

99888-4

No. 80025-6-1

Supreme COURT
OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

State of Washington, Respondent,
v.
Jeffery Brooks, Petitioner,

MOTION FOR DISCRETIONARY REVIEW

Treated as a petition for review

Jeffery Brooks
[Name of petitioner]

Jeffery Brooks
Clallam Bay Corr. Center
1830 Eagle Crest way
Clallam Bay, WA. 98306
[Address]

A. Identity of Petitioner

_____ [Name] asks this court to accept review of the decision designated in Part B of this motion.

B. Decision

[Statement of the decision or parts of decision petitioner wants reviewed, the court entering or filing the decision, the date entered or filed, and the date and a description of any order granting or denying motions made after the decision such as a motion for reconsideration.]

This petitioner wants this court to review the issue that there was added additional authorities filed to the reviewing court that had shown caselaw that the time and date this delivery allegedly occurred are vital in order to make a search warrant valid and it was missing and the state of Washington had made a statement in their reply that the Appellant did not submit any authority to argue this. (See Respondents brief at 11.

The additional authority covered this issue and makes this argument have merit. see attached court of appeals decision.

_____ A copy of the decision [and trial court memorandum opinion] is in the Appendix.

C. Issues Presented for Review

[Define the issues which the court is asked to decide if review is granted.]

The appellant wants the issue of Stateness to be reviewed and the issue of additional authorities that was filed prior to the lower courts Decision.

D. Statement of the Case

[The statement should be brief and contain only material relevant to the motion.]

This is a matter that the investigating police had used a confidential informant to purchase drugs and was unsuccessful in the attempt and then the officers that had went to the magistrate to obtain a search warrant had created a determination of probable cause stating that there was a successful purchase without a time or date of purchase that clearly shows that the information was state and no warrant should of been granted.

E. Argument Why Review Should Be Accepted

[The argument should be short and concise and supported by authority.]

This court states that Art 1 §7 provides that no person shall be disturbed in his private affairs, or his home invaded without authority of law. It is now settled that Art 1 §7 is more protective than the 4th Amend. and a Garwall analysis is no longer necessary. State v. Urieling, 144 Wn.2d 489, 495, 28 P.3d 762 (2001), and focuses on those privacy interests which citizens of this state have held, and should be entitled to hold safe from governmental trespass State v. Myrick, 102 Wn.2d 506, 514, 688 P.2d 151 (1984). Thus whether use of that technology without a warrant violates Art. 1 §7. Myrick, 102 Wn.2d at 514; State v. Young, 123 Wn.2d 173, 181-82, 867 P.2d 593 (1994).

F. Conclusion

[State the relief sought if review is granted.]

To Dismiss this case with or without prejudice or remand for a new trial.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 20__.

Respectfully submitted,

Petitioner

APPENDIX

FILED
SUPREME COURT
LEA ENNIS,
STATE OF WASHINGTON
Court Administrator/Clerk
6/15/2021 12:30 PM
BY SUSAN L. CARLSON
June 11 2021
CLERK

*The Court of Appeals
of the
State of Washington
Seattle*

DIVISION I
One Union Square
600 University Street
98101-4170
(206) 464-7750

Prosecuting Atty King County
King Co Pros/App Unit Supervisor
W554 King County Courthouse
516 Third Avenue
Seattle, WA 98104
paoappellateunitmail@kingcounty.gov

Donna Lynn Wise
King County Prosecutor's Office
516 3rd Ave Ste W554
Seattle, WA 98104-2362
donna.wise@kingcounty.gov

Jeffrey Dwyane Brooks
DOC # 704340
Clallam Bay Correction Center
1830 Eagle Crest Way
Clallam Bay, WA 98326
e-mail

CASE #: 80025-6-I
State of Washington, Respondent v. Jeffrey D. Brooks, Appellant
King County, Cause No. 16-1-04636-0

Counsel:

Enclosed is a copy of the opinion filed in the above-referenced appeal which states in part:

"Therefore, we affirm"

Counsel may file a motion for reconsideration within 20 days of filing this opinion pursuant to RAP 12.4(b). If counsel does not wish to file a motion for reconsideration but does wish to seek review by the Supreme Court, RAP 13.4(a) provides that if no motion for reconsideration is made, a petition for review must be filed in this court within 30 days.

In accordance with RAP 14.4(a), a claim for costs by the prevailing party must be supported by a cost bill filed and served within ten days after the filing of this opinion, or claim for costs will be deemed waived.

Should counsel desire the opinion to be published by the Reporter of Decisions, a motion to publish should be served and filed within 20 days of the date of filing the opinion, as provided by RAP 12.3 (e).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Lea Ennis". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Lea" and last name "Ennis" clearly distinguishable.

Lea Ennis
Court Administrator/Clerk

SSD

Enclosure

c: The Honorable Julia L. Garratt

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
DIVISION ONE

STATE OF WASHINGTON,)	No. 80025-6-I
)	
Respondent,)	
)	
v.)	
)	
JEFFREY DWAYNE BROOKS,)	UNPUBLISHED OPINION
)	
Appellant.)	
_____)	

VERELLEN, J. — Jeffrey Brooks challenges his convictions for second degree possession of a firearm and possession of heroin with intent to deliver, arguing that the police officer's affidavit was insufficient to support the trial court's finding of probable cause to issue a search warrant. Because the officer's affidavit provided sufficient facts for a reasonable person to conclude that Brooks was involved in criminal activity, the trial court did not abuse its discretion in issuing a search warrant.

Therefore, we affirm.

FACTS

In April 2016, a confidential informant told Tacoma Police Officer Shawn Mallot that a heroin dealer known as "Fat Head" was selling heroin in King and Pierce counties. "Fat Head" was later identified as Jeffrey Brooks.

The informant described Brooks as a “black male in his late 40s or 50s with longer hair usually worn in a ponytail” who often drove a dark blue minivan.¹ The informant also told Officer Mallot that a Cadillac “belonged” to Brooks.²

A few weeks later, the informant agreed to conduct a controlled buy at Brooks’s residence. When the informant arrived at Brooks’s residence, another officer watched as a male matching Brooks’s description opened the door and let the informant inside. The informant returned with heroin she purchased from Brooks.

On April 20, the informant agreed to conduct a second controlled buy from Brooks. Officers watched as Brooks left his residence and drove in his Cadillac to the “deal location.”³ The informant entered the Cadillac for a “period of time” and then exited the vehicle.⁴ The informant did not return with heroin.⁵ On April 25, an

¹ Clerk’s Papers (CP) at 140.

² CP at 140.

³ CP at 140.

⁴ CP at 141.

⁵ We note that at trial Officer Mallot clarified that 0.7 grams of heroin was obtained by the informant at the second controlled buy. Report of Proceedings (RP) (Jan. 29, 2019) at 788-89. And the court entered finding of fact 11 on the State’s motion to admit prior bad acts of previous controlled buys at trial: “The confidential informant again obtained 0.7 grams of heroin [at the second controlled buy].” CP at 91. On the suppression motion, the defense stated that the affidavit failed to indicate any drugs had been obtained in the second controlled buy. RP (Nov. 26, 2018) at 7-8. In response, the trial court noted that likely a sentence had been left out of the affidavit, but agreed with the defense that the court could only consider facts contained in the affidavit and did not rely on any drugs having been obtained in the second controlled buy. RP (Nov. 26, 2018) at 13-14. Consistent with those comments, the court’s findings of fact on the CrR 3.6 motion to suppress acknowledge that “[r]egarding the second controlled buy, the affidavit

informant from another agency who had also bought drugs from "Fat Head" was shown a picture of Brooks and identified him as "Fat Head."

On April 28, the trial court issued a search warrant authorizing the search of Brooks's residence, his minivan, and his Cadillac. On May 4, officers executed the search warrant. The officers found heroin in Brooks's pocket, heroin, methamphetamine, and a loaded handgun in his residence, and cocaine and drug paraphernalia in his Cadillac.

Brooks was charged with second degree unlawful possession of a firearm, possession of heroin with intent to deliver, and possession of cocaine with intent to deliver. At a CrR 3.6 hearing, Brooks argued that the search warrant was defective because it was not supported by probable cause and that the seized evidence should be suppressed. The court denied the motion to suppress and entered findings of fact and conclusions of law.

On January 2, 2019, a jury found Brooks guilty of second degree unlawful possession of a firearm and possession of heroin with intent to deliver.

Brooks appeals.

ANALYSIS

Brooks argues that the trial court erred in denying his motion to suppress because the search warrant was not supported by probable cause. The existence

never states that officers received purchased drugs back from the confidential informant." CP at 25.

of probable cause is a legal question reviewed de novo.⁶ He has not assigned error to the trial court's findings of fact, and they are verities on appeal.⁷

Article I, section 7 of the Washington Constitution requires that a "search warrant be issued upon a determination of probable cause based upon "facts and circumstances sufficient to establish a reasonable inference" that criminal activity is occurring or that contraband exists at a certain location."⁸ "The affidavit in support of a search warrant must be based on more than suspicion or mere personal belief that evidence of the crime will be found on the premises searched."⁹

Brooks challenges conclusion of law 4, that "[t]he warrant was supported by probable cause."¹⁰

The trial court found that probable cause existed to issue a search warrant based on Officer Mallot's affidavit. The affidavit provides that a reliable confidential informant told Officer Mallot that Brooks was dealing heroin and that the informant agreed to participate in two controlled buys. The affidavit states the first controlled buy occurred at Brooks's residence, officers watched as a man

⁶ State v. Chamberlin, 161 Wn.2d 30, 40, 162 P.3d 389 (2007) (citing In re Det. of Petersen, 145 Wn.2d 789, 799, 42 P.3d 952 (2002)).

⁷ Cowiche Canyon Conservancy v. Bosley, 118 Wn.2d 801, 808, 828 P.2d 549 (1992).

⁸ State v. Vickers, 148 Wn.2d 91, 108, 59 P.3d 58 (2002) (quoting State v. Thein, 138 Wn.2d 133, 140, 977 P.2d 582 (1999)).

⁹ Id.

¹⁰ CP at 25.

matching the informant's description of Brooks answered the door, and the informant returned with heroin. The affidavit also states that the second controlled buy occurred at a predetermined, agreed-upon location and that officers watched Brooks leave his residence and drive in his Cadillac to the location. And the court found that the informant was "sufficiently credible" and that heroin was obtained from the first controlled buy.¹¹

Brooks contends that Officer Mallot's affidavit was insufficient to establish probable cause because it was based on stale information. A "magistrate cannot determine whether observations recited in the affidavit are stale unless the magistrate knows the date of those observations."¹² But "[a]n affidavit lacking the timing of the necessary observations might still be sufficient if the magistrate can infer recency from other facts and circumstances in the affidavit."¹³ And "[c]ommon sense is the test for staleness of information in a search warrant affidavit."¹⁴

Brooks relies on State v. Higby¹⁵ to suggest that affidavits must "recite specific data as to the times, places, and magnitude of previous criminal activity."¹⁶

Higby is distinguishable.

¹¹ CP at 26.

¹² State v. Lyons, 174 Wn.2d 354, 361, 275 P.3d 314 (2012).

¹³ Id.

¹⁴ State v. Maddox, 152 Wn.2d 499, 505, 98 P.3d 1199 (2004).

¹⁵ 26 Wn. App. 457, 459-62, 613 P.2d 1192 (1980).

¹⁶ Appellant's Br. at 22-24.

In Higby, the officers arrested the driver and the passenger of a vehicle for possession of marijuana and hashish.¹⁷ The officer's affidavit stated that the passenger told the officers that he purchased marijuana from Higby's residence two weeks earlier.¹⁸ The officer also recalled that six months earlier, a different informant told him that he or she had observed "the packaging and sale" of marijuana at Higby's residence.¹⁹ The appellate court held that "[a] single observation of possible marijuana activity 6 months in the past combined with one small marijuana sale 2 weeks in the past and observations of marginally suspicious activity . . . is insufficient to establish a reasonable belief that marijuana will be found on the premises at the time of the search."²⁰ The appellate court acknowledged "an increasing concern for the necessity that affidavits recite specific data as to times, places and magnitude of previous criminal activity."²¹

But here, Officer Mallot's affidavit states "specific data" about Brooks's previous criminal activity. The April 28 affidavit states that the first controlled buy occurred in mid-April at Brooks's residence and heroin was obtained. The affidavit also states that the second controlled buy occurred on April 20 and that the second informant identified Brooks as "Fat Head" on April 25. In this context, the reference to the first controlled buy in "mid-April" is not deficient. Viewed with

¹⁷ Higby, 26 Wn. App. at 460.

¹⁸ Id.

¹⁹ Id.


²⁰ Id. at 462-63.

²¹ Id. at 463.


common sense, all of the information provided in Officer Mallot's affidavit supports an inference of recency; the information was not stale.²²

Because a reasonable person could conclude that Brooks was recently dealing heroin from the facts described in Officer Mallot's affidavit, probable cause existed to issue a search warrant. Brooks fails to establish the trial court erred.

Therefore, we affirm.



WE CONCUR:



²² Brooks also challenges conclusion of law 3, that "[t]he nonsuccess of the second controlled buy does not erase the validity and success of the first controlled buy; it is neutral or indeed adds to the credibility of the law enforcement officer's behavior." CP at 25. He fails to provide any authority in support of his assertion. To the extent Brooks also challenges the trial court's credibility finding, reviewing courts defer to the factfinder's credibility determinations. State v. Living Essentials, LLC, 8 Wn. App. 2d 1, 14, 436 P.3d 857 (2019) (citing Weyerhaeuser v. Tacoma-Pierce County Health Dep't, 123 Wn. App. 59, 65, 96 P.3d 460 (2004)), review denied, 193 Wn.2d 1040, 449 P.3d 658 (2019), cert. denied, 141 S. Ct. 234, 208 L. Ed. 2d 14 (2020).

INMATE

June 15, 2021 - 12:30 PM

Transmittal Information

Filed with Court: Supreme Court
Appellate Court Case Number: 80025-6
Appellate Court Case Title: State of Washington, Respondent v. Jeffrey D. Brooks, Appellant

DOC filing of Brooks Inmate DOC Number 704340

The following documents have been uploaded:

- 800256_20210615123008SC255615_8328_InmateFiling.pdf {ts '2021-06-15 12:15:54'}

The Original File Name was DOC1pCBY1180@doc1.wa.gov_20210615_124851.pdf

The DOC Facility Name is Clallam Bay Corrections Center.

The Inmate The Inmate/Filer's Last Name is Brooks.

The Inmate DOC Number is 704340.

The CaseNumber is 800256.

The Comment is 1of1.

The entire original email subject is 04,Brooks,704340,800256,1of1.

The email contained the following message:

External Email Warning! This email has originated from outside of the Washington State Courts Network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender, are expecting the email, and know the content is safe. If a link sends you to a website where you are asked to validate using your Account and Password, DO NOT DO SO! Instead, report the incident. Reply to: DOC1pCBY1180@doc1.wa.gov <DOC1pCBY1180@doc1.wa.gov>
Device Name: DOC1pCBY1180 Device Model: MX-2615N Location: G/H Units CBCC File Format: PDF MMR(G4) Resolution: 200dpi x 200dpi Attached file is scanned image in PDF format. Use Acrobat(R)Reader(R) or Adobe(R)Reader(R) of Adobe Systems Incorporated to view the document. Adobe(R)Reader(R) can be downloaded from the following URL: Adobe, the Adobe logo, Acrobat, the Adobe PDF logo, and Reader are registered trademarks or trademarks of Adobe Systems Incorporated in the United States and other countries. <https://smex-ctp.trendmicro.com:443/wis/clicktime/v1/query?url=http%3a%2f%2fwww.adobe.com&umid=c104cd05-1935-40fe-bafe-9e4eab1e7bec&auth=d15df2c165e24fb53bc026dba1ee9b619a161a5a-8eba2c3df3d6891d36b72393be6dcbab7cc98921>

The following email addresses also received a copy of this email:

A copy of the uploaded files will be sent to:

- donna.wise@kingcounty.gov
- paoappellateunitmail@kingcounty.gov

Note: The Filing Id is 20210615123008SC255615