FILED 5/31/2022 Court of Appeals Division I State of Washington

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE OF WASHINGTON,		No. 82346-9-I
Respond	ent,)	DIVISION ONE
v.)	
GREENFIELD, CHRISTIAN JAMES, DOB: 10/21/1972,		UNPUBLISHED OPINION
Appellan) t.)	

BOWMAN, J. — On February 4, 2021, the trial court sentenced Christian James Greenfield for possession of a stolen vehicle and theft of a motor vehicle under Snohomish County cause number 18-1-00875-31. At the same time, the court sentenced Greenfield for possession of a stolen vehicle and possession of a controlled substance under Snohomish County cause number 18-1-00874-31. Greenfield separately appealed both cause numbers. In each appeal, Greenfield argues we should remand his case for resentencing because the court failed to follow the procedural requirements of the parent offender sentencing alternative (POSA) statute, RCW 9.94A.655, in determining whether a POSA was an appropriate sentence for him and abused its discretion in denying the POSA. He also argues the court erred by imposing discretionary legal financial obligations (LFOs), interest on nonrestitution LFOs, and a community custody condition requiring that he "[s]tay out of drug areas."

On May 2, 2022, another panel of this court issued a published opinion vacating Greenfield's conviction for possession of a controlled substance and remanding the possession of a stolen vehicle conviction under Snohomish County cause number 18-1-00874-31 for the trial court to "consider Greenfield's request for a POSA within the framework" of the statute. State v. Greenfield, No. 82345-1-I, slip op. at 1 (Wash. Ct. App. May 2, 2022), https://www.courts.wa.gov/opinions/pdf/823451.pdf. We incorporate the analysis and conclusions of that published opinion, vacate the judgment and sentence for the possession of a stolen vehicle and theft of a motor vehicle convictions under Snohomish County cause number 18-1-00875-31, and remand for the court likewise to consider Greenfield's request for a POSA.

WE CONCUR:

Andrus, C.J.

¹ Because we vacate Greenfield's judgment and sentence, we do not address his challenges to the LFOs and community custody condition.