*, 523 U.S. 1007 (1998); *Allen*, 101 Wn.2d at 358.

As discussed above, although legal efficacy is not a separate element of the offense of forgery, it is a definitional aspect of “instrument” which must be proved to the jury beyond a reasonable doubt. *Ring*, 191 Wn. App. at 793. Because this common law meaning of the word “instrument” is a technical term outside the word’s common usage, Smith proposed an instruction defining that term as “something, which, if genuine, may have legal effect or be the foundation of legal liability.” CP 224.

A defendant has the right “to have the jury base its decision on an accurate statement of the law applied to the facts of the case.” *State v. Miller*, 131 Wn.2d 78, 90-91, 929 P.2d 372 (1997). The defendant “should not have to convince the jury what the law is.” *State v. Thomas*, 109 Wn.2d 222, 228, 743 P.2d 816 (1987); *accord Pouncy*, 168 Wn.2d at 392 (“It is not sufficient that counsel were able to argue to the jury their respective understandings of the term based on expert testimony; lawyers

have a hard enough time convincing jurors of facts without also having to convince them what the applicable law is.”).

Refusal to give the proposed instruction, which was a correct statement of the law and supported by the evidence, impacted Smith’s constitutional right to due process, and this Court should grant review. RAP 13.4(b)(3).

3. The Court of Appeals’ holding that defense evidence was properly excluded conflicts with a decision of this Court and presents a significant constitutional question this Court should address.

Criminal defendants have the constitutional right to present a complete defense. *State v. Wittenbarger*, 124 Wn.2d 467, 474, 880 P.2d 517 (1994); *Crane v. Kentucky*, 476 U.S. 683, 690, 106 S.Ct. 2142, 90 L.Ed.2d 636 (1986); U.S. Const. amend. V, VI, XIV; Wash. Const. art. 1, § 22. Relevant, admissible evidence offered by the defense may be excluded only if the prosecution demonstrates a compelling state interest in doing so. *State v. Hudlow*, 99 Wn.2d 1, 15-16, 659 P.2d 514 (1983). Although a trial court has discretion to determine whether evidence is admissible, a decision which is manifestly unreasonable or based on untenable grounds must be reversed on appeal. *See State v. Crowder*, 103 Wn. App. 20, 25-26, 11 P.3d 828 (2000), *review denied*, 142 Wn.2d 1024, (2001).

The trial court violated Smith's right to present a complete defense by excluding proposed testimony from James's attorney regarding the facts included in James's plea statement. The proposed testimony was relevant to rebut the State's theory that Smith and Broussard were involved in James's overall scheme to fraudulently obtain funds.

The State called James as a witness to attempt to establish a connection between him and the defendants. When James did not testify as the State expected, the prosecutor questioned him about his plea form, and James acknowledged that he signed and initialed the plea form, but he testified that it was prepared by his attorney. 6RP 897-905. The prosecutor established that James initialed statements in the form indicating that James, Broussard, and Smith were working together to get the money. 6RP 907.

Once the jury heard the contents of the plea form, the source of those statements became relevant. The defense made an offer of proof that James's attorney drafted the plea form using facts dictated by the prosecutor. 8RP 1007-08, 1010-11. This evidence made it more likely that James's testimony was credible and undercut the State's attempt to impeach him. The court concluded, however, that the proposed testimony was not relevant because the contents of the plea statement were not before the jury. 8RP 1014-15. This conclusion misconstrues the nature of

the evidence and is an untenable reason for excluding the offered testimony.

The Court of Appeals held that the trial court had discretion to exclude the proposed testimony, stating that if a witness denies making a prior inconsistent statement and no extrinsic evidence of that statement is introduced, a trial court may disallow testimony explaining the prior statement. Slip Op. at 20-21 (citing *State v. Thacker*, 94 Wn.2d 276, 280, 616 P.2d 655 (1980)). ““The rationale is that no impeachment evidence has been introduced into evidence which calls for an explanation.”” *Id.* (quoting *Thacker*, 94 Wn.2d at 280).

The Court of Appeals acknowledged that *Thacker* rejected the notion that a defendant is never entitled to introduce evidence to explain prior statements not introduced in evidence. Slip Op. at 21. For instance, in *Thacker*, on cross examining the defendant, the prosecutor read extensive excerpts from the defendant’s prior interview in question and answer form. *Thacker*, 94 Wn.2d at 277-78, 281. This Court held it was error to refuse the defendant’s request to put on rebuttal evidence, where the effect of the prosecutor’s cross examination “was to give the jury the impression that the statements were properly in evidence.” *Id.* at 282.

The Court of Appeals held that the general rule from *Thacker* applies, distinguishing this case on the basis that the prosecutor did not

read from the plea statement or give any indication that the contents of the statement were evidence in the case. Slip. Op. at 21-22.

What the court overlooked, however, was that the prosecutor went through each statement in James's plea form, reading several verbatim, and James confirmed that he initialed each of the statements as part of his guilty plea. 6RP 897-907. Although he testified that the statements were not true and gave an explanation for why he adopted them in his plea form, the effect of this impeachment "was to give the jury the impression that the statements were properly in evidence." *See Thacker*, at 282. The trial court abused its discretion in excluding the proposed evidence, and the Court of Appeals's conclusion to the contrary conflicts with this Court's holding in *Thacker*. This Court should grant review. RAP 13.4(b)(1). The denial of the right to present a complete defense is constitutional error. *Crane*, 476 U.S. at 690. This Court should grant review under RAP 13.4(b)(3).

4. Trial counsel's failure to request a limiting instruction denied smith effective representation.

Every criminal defendant is guaranteed the right to the effective assistance of counsel. *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668, 685, 104 S.Ct. 2052, 80 L.Ed.2d 674 (1984); *State v. Thomas*, 109 Wn.2d 222, 229, 743 P.2d 816 (1987); U.S. Const. amend. VI; Wash. Const. art. I, § 22. A

defendant is denied effective assistance when his attorney's conduct "(1) falls below a minimum objective standard of reasonable attorney conduct, and (2) there is a probability that the outcome would be different but for the attorney's conduct." *State v. Benn*, 120 Wn.2d 631, 663, 845 P.2d 289 (citing *Strickland*, 466 U.S. at 687-88), *cert. denied*, 510 U.S. 944 (1993).

This Court has recognized that counsel may be ineffective for failing to propose a jury instruction. *See State v. Thomas*, 109 Wn.2d at 226 (counsel ineffective in failing to propose instruction that would allow counsel to argue defendant's intoxication negated mens rea). In this case, although James's prior inconsistent statements were admissible only to impeach his credibility as a witness, defense counsel never asked the court to give a limiting instruction.

A witness may be impeached with prior out of court statements of material fact that are inconsistent with his or her testimony in court. ER 607; ER 613; *State v. Clinkenbeard*, 130 Wn. App. 552, 569, 123 P.3d 872 (2005); *State v. Dickenson*, 48 Wn. App. 457, 466, 740 P.2d 312, *review denied*, 109 Wn.2d 1001 (1987). In most instances, prior inconsistent statements may not be used as substantive proof of the elements required for conviction. *State v. Burke*, 163 Wn.2d 204, 219, 181 P.3d 1 (2008). Impeachment evidence goes only to the witness's credibility; it may not be considered as proof of the substantive facts encompassed by the evidence.

Clinkenbeard, 130 Wn. App. at 569; *State v. Johnson*, 40 Wn. App. 371, 377, 699 P.2d 221 (1985). Thus, where prior inconsistent statements are admitted to impeach a witness, “an instruction cautioning the jury to limit its consideration of the statement to its intended purpose is both proper and necessary.” *Johnson*, 40 Wn. App. at 377 (citing *State v. Pitts*, 62 Wn.2d 294, 297, 382 P.2d 508 (1963)). Without a request for a limiting instruction, evidence admitted as relevant for one purpose is deemed relevant for others. *State v. Meyers*, 133 Wn.2d 26, 36, 941 P.2d 1102 (1997).

The Court of Appeals held that Smith would not have been entitled to a limiting instruction with regard to James’s prior inconsistent statements, because those statements were never admitted into evidence. Slip Op. at 23. This conclusion is not supported by the record. James testified at trial that Smith had nothing to do with the transactions he was involved in, and that his prior statements that he, Smith, and Broussard were working together were not true. 6RP 907, 913. The State introduced the contents of James’s plea form, which James acknowledged initialing and signing, to impeach James. 8RP 1012. Counsel’s failure to request a limiting instruction created the very real problem that the jury may have considered the statements in James’s plea form as substantive evidence. *See State v. Hancock*, 109 Wn.2d 760, 766, 748 P.2d 611 (1988).

Counsel's failure to request a limiting instruction constitutes ineffective assistance of counsel. This Court should grant review. RAP 13.4(b)(3).

F. CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed above, this Court should grant review and reverse Smith's convictions.

DATED this 26th day of June 2020.

Respectfully submitted,

GLINSKI LAW FIRM PLLC

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Catherine E. Glinski".

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. Anthony Smith, Court of Appeals Cause No. 51946-1-II, as
follows:

Anthony Smith/DOC#347279
Airway Heights Corrections Center
PO Box 2049
Airway Heights, WA 99001

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
June 26, 2020

May 27, 2020

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

DIVISION II

STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Respondent.

vs.

ANTHONY JERROD SMITH,

Appellant.

No. 51946-1-II

PART PUBLISHED OPINION

MAXA, P.J. – Anthony Smith appeals his convictions of one count of first degree theft, two counts of forgery, and one count of money laundering. Smith’s convictions arose from his involvement in certain transactions with his half-brothers, Derek James and Adrian Broussard. The transactions involved creating auto dealer businesses and using invalid social security numbers to obtain loans from credit unions to purchase cars from the auto dealers. The men then would deposit the loan amount into a bank account for one of the auto dealer businesses but would not actually complete the car sale.

Smith created an auto dealer business and opened a business banking account for that business using a social security number belonging to another person. James obtained a loan from a credit union to purchase a car from Smith’s business. The credit union issued a check payable to Smith’s business, which was deposited into the business’s bank account. Two days later, Smith opened another business banking account using the same social security number and transferred the funds from the credit union loan in the first account to that new account. Shortly

afterward, Smith withdrew nearly all the funds from the new account. There was no indication that James ever purchased the car for which he obtained the loan.

In the published portion of this opinion, we hold that (1) the evidence was sufficient to convict Smith of the two counts of forgery because there was evidence that his two bank account applications had legal efficacy and were falsely completed, and (2) the trial court did not err in refusing to give an instruction defining “instrument” to include a legal efficacy requirement because the legal efficacy of the bank account applications was a question of law for the trial court. In the unpublished portion, we address and reject Smith’s other arguments but conclude that the criminal filing fee must be stricken. Accordingly, we affirm Smith’s convictions, but we remand for the trial court to strike the criminal filing fee from the judgment and sentence.

FACTS

Business Formation, Bank Account Applications, and Loan Transactions

Smith, James, and Broussard each registered businesses with the Secretary of State. In April 2016, James registered a business named “Fast Lane Autos.” On the same day, Broussard registered a business named “Brown Bear Auto.” In June, Smith registered a business named “A.J. Motors.”

On June 23, Smith opened a Wells Fargo business banking account for A.J. Motors using a social security number belonging to a child from Indiana. Around the same time, James and Broussard also opened bank accounts for their businesses.

On June 24, James obtained a \$14,840 loan from Inspirus Credit Union to purchase a car from Smith’s business, A.J. Motors. James applied for the loan using the social security number of a child in Ohio. On June 28, the credit union issued a check for \$14,840 payable to A.J.

Motors. On June 29, the check was deposited into A.J. Motors' bank account. This deposit was the first and only deposit of funds into the account.

On July 1, Smith returned to the Wells Fargo branch where he had opened the A.J. Motors account and asked a banker to stop payment on an unauthorized deposit to the account for \$14,840. The banker was unable to do so because of the status of the deposit. The banker offered to initiate a procedure involved opening a new account, transferring all the funds from the old account to the new account, and closing the old account. Smith opened another Wells Fargo business banking account for A.J. Motors, again using the social security number of the Indiana child. With Smith's authorization, the bank transferred all of the \$14,840 in the old account to the new account.

On July 11, surveillance footage showed Smith making two withdrawals from the new account, the first in the amount of \$5,000 and the second in the amount of \$9,800. Without the prior transfer from the initial account, there would not have been sufficient funds in the new account to make these withdrawals. There was no indication that James ever purchased the car for which he obtained the loan.

Tacoma Police investigated the transactions involving Smith, James, and Broussard. The State later charged Smith with two counts of forgery, one count of first degree theft, and one count of money laundering.

Motion to Dismiss Forgery Charges

At trial, after the State rested, Smith brought a motion to dismiss the forgery charges. He argued that the forgery charges should be dismissed because the bank account applications lacked legal efficacy, and because the State had not shown that he falsely completed the applications. The trial court denied the motion to dismiss the forgery counts. The court stated,

[T]he evidence satisfies the Court that if this application for an account has legal efficacy as the law defines it, that there is substantial evidence from which a juror could conclude that forgery was committed beyond a reasonable doubt; that is to say that Mr. Smith acted with intent to defraud knowing that the document that he was completing, that he was uttering, was false.

7 Report of Proceedings (RP at 994-95).

Jury Instructions

The trial court gave a jury instruction that stated, “A person commits the crime of Forgery when, with intent to injure or defraud, he or she falsely completes a written instrument or possesses, offers, or puts off as true, a written instrument which he or she knows to be forged.” Clerk’s Papers (CP) at 299. The court also gave the following instruction: “ ‘Written instrument’ means any paper, document or other instrument containing written or printed matter or its equivalent.” CP at 301.

Smith proposed an instruction that stated, “An instrument is something, which, if genuine, may have legal effect or be the foundation of legal liability.” CP at 224. He argued that the definition of “instrument” as proposed in his instruction reflected the common law definition. The trial court declined to give this instruction.

Conviction

The jury found Smith guilty of two counts of forgery, one count of first degree theft, and one count of money laundering. Smith appeals his convictions.

ANALYSIS

A. SUFFICIENCY OF THE EVIDENCE

Smith argues that the State failed to present sufficient evidence on the two forgery counts because it failed to establish that (1) the bank account applications Smith completed for A.J. Motors had legal efficacy and (2) the applications were falsely completed. We disagree.

1. Standard of Review

The test for determining sufficiency of the evidence is whether, after viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the State, any rational trier of fact could have found guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. *State v. Cardenas-Flores*, 189 Wn.2d 243, 265, 401 P.3d 19 (2017). In a sufficiency of the evidence claim, the defendant admits the truth of the evidence and the court views the evidence and all reasonable inferences drawn from that evidence in the light most favorable to the State. *Id.* at 265-66. Credibility determinations are made by the trier of fact and are not subject to review. *Id.* at 266. Circumstantial and direct evidence are equally reliable. *Id.*

2. Legal Principles

Under RCW 9A.60.020(1),

A person is guilty of forgery if, with intent to injure or defraud: (a) He or she falsely makes, completes, or alters a written instrument or; (b) He or she possesses, utters, offers, disposes of, or puts off as true a written instrument which he or she knows to be forged.

Under this statute, the existence of a written instrument is an element of forgery. *State v. Ring*, 191 Wn. App. 787, 791, 364 P.3d 853 (2015).

RCW 9A.60.010(7) defines “written instrument” as,

(a) Any paper, document, or other instrument containing written or printed matter or its equivalent; or (b) any access device, token, stamp, seal, badge, trademark, or other evidence or symbol of value, right, privilege, or identification.

Although this definition refers to an “other instrument,” neither RCW 9A.60.020(1) nor RCW 9A.60.010(7) defines “instrument.” Therefore, the common law provides the definition. *Ring*, 191 Wn. App. at 792; *see* RCW 9A.04.060 (“The provisions of the common law relating to the commission of crime and the punishment thereof . . . shall supplement all penal statutes of this state”).

“Under the common law, an instrument is something that, if genuine, would have legal effect or be the foundation of legal liability.” *Ring*, 191 Wn. App. at 792. Therefore, a “written instrument” as used in RCW 9A.60.020 is defined as a writing that has legal efficacy. *Id.* Under this definition, “a writing can support a forgery charge only if the writing would have legal efficacy if genuine.” *Id.*

3. Legal Efficacy of Bank Account Applications

Smith argues that the evidence does not establish that the bank account applications at issue constituted “written instruments” under the forgery statute because there was no evidence that the applications had any legal effect or that they could be foundations for legal liability. We disagree.

The legal efficacy rule was part of Washington forgery law under former chapter 9.44 RCW (1909) from 1909 through 1975, when the current forgery statute was enacted. *Ring*, 191 Wn. App. at 792. The legislature intended to continue the legal efficacy rule under the new forgery statute. *Id.* The former forgery statute listed categories of documents that satisfied the legal efficacy requirement, including

“any writing or instrument by which any claim, privilege, right, obligation or authority, or any right or title to property, real or personal, is or purports to be, or upon the happening of some future event may be, evidenced, created, acknowledged, transferred, increased, diminished, encumbered, defeated, discharged or affected.”

State v. Bradshaw, 3 Wn. App. 2d 187, 190 n.1, 414 P.3d 1148 (2018) (quoting former RCW 9.44.020 (1909)). Legislation revising the forgery statute in 1975 removed the particularized list of categories of items that can be forged. *Bradshaw*, 3 Wn. App. 2d at 190. However, the “use of the expression ‘written instrument’ was meant to encompass the full range of items in the previous statute.” *State v. Scoby*, 117 Wn.2d 55, 59-60, 810 P.2d 1358 (1991).

No Washington case previously has considered the legal efficacy of a bank account application under the forgery statute. As authority, the State points to several military court cases holding that checking account applications had legal efficacy under 10 U.S.C. § 905. *See U.S. v. White*, 35 M.J. 154, 156 (C.M.A. 1992); *U.S. v. Ivey*, 32 M.J. 590, 591 (A.C.M.R. 1991); *U.S. v. Sherman*, 52 M.J. 856, 859 (C.M.A. 2000).

In general, bank account applications initiate a contractual relationship between the bank and the depositor that, once accepted by the bank, create rights in and impose obligations on both parties. Depositors give money to the bank in exchange for the bank's services. The bank services the depositor's account in exchange for fees and the use of the depositor's funds.

Here, by signing the applications, Smith agreed that his relationship with the bank would be bound by certain agreements. The trial court admitted the account applications themselves as evidence. The applications both contained a "Certificate of Authority" which read in part

Each person who signs the "Certified/Agreed To" section of this Application certifies that . . . [t]he Customer's use of any [Bank] deposit account, product or service *will confirm the Customer's receipt of, and agreement to be bound by, the Bank's applicable fee and information schedule and account agreement that includes the Arbitration Agreement under which any dispute between the Customer and the Bank relating to the Customer's use of any Bank deposit account, product or service will be decided.*

Ex. 65 at 5, Ex. 78 at 4 (emphasis added). The "Certificate of Authority" also provided that anyone who signed the application certified that he or she was authorized to act with respect to the account and any agreements with Wells Fargo, to make payments from the account, and to give instructions to Wells Fargo regarding the transaction of any business relating to the account. Therefore, the bank account applications at issue here provided the foundation of legal liability and had legal efficacy under the forgery statute.

Accordingly, we hold that sufficient evidence supports the conclusion that Smith's bank account applications had legal efficacy.

4. Falsely Completed Bank Account Applications

Smith argues that even if the bank account applications had legal efficacy, the State failed to establish that they were falsely completed. We disagree.

"To 'falsely complete' a written instrument means to transform an incomplete written instrument into a complete one by adding or inserting matter, without the authority of anyone entitled to grant it." RCW 9A.60.010(4). Forgery does not include making false entries in an otherwise genuine document but instead involves "the manufacture of a false or spurious document made to appear to be other than what it actually is." *State v. Esquivel*, 71 Wn. App. 868, 870-71, 863 P.2d 113 (1993).

Smith analogizes his case to *State v. Mark*, 94 Wn.2d 520, 618 P.2d 73 (1980). In *Mark*, a pharmacist completed Medicaid claim forms by writing a physician's name in a space marked "physician's signature" in cases where he had received prescriptions from physicians over the phone or where the prescriptions were renewable. *Id.* at 521-22. The Supreme Court granted review to determine "whether the writing in of a physician's name on the claim form was an act of forgery if no prescription had in fact been received by the defendant." *Id.* at 523.

The court concluded that the filling in of blank prescription billing forms without the doctor's authorization did not constitute forgery. *Id.*

[T]he physician's name, when filled in by the defendant, did not purport to be the signature of the physician; rather it was a representation that the physician had prescribed the drugs for which claim was made. . . . [T]here was no showing that the defendant forged any prescriptions. His offense was in representing to the Department the number and kind of prescriptions which he had received. A misrepresentation of fact, *so long as it does not purport to be the act of someone other than the maker*, does not constitute forgery.

Id. (emphasis added).

Smith argues that as in *Mark*, the account applications at issue here are genuine documents that he as the owner of A.J. Motors had the authority to complete; they simply contained a piece of false information. He contends that merely providing false information in this context cannot be the basis for a forgery charge.

But *Mark* is distinguishable because Smith did not simply provide false information when completing the applications. He also provided the social security number of another person, a child in Indiana. The court in *Mark* specified that “[a] misrepresentation of fact, *so long as it does not purport to be the act of someone other than the maker*, does not constitute forgery.” 94 Wn.2d at 523. And RCW 9A.60.010(4) states that to falsely complete a written instrument means to complete it “by adding or inserting matter, *without the authority of anyone entitled to grant it.*” (Emphasis added). A social security number is a form of identification, and Smith’s use of the Indiana child’s social security number misrepresented that someone with that social security number was opening a bank account. Smith also did not have the authority to use the social security number of the child in Indiana.¹

¹ Courts in several other jurisdictions have held that the use of another’s social security number supports a forgery conviction. *McCleaf v. Carroll*, 416 F. Supp. 2d 283, 293 (D. Del. 2006) (defense counsel was not ineffective for failing to challenge evidence supporting forgery conviction where defendant signed arrest card with a false social security number, birthdate, name, and scar/tattoo information); *State v. DeGenero*, 2017-Ohio-624, 85 N.E.3d 170, 174-75 (2017) (sufficient evidence supported defendant’s forgery conviction where defendant made purchases with a credit card he had obtained by providing his deceased grandmother’s name and social security number); *Bocanegra v. State*, 969 N.E.2d 1026, 1029 (Ind. Ct. App. 2012) (sufficient evidence supported defendant’s intent to defraud in forgery prosecution where defendant did not have the documents to work legally in the United States and used another person’s name and social security number to obtain employment); *Jackson v. State*, 277 Ga. App. 801, 803-04, 627 S.E.2d 853 (2006) (trial court did not err in denying defendant’s motion for directed verdict on forgery charge where defendant cashed a check made out to the victim after endorsing it with victim’s name and social security number).

Accordingly, we hold that sufficient evidence supports the conclusion that Smith falsely completed the bank account applications.

B. PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTION REGARDING LEGAL EFFICACY

Smith argues that the trial court erred by declining to give his proposed jury instruction on the definition of “instrument,” which included the legal efficacy requirement. We disagree because the legal efficacy of the bank account applications was a question of law for the trial court. Therefore, Smith was not entitled to a jury instruction regarding that issue.

1. No Constitutional Requirement

Under the Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, a criminal defendant is entitled to a jury determination of every element of the charged offense. *Apprendi v. New Jersey*, 530 U.S. 466, 476-77, 120 S. Ct. 2348, 147 L. Ed. 2d 435 (2000). As a result, the trial court must instruct the jury on all elements of the offense. *State v. Scott*, 110 Wn.2d 682, 689, 757 P.2d 492 (1988). Smith argues that failing to give an instruction incorporating the legal efficacy requirement violates this constitutional requirement.

However, legal efficacy is not an element of forgery. *Ring*, 191 Wn. App. at 793. The existence of a “written instrument” is the essential element. *Id.* Legal efficacy is merely a definition of that element. *See id.* at 793-94. The constitution does not require that the trial court further define an element of an offense. *Scott*, 110 Wn.2d at 689; *see also State v. O’Donnell*, 142 Wn. App. 314, 325, 174 P.3d 1205 (2007). “[F]ailure to give a definitional instruction is not failure to instruct on an essential element.” *State v. Brown*, 132 Wn.2d 529, 612, 940 P.2d 546

(1997). Therefore, there is no constitutional requirement that the jury rather than the trial court decide the legal efficacy issue.²

But that conclusion does not resolve the issue here. If legal efficacy must be decided by the jury rather than the court, the trial court still may be required to instruct on legal efficacy under nonconstitutional principles.

2. *Miller* – Trial Court’s Gate-Keeping Function

In *State v. Miller*, the Supreme Court addressed whether the trial court or the jury should resolve a requirement of a conviction that was not an element of the offense. 156 Wn.2d 23, 24, 31, 123 P.3d 827 (2005). In that case, the court held that the validity of the no-contact order is not an element or an implied element of the crime of violating such an order. *Id.* at 27-31. The court stated, “The legislature likely did not include validity as an element of the crime because issues concerning the validity of an order normally turn on questions of law. Questions of law are for the court, not the jury, to resolve.” *Id.* at 31.

The court further stated that “issues relating to the validity of a court order . . . are uniquely within the province of the court.” *Id.* The court concluded, “The court, as part of its gate-keeping function, should determine as a threshold matter whether the order alleged to be violated is applicable and will support the crime charged. Orders that are not applicable to the crime should not be admitted.” *Id.*

In *State v. Case*, the court adopted the same rule with regard to a statute elevating violation of a no-contact order to a felony when an offender has at least two prior convictions for

² Smith does not argue that legal efficacy is an implied, nonstatutory element of forgery. An implied element is one that either “fit[s] within longstanding principles of law or [is] derived from our reasoned judgment as to legislative intent.” *State v. Miller*, 156 Wn.2d 23, 28, 123 P.3d 827 (2005). We do not address this issue.

violating certain qualifying orders. 187 Wn.2d 85, 87, 384 P.3d 1140 (2016). The court stated, “[W]hether the prior convictions met the qualifying statutory requirements is a threshold legal determination to be made by the trial judge, not a question for the jury.” *Id.* at 92.

3. WPIC 130.10

The standard instruction for the definition of “written instrument” in the context of forgery is contained in 11A WASHINGTON PRACTICE: WASHINGTON PATTERN JURY INSTRUCTIONS: CRIMINAL 130.10 (4th ed. 2016) (WPIC). WPIC 130.10 does not contain a further definition of “instrument” that includes a legal efficacy requirement.

The “Note on Use” for the instruction states, “If there is an issue for the jury regarding whether the basis for the alleged forgery is an ‘instrument,’ an instruction may have to be crafted based on the common law definition of the term. See the Comment below.” WPIC 130.10, note on use. The comment to WPIC 130.10 explains the common law legal efficacy requirement but then states, “Because issues of legal efficacy will *generally be for the court to determine, rather than the jury*, the committee has not included the common law definition in the instruction.” WPIC 130.10, comment (emphasis added).

4. Division One Unpublished Decision in *Hill*

In *State v. Hill*, No. 70742-6-I, slip op. at 10-16 (Wash. Ct. App. Oct. 27, 2014) (unpublished), <http://www.courts.wa.gov/opinions/pdf/707426.pdf>, Division One of this court expressly addressed the issue presented here in a forgery case. The court held that the defendant was entitled to have the jury instructed on the legal efficacy issue and that the jury rather than the trial court must decide whether a written instrument has legal efficacy. *Id.* at 1, 12-16.

The court acknowledged that legal efficacy is not an explicit or implied element of forgery. *Id.* at 13-14. But the court stated,

[T]he element at issue is that Hill possessed or put off as true a written instrument. To be an instrument, a writing must be found to have legal efficacy. Thus, while legal efficacy is not a separate element of the offense of forgery, it is a definitional aspect of “instrument,” which must be proved to the jury beyond a reasonable doubt.

Id. at 14.

The court concluded that *Miller* was inapplicable to the legal efficacy determination. *Id.* at 14-15. The court stated,

The legal efficacy of an alleged written instrument is distinguishable from the validity of a domestic violence no-contact order. *Prior authority establishes* that the question of whether the “money order” was legally efficacious was for the trier of fact to determine because it was part and parcel of the trier of fact’s inquiry into whether an instrument was proved to exist. This conclusion necessarily follows from *State v. Smith*, 72 Wn. App. 237, 864 P.2d 406 (1993).

Id. (emphasis added).

However, the court did not identify the prior authority that establishes that legal efficacy must be decided by the trier of fact. We have located no such authority. In *Smith*, the court simply held that a written instrument must have legal efficacy to support a forgery conviction and reversed a jury verdict because the instrument at issue had no legal efficacy. 72 Wn. App. at 243. The court in *Smith* did not address whether the legal efficacy question was one for the trial court or for the jury.³

5. Analysis

Whether a written instrument has legal efficacy involves the interpretation of that instrument. “The interpretation to be given written instruments, whether the procedure be civil or criminal is a matter of law for the court, and not a question of fact for the jury.” *State v.*

³ The court in *Hill* also cited to *Scoby*, 117 Wn.2d at 63, and *State v. Aitken*, 79 Wn. App. 890, 892-95, 905 P.2d 1235 (1995). But neither case addressed whether the legal efficacy question was one for the trial court or for the jury.

Comer, 176 Wash. 257, 266, 28 P.2d 1027 (1934); *see also In re Estate of Larson*, 71 Wn.2d 349, 354, 428 P.2d 558 (1967). “Questions of law are for the court, not the jury, to resolve.” *Miller*, 156 Wn.2d at 31. And legal efficacy of an instrument involves issues that are “uniquely within the province of the court.” *Id.*

This is particularly true for a document like a bank account application. The jury would have no basis for determining whether a bank account application has legal efficacy. Such a determination requires a legal analysis that could be performed only by the trial court.

Treating legal efficacy as a legal issue is consistent with the case law. Almost all of the reported legal efficacy cases address sufficiency of the evidence challenges. *State v. Haislip*, 77 Wn.2d 838, 842, 467 P.2d 284 (1970); *State v. Taes*, 5 Wn.2d 51, 53-54, 104 P.2d 751 (1940); *Bradshaw*, 3 Wn. App. 2d at 189-90; *Smith*, 72 Wn. App. at 239; *State v. Aitken*, 79 Wn. App. 890, 893-94, 905 P.2d 1235 (1995); *State v. Stiltner*, 4 Wn. App. 33, 36-38, 479 P.2d 103 (1971). In all these cases, the appellate court essentially determined as a matter of law whether an instrument had legal efficacy. If so, the evidence was found sufficient. *See Haislip*, 77 Wn.2d at 842; *Bradshaw*, 3 Wn. App. 2d at 194; *Aitken*, 79 Wn. App. at 894. If not, the evidence was found insufficient. *See Taes*, 5 Wn.2d at 53-54; *Smith*, 72 Wn. App. at 243; *Stiltner*, 4 Wn. App. at 38.

We recognize that *Miller* can be distinguished. Whether a no-contact order is valid is different than whether a written instrument has legal efficacy. Division One in *Hill* noted that a court order is the result of a proceeding with due process protections, and that is not the case for written instruments. Slip op. at 16. However, the Supreme Court in *Miller* did not base its analysis on the nature of the order itself, but on the fact that the validity of such an order is a

question of law “uniquely within the province of the court.” 156 Wn.2d at 31. We reach the same conclusion regarding the legal efficacy of an instrument.

We conclude that the legal efficacy of Smith’s bank account applications was a question of law for the trial court. Accordingly, we hold that the trial court did not err in declining to give Smith’s legal efficacy jury instruction.

CONCLUSION

We affirm Smith’s convictions, but we remand for the trial court to strike the criminal filing fee from the judgment and sentence.

A majority of the panel having determined that only the foregoing portion of this opinion will be printed in the Washington Appellate Reports and that the remainder shall be filed for public record in accordance with RCW 2.06.040, it is so ordered.

In the unpublished portion of this opinion, we hold that (1) the trial court’s exclusion of James’s attorney’s testimony did not violate Smith’s right to present a defense; (2) defense counsel’s performance was not deficient for failing to request limiting instructions regarding James’s prior statements and bad acts; and (3) as the State concedes, the criminal filing fee imposed as a legal financial obligation (LFO) must be stricken from the judgment and sentence.

ADDITIONAL FACTS

James and Broussard also were charged in relation to these transactions, and their cases were joined with Smith’s case for trial. Before trial, James entered a guilty plea. James’s Statement of Plea of Guilty included a section for him to state in his own words what made him guilty. That section stated that (1) James had knowingly used the social security numbers of other people to obtain loans for vehicles he did not intend to buy, including the \$14,840 loan from Inspirus Credit Union; (2) Smith had opened the Wells Fargo accounts for A.J. Motors

knowingly using the Indiana child's social security number; (3) Smith knew that James deposited the \$14,840 check from Inspirus in the A.J. Motors account; (4) all three brothers made withdrawals from the business accounts; and (5) James, Smith, and Broussard all were working together and each knew what the other two were doing. James initialed next to the beginning of this section and signed at the end of the guilty plea statement.

James's Trial Testimony

At trial, the prosecutor asked James about his guilty plea statement.

Q. [Y]ou entered a guilty plea, right?

A. Of course.

Q. And in that guilty plea you said, during the period between April 12th –

A. No, no, no, no, you're wrong. I didn't say none of that. Like I already told you before, my lawyer said that, and since I was on my way to hurry up and get out of Pierce County, all I did was just initial that, but those words were not from my mouth. No, I did not say any of that at all regardless of what that says. So you can call [my attorney]. . . . That's the one that made those statements, not me.

6 RP at 896-97. James continued "I initialed everywhere where it said initial so I can hurry up and leave because I wanted to start my [sentence]." 6 RP at 899. He testified that the facts recounted in his guilty plea were not true facts.

The following exchange occurred between the prosecutor and James:

Q. Yes or no, Mr. James. Mr. Smith knew that M.M. was a real person when he opened the Wells Fargo account for A.J. Motors?

A. Nobody knew anything besides me, simple as that.

Q. Except you initialed That was included in your statement, right?

A. No, not my statement, no, not my statement, because I didn't even make no statement.

Q. You also deposited the \$14,840 check into Mr. Smith's A.J. Motors account, correct?

A. That's not correct.

Q. And you knew that Mr. Smith did this, correct?

A. Not correct. I don't even know where you even got that from. Like I said, these are not from me.

....

Q. You also knew that Mr. Broussard created a purchase agreement between himself and Fast Lane Autos using a social security number that wasn't his own, correct?

A. Not correct, for the last time.

....

Q. . . . Mr. Broussard took that purchase agreement to TAPCO and obtained a check in the amount of \$13,400, correct?

A. I don't know what happened.

Q. You and Mr. Smith and Mr. Broussard made multiple withdrawals from both the U.S. Bank account and from the Wells Fargo accounts, correct?

A. Not correct.

Q. You each knew what the other two was doing, correct?

A. Not correct.

Q. And the three of you were all working together to get the money, weren't you?

A. Not correct.

Q. Except that's all contained within the plea statement that you signed, correct?

A. No, not correct.

Q. That's not your signature at the bottom of paragraph 11?

A. Like I said, these statements are not correct, for the last time. They're not from my mouth.

Q. But you adopted –

A. No, I didn't adopt anything. They're not from my mouth.

Q. You told the Court you adopted them as your own, correct?

A. They're not mine. Like I said, all I did was initial and sign just so I can hurry up and leave.

6 RP at 905-07.

Evidentiary Rulings on James's Prior Bad Acts and Statements

After James's testimony, the trial court analyzed whether documentary evidence of James's financial transactions would be admissible against Smith and Broussard. The court concluded that

[A]s I apply Evidence Rule 404(b) and Evidence Rule 403, I believe and find that the circumstantial evidence of an overall criminal scheme and the defendants' knowledge of it and their motive and intent to participate is highly probative and its probative value, in the Court's view, clearly outweighs the minimal risks that are cautioned against in Evidence Rule 403.

7 RP at 951. The trial court admitted the documentary evidence.

The trial court stated that the documentary evidence "might appropriately be the subject of a limiting instruction" if the defendants proposed such an instruction, "perhaps identifying the documents that the jury may only consider for a limiting purpose . . . that pertain to certain transactions, documents pertaining to a particular credit union or a bank perhaps to clue the jury in as to the limited purpose of those documents." 7 RP at 951-52.

Defense counsel did not request a limiting instruction regarding the documentary evidence of James's financial transactions, and no instruction regarding that evidence was given. Defense counsel also did not request a limiting instruction on the prosecutor's use of the statements in James's plea agreement to impeach him, and no instruction regarding those statements was given.

Also following James's testimony, Broussard's attorney served James's former attorney with a subpoena to testify regarding the circumstances surrounding the drafting of James's statements in the guilty plea. Smith joined in the request to have James's former attorney testify. The Department of Assigned Counsel moved to quash the subpoena.

Smith and Broussard argued that in attempting to impeach James using prior inconsistent statements from his plea, the prosecutor had read James's prior statements into the record. They wanted to call James's former attorney to testify that the language in James's plea statement came not from James himself, but from an email from the prosecutor. The trial court quashed the warrant.

Imposition of Criminal Filing Fee

At sentencing, the trial court imposed legal financial obligations (LFOs), including a \$200 criminal filing fee. The trial court did not consider at the sentencing hearing whether Smith was indigent. But the court found Smith indigent for purposes of appeal.

A. EXCLUSION OF JAMES'S ATTORNEY'S TESTIMONY

Smith argues that the trial court's exclusion of the testimony of James's attorney regarding the circumstances under which the statements in James's plea agreement were drafted violated his constitutional right to present a defense. We disagree.

1. Legal Principles

A criminal defendant has a constitutional right to present a defense. *State v. Jones*, 168 Wn.2d 713, 720, 230 P.3d 576 (2010). This right to present a defense derives from the Sixth Amendment to the United States Constitution and article I, section 22 of the Washington Constitution. *State v. Wade*, 186 Wn. App. 749, 763, 346 P.3d 838 (2015). There also is a

fundamental due process right to present a defense under the Fourteenth Amendment. *State v. Lizarraga*, 191 Wn. App. 530, 551-52, 364 P.3d 810 (2015).

However, a defendant has no constitutional right to present evidence that is inadmissible under standard evidence rules. *Wade*, 186 Wn. App. at 764. Pertinent here, “[d]efendants have a right to present only relevant evidence, with no constitutional right to present *irrelevant* evidence.” *Jones*, 168 Wn.2d at 720. Therefore, a defendant’s evidence must at least have minimal relevance to implicate the right to present a defense. *Id.*

In evaluating whether the exclusion of evidence violates the defendant’s constitutional right to present a defense, “the State’s interest in excluding evidence must be balanced against the defendant’s need for the information sought to be admitted.” *State v. Arndt*, 194 Wn.2d 784, 812, 453 P.3d 696 (2019).

We review a trial court’s evidentiary rulings for abuse of discretion. *Id.* at 797. We review de novo whether an evidentiary ruling violated the defendant’s right to present a defense. *Id.* at 797-98.

2. Admissibility of Testimony Explaining Prior Inconsistent Statements

Witnesses may be impeached with a prior out-of-court statement of a material fact that is inconsistent with their trial testimony. ER 613. This evidence is not probative of the substantive facts but is impeachment evidence affecting the witness’s credibility. *State v. Clinkenbeard*, 130 Wn. App. 552, 569, 123 P.3d 872 (2005). If a witness has been impeached by a prior statement, evidence generally is admissible to explain that statement. *See* ER 801(d)(1); *see also* 5A KARL B. TEGLAND, WASHINGTON PRACTICE EVIDENCE LAW AND PRACTICE § 613.18 (6th ed. 2016).

However, if a witness denies making a prior inconsistent statement and no extrinsic evidence of that statement is introduced, a trial court may disallow testimony explaining the prior

statement. *State v. Thacker*, 94 Wn.2d 276, 280, 616 P.2d 655 (1980). “The rationale is that no impeachment evidence has been introduced into evidence which calls for an explanation.” *Id.* The trial court has discretion whether to admit explanatory testimony. *Id.* at 280-81.

The court in *Thacker* rejected the notion that a defendant is *never* entitled to introduce evidence that would explain prior statements not introduced into evidence. *Id.* at 281. In that case, on cross-examination of the defendant the prosecutor read extensive excerpts from the defendant’s prior interview in question and answer form. *Id.* at 277-78, 281. The court held that it was error to refuse the defendant’s request to put on rebuttal testimony where the total effect of the prosecutor’s cross-examination of the defendant “was to give the jury the impression that the statements were properly in evidence.” *Id.* at 282.

3. Analysis

Here, the State called James as a witness and asked him to admit several statements contained in his guilty plea statement. However, the prosecutor did not read directly from the plea statement and the statement was not offered into evidence. Instead, she asked questions based on the statements made in the plea statement in an attempt to have James admit those statements. Further, James repeatedly denied authoring the statements and repeatedly stated they were not true. He explained several times that his lawyer had written the statements and that he signed off on them because he was in a hurry to leave Pierce County and start serving his sentence.

As a result, the general rule in *Thacker* applies here. Because James denied authorship of the prior inconsistent statements in the plea agreement and no extrinsic evidence was introduced, the trial court had discretion to exclude testimony explaining the prior statement. *Thacker*, 94 Wn.2d at 280. Conversely, the holding in *Thacker* – that the trial court abused its discretion by

excluding explanatory evidence under the specific facts of that case – is inapplicable here. Unlike in *Thacker*, the prosecutor here did not read from the plea statement or give any indication that the contents of the statement were evidence in the case. Further, James did provide an explanation for the prior inconsistent statements – he stated that because he was eager to leave Pierce County and start his sentence, he signed off on what his lawyer had written even though it was not true.

Accordingly, we hold that the trial court did not abuse its discretion in excluding the testimony of James’s attorney.

B. INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL

Smith contends that his trial counsel was ineffective because he failed to request limiting instructions regarding James’s prior inconsistent statements and evidence of James’s crimes. We disagree.

1. Standard of Review

The Sixth Amendment to the United States Constitution and article I, section 22 of the Washington Constitution guarantee criminal defendants the right to effective assistance of counsel. *State v. Estes*, 188 Wn.2d 450, 457, 395 P.3d 1045 (2017). We review de novo ineffective assistance of counsel claims. *Id.*

To prevail on an ineffective assistance claim, the defendant must show both that (1) defense counsel’s representation was deficient and (2) the deficient representation prejudiced him or her. *Id.* at 457-58. Representation is deficient if, after considering all the circumstances, it falls below an objective standard of reasonableness. *Id.* at 458. Prejudice exists if there is a reasonable probability that, except for counsel’s error, the result of the proceeding would have

been different. *Id.* It is not enough that ineffective assistance conceivably impacted the case's outcome; the defendant must affirmatively show prejudice. *Id.*

We begin our analysis with a strong presumption that defense counsel's performance was reasonable. *Id.* Defense counsel's conduct is not deficient if it can be characterized as legitimate trial strategy or tactics. *Id.* To rebut the strong presumption that counsel's performance was effective, "the defendant bears the burden of establishing the absence of any 'conceivable legitimate tactic explaining counsel's performance.'" *State v. Grier*, 171 Wn.2d 17, 42, 246 P.3d 1260 (2011) (quoting *State v. Reichenbach*, 153 Wn.2d 126, 130, 101 P.3d 80 (2004)).

Where counsel's failure to request a particular jury instruction is the basis for a claim of ineffective assistance, the defendant must show he or she "was entitled to the instruction, counsel's performance was deficient in failing to request it, and the failure to request the instruction caused prejudice." *State v. Classen*, 4 Wn. App. 2d 520, 540, 422 P.3d 489 (2018).

2. Failure to Request Limiting Instruction on James's Prior Inconsistent Statements

As discussed above, a witness may be impeached with a prior out-of-court statement of a material fact that is inconsistent with his or her testimony in court, even if such a statement would otherwise be inadmissible as hearsay. ER 613; *Clinkenbeard*, 130 Wn. App. at 569. If the witness denies the inconsistent statement, then extrinsic evidence of the statement is admissible for purposes of impeachment. ER 613(b). Where prior inconsistent statements are admitted as impeachment evidence, an instruction cautioning the jury to limit its consideration of the statements to their intended purpose is proper. *State v. Johnson*, 40 Wn. App. 371, 377, 699 P.2d 221 (1985).

But here, Smith cannot show he was entitled to a limiting instruction on James's prior inconsistent statements because the statements were never admitted into evidence. When the

State attempted to impeach James with the statements in his guilty plea statement, he denied that the statements were his and the plea statement itself was never entered into evidence. Therefore, we hold that Smith's ineffective assistance of counsel claim fails because the trial court would not have given a limiting instruction even if defense counsel had requested one.

3. Failure to Request Limiting Instruction on Evidence of James's Crimes

ER 404(b) prohibits a court from admitting "[e]vidence of other crimes, wrongs, or acts . . . to prove the character of a person in order to show action in conformity therewith." But such evidence may "be admissible for other purposes, such as proof of motive, opportunity, intent, preparation, plan, knowledge, identity, or absence of mistake or accident." ER 404(b). If evidence of prior crimes, wrongs, or acts is admitted for a proper purpose, the defendant is entitled to request and receive a limiting instruction. *State v. Gresham*, 173 Wn.2d 405, 423, 269 P.3d 207 (2012).

However, courts generally presume that defense counsel's choice not to request a limiting instruction was a tactical decision to avoid drawing further attention to the evidence. *State v. Dow*, 162 Wn. App. 324, 335, 253 P.3d 476 (2011). Therefore, the burden is on the defendant to rebut this presumption. *State v. Yarbrough*, 151 Wn. App. 66, 90-91, 210 P.3d 1029 (2009).

Here, Smith's counsel may have decided to forgo a limiting instruction to avoid reemphasizing James's prior bad acts. Because defense counsel's failure to request a limiting instruction may have been a legitimate trial tactic, Smith does not show that his trial counsel's performance fell below an objective standard of reasonableness. We hold that Smith's ineffective assistance of counsel claim on this basis fails.

C. IMPOSITION OF CRIMINAL FILING FEE

Smith argues, and the State concedes, that we should strike the criminal filing fee imposed as an LFO from his judgment and sentence. We agree.

In 2018, the legislature amended RCW 36.18.020(2)(h), which now prohibits imposition of the criminal filing fee on a defendant who is indigent as defined in RCW 10.101.010(3)(a)-(c). This amendment applies prospectively to cases pending on direct appeal. *State v. Ramirez*, 191 Wn.2d 732, 749-50, 426 P.3d 714 (2018).

The trial court found that Smith was indigent for purposes of appeal. The record is unclear if the trial court found Smith indigent based on the definitions in RCW 10.101.010(3)(a)-(c), but the State does not oppose striking the criminal filing fee. Therefore, we order the trial court to strike the criminal filing fee.

CONCLUSION

We affirm Smith's convictions, but we remand for the trial court to strike the criminal filing fee from the judgment and sentence.




MAXA, P.J.

We concur:



GLASGOW, J.



CRUSER, J.

GLINSKI LAW FIRM PLLC

June 26, 2020 - 12:25 PM

Transmittal Information

Filed with Court: Court of Appeals Division II
Appellate Court Case Number: 51946-1
Appellate Court Case Title: State of Washington, Respondent v. Anthony J. Smith, Appellant
Superior Court Case Number: 16-1-03561-4

The following documents have been uploaded:

- 519461_Petition_for_Review_20200626122428D2786138_2371.pdf
This File Contains:
Petition for Review
The Original File Name was State v. Smith PETITION for review_merged2.pdf

A copy of the uploaded files will be sent to:

- PCpatcecf@piercecountywa.gov
- jeremy@glissonmorris.com
- kristie.barham@piercecountywa.gov

Comments:

Sender Name: Catherine Glinski - Email: glinskilaw@wavecable.com
Address:
PO BOX 761
MANCHESTER, WA, 98353-0761
Phone: 360-876-2736

Note: The Filing Id is 20200626122428D2786138