

NO. 45348-7-II

COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON,  
DIVISION II

---

In Re the Personal Restraint

of

DERON ANTHONY PARKS,

Petitioner.

---

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF OF PETITIONER

---

John A. Hays, No. 16654  
Attorney for Petitioner

1402 Broadway  
Suite 103  
Longview, WA 98632  
(360) 423-3084

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	Page
A. TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iii
B. ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR	
1. Assignment of Error .....	1
2. Issue Pertaining to Assignment of Error .....	1
C. STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	2
D. ARGUMENT	
<b>THIS COURT SHOULD NOT IMPOSE APPELLATE     COSTS ON APPEAL .....</b>	<b>3</b>
E. CONCLUSION .....	7
F. AFFIRMATION OF SERVICE .....	8

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

Page

*State Cases*

*State v. Nolan*, 141 Wn.2d 620, 8 P.3d 300 (2000) ..... 3, 4  
*State v. Sinclair*, 192 Wn. App. 380, 367 P.3d 612 (2016) ..... 3-5

*Statutes and Court Rules*

RCW 10.73.160 ..... 3, 4  
RAP 14.2 ..... 3

*ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR*

*Assignment of Error*

This court should not impose appellate costs on appeal.

*Issues Pertaining to Assignment of Error*

Should an appellate court impose costs on appeal if an indigent client has no present or future ability to pay those costs?

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On November 19, 2010, the Clark County Superior Court sentenced the defendant to life in prison with a minimum mandatory time of 102 months to serve before first being eligible of conditional release following his conviction by jury on a charge of second degree rape. CP 5-23. At trial the defendant was represented by appointed counsel upon the trial court's finding of indigency. CP 30. The defendant subsequently unsuccessfully pursued direct review with an appointed attorney upon the trial court's second finding that the defendant was indigent. CP 44-56.

The defendant later filed a personal restraint petition, which is now before this court following a remand from the Washington Supreme Court and an evidentiary hearing before the Clark County Superior Court as ordered by the Supreme Court. CP 65-67. The court appointed an attorney to represent the defendant at both the evidentiary hearing and now during the remand back to this court. CP 61-62. The defendant has continuously been in custody since August of 2010. CP 3.

## ARGUMENT

### **THIS COURT SHOULD NOT IMPOSE APPELLATE COSTS ON APPEAL.**

The appellate courts of this state have discretion to refrain from awarding appellate costs even if the State substantially prevails on appeal. RCW 10.73.160(1); *State v. Nolan*, 141 Wn.2d 620, 626, 8 P.3d 300 (2000); *State v. Sinclair*, 192 Wn. App. 380, 382, 367 P.3d 612, 613 (2016). A defendant's inability to pay appellate costs is an important consideration to take into account when deciding whether or not to impose costs on appeal. *State v. Sinclair, supra*. In the case at bar the trial court found the defendant indigent and entitled to the appointment of counsel at both the trial and appellate level. In the same matter this Court should exercise its discretion and disallow trial and appellate costs should the State substantially prevail.

Under RAP 14.2 the State may request that the court order the defendant to pay appellate costs if the state substantially prevails. This rule states that a "commissioner or clerk of the appellate court will award costs to the party that substantially prevails on review, unless the appellate court directs otherwise in its decision terminating review." RAP 14.2. In *State v. Nolan, supra*, the Washington Supreme Court held that while this rule does not grant court clerks or commissioners the discretion to decline the imposition of appellate costs, it does grant this discretion to the appellate

court itself. The Supreme Court noted:

Once it is determined the State is the substantially prevailing party, RAP 14.2 affords the appellate court latitude in determining if costs should be allowed; use of the word “will” in the first sentence appears to remove any discretion from the operation of RAP 14.2 with respect to the commissioner or clerk, but that rule allows for the appellate court to direct otherwise in its decision.

*State v. Nolan*, 141 Wn. 2d at 626.

Likewise, in RCW 10.73.160 the Washington Legislature has also granted the appellate courts discretion to refrain from granting an award of appellate costs. Subsection one of this statute states: “[t]he court of appeals, supreme court, and superior courts *may* require an adult offender convicted of an offense to pay appellate costs.” (emphasis added). In *State v. Sinclair*, *supra*, this Court recently affirmed that the statute provides the appellate court the authority to deny appellate costs in appropriate cases. *State v. Sinclair*, 192 Wn. App. at 388. A defendant should not be forced to seek a remission hearing in the trial court, as the availability of such a hearing “cannot displace the court’s obligation to exercise discretion when properly requested to do so.” *Supra*.

Moreover, the issue of costs should be decided at the appellate court level rather than remanding to the trial court to make an individualized finding regarding the defendant’s ability to pay, as remand to the trial court not only “delegate[s] the issue of appellate costs away from the court that is

assigned to exercise discretion, it would also potentially be expensive and time-consuming for courts and parties.” *State v. Sinclair*, 192 Wn. App. at 388. Thus, “it is appropriate for [an appellate court] to consider the issue of appellate costs in a criminal case during the course of appellate review when the issue is raised in an appellate brief.” *State v. Sinclair*, 192 Wn. App. at 390. In addition, under RAP 14.2, the Court may exercise its discretion in a decision terminating review. *Id.*

An appellate court should deny an award of costs to the state in a criminal case if the defendant is indigent and lacks the ability to pay. *Sinclair, supra*. The imposition of costs against indigent defendants raises problems that are well documented, such as increased difficulty in reentering society, the doubtful recoupment of money by the government, and inequities in administration. *State v. Sinclair*, 192 Wn.App. at 391 (citing *State v. Blazina, supra*). As the court notes in *Sinclair*, “[i]t is entirely appropriate for an appellate court to be mindful of these concerns.” *State v. Sinclair*, 192 Wn.App. at 391.

In *Sinclair*, the trial court entered an order authorizing the defendant to appeal *in forma pauperis*, to have appointment of counsel, and to have the preparation of the necessary record, all at State expense upon its findings that the defendant was “unable by reason of poverty to pay for any of the expenses

of appellate review” and that the defendant “cannot contribute anything toward the costs of appellate review.” *State v. Sinclair*, 192 Wn. App. at 392. Given the defendant’s indigency, combined with his advanced age and lengthy prison sentence, there was no realistic possibility he would be able to pay appellate costs. Accordingly, the Court ordered that appellate costs not be awarded.


Similarly in the case at bar, the defendant is indigent and lacks an ability to pay. The trial court originally entered an order finding the defendant indigent in 2010, and then entered an order of indigency for the purpose of his direct appeal. The defendant now has an appointed attorney who represented him during the evidentiary hearing and now represents the defendant before this court. He has continuously been in custody since his arrest in 2010. Given these factors, it is unrealistic to think the defendant will be able to pay appellate costs. Thus, this court should exercise its discretion to reach a just and equitable result and direct that no appellate costs be allowed should the State substantially prevail on this PRP.

**CONCLUSION**

If the state prevails, this court should not impose costs on this PRP.

DATED this 1<sup>st</sup> day of June, 2016.

Respectfully submitted,



John A. Hays, No. 16654  
Attorney for Appellant

**COURT OF APPEALS OF WASHINGTON, DIVISION II**

**STATE OF WASHINGTON,**  
**Respondent,**

**NO. 45348-7-II**

**vs.**

**AFFIRMATION  
OF SERVICE**

**DERON A. PARKS,**  
**Appellant.**

---

The under signed states the following under penalty of perjury under the laws of Washington State. On the date below, I personally e-filed and/or placed in the United States Mail the Brief of Appellant with this Affirmation of Service Attached with postage paid to the indicated parties:

1. Mr. Tony Golik  
Clark County Prosecuting Attorney  
1013 Franklin Street  
Vancouver, WA 98666-5000  
prosecutor@clark.wa.gov
2. Deron A. Paris, No. 344051  
Coyote Ridge Corrections Center  
P.O. Box 769  
Connell, WA 99326

Dated this 1<sup>st</sup> day of June, 2016, at Longview, WA.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Diane C. Hays

# HAYS LAW OFFICE

**June 01, 2016 - 3:45 PM**

## Transmittal Letter

Document Uploaded: 3-prp2-453487-Other Brief~2.pdf

Case Name: State v. Deron Parks

Court of Appeals Case Number: 45348-7

**Is this a Personal Restraint Petition?**  Yes  No

### The document being Filed is:

Designation of Clerk's Papers  Supplemental Designation of Clerk's Papers

Statement of Arrangements

Motion:  \_\_\_\_\_

Answer/Reply to Motion:  \_\_\_\_\_

Brief:  Other  \_\_\_\_\_

Statement of Additional Authorities

Cost Bill

Objection to Cost Bill

Affidavit

Letter

Copy of Verbatim Report of Proceedings - No. of Volumes:  \_\_\_\_\_

Hearing Date(s):  \_\_\_\_\_

Personal Restraint Petition (PRP)

Response to Personal Restraint Petition

Reply to Response to Personal Restraint Petition

Petition for Review (PRV)

Other:  \_\_\_\_\_

### Comments:

2nd Supplemental Brief of Petitioner

Sender Name: Diane C Hays - Email: [jahayslaw@comcast.net](mailto:jahayslaw@comcast.net)

A copy of this document has been emailed to the following addresses:

[prosecutor@clark.wa.gov](mailto:prosecutor@clark.wa.gov)