

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

THE STATE OF WASHINGTON	)	No. 78874-4-I
	)	
Respondent,	)	DIVISION ONE
	)	
v.	)	UNPUBLISHED OPINION
	)	
DAVID CLAYTON, JR.,	)	
	)	
Appellant.	)	
	)	

---

PER CURIAM — David Clayton challenges his judgment and sentence for third degree assault, contending that the sentencing court acted contrary to RCW 10.82.090(1) in ordering Clayton’s non-restitution legal financial obligations to bear interest. But Clayton appears to be mistaken. A marked checkbox in the judgment and sentence indicates that “interest is waived,” and the minutes of the sentencing hearing confirm that “[a]ll interest is waived except with respect to restitution.” Nothing in the judgment and sentence indicates that Clayton will be assessed interest on non-restitution legal financial obligations.<sup>1</sup>

Affirmed.

---

<sup>1</sup> The appellant’s statement of additional grounds challenges the effectiveness of his attorney’s representation, but the limited record on appeal does not support those claims.

FOR THE COURT:

Verellen J.  
Seach J.  
Appelwick, J.