

90479-1

FILED
July 3, 2014
Court of Appeals
Division I
State of Washington

No. 71067-2-I

COURT OF APPEALS, DIVISION I
OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Respondent,

v.

BRIAN BRUSH,

Appellant.

Pacific County Superior Court Cause No. 09-1-00143-8
The Honorable Judge Michael J. Sullivan

STATE'S MOTION FOR SUPREME COURT DISCRETIONARY REVIEW

DAVID BURKE
PACIFIC COUNTY PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE
P.O. BOX 45
SOUTH BEND, WASHINGTON 98586
(360) 875-9361

FILED
JUL 10 2014
CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
CF

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
IDENTITY OF PETITIONER	1
CITATION TO COURT OF APPEALS DECISION	1
ISSUE PRESENTED FOR REVIEW	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	1
ARGUMENT	10
CONCLUSION	15
UNPUBLISHED OPINION ON REVIEW	A 1
ORDER DENYING MOTION TO RECONSIDER	A 18
INSTRUCTION NO. 26	A 19

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

FEDERAL CASES

Blakely v. Washington, 542 U.S. 296, 124 S.Ct. 2531,
159 LEd.2d.403 (2004) 10, 11

WASHINGTON STATE CASES

City of Seattle v. Smiley, 41 Wn.App. 189, 702 P.2d 1206 (1985) 15

State v. Atkinson, 113 Wn.App. 661, 54 P.3d 702 (2002) 12

State v. Barnett, 104 Wn. App. 191, 16 P.3d 74 (2001) 10, 11, 12

State v. Becker, 132 Wn.2d 54, 935 P.2d 13231 (1997) 9

State v. Bell, 116 Wn.App. 678, 67 P.3d 527 (2003) 12

State v. Bencivenga, 137 Wn.2d 703, 974 P.2d 832 (1999) 11

State v. Daniels, 56 Wn.App. 646, 784 P.2d 579 (1990) 12

State v. Deal, 128 Wn.2d 693, 911 P.2d 996 (1996) 14

State v. Eaker, 113 Wn. App. 111, 53 P.3d 37 (2002) 9

State v. Epefanio, 156 Wn. App. 378, 234 P.3d 253 (2010) 10, 11 - 12

State v. Harris, 123 Wn.App. 906, 99 P.3d 902 (2004) 11

State v. Jackman, 156 Wn.2d 736, 743, 132 P.3d 136 (2006) 9

State v. Lane, 125 Wn.2d 825, 889 P.2d 929 (1995) 14

State v. Mills, 116 Wn.App. 106, 64 P.3d 1253 (2003) 13

State v. Quigg, 72 Wn.App. 828, 866 P.2d 655 (1994) 12

<i>State v. Ratliff</i> , 121 Wn. App. 642, 90 P.3d 79 (2004)	9
<i>State v. Willis</i> , 153 Wn.2d 366, 103 P.3d 143 (2005)	15
<i>State v. Woods</i> , 143 Wn.2d 561, 23 P.3d 1046 (2001)	14
<i>Ulmer v. Ford Motor Co.</i> , 75 Wn.2d 522, 452 P.2d 729 (1969)	13

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

Wash. Const. Article IV, Section 16	9, 14, 15
-------------------------------------	-----------

WASHINGTON STATUTES

RCW 9.94A.390(2)(h)	12
RCW 9.94A.535(3)(h)(i)	9

OTHER AUTHORITIES

RAP 13.4	15
WPIC 300.16	11 - 15
WPIC 300.17	9 - 15

I. IDENTITY OF PETITIONER

The State of Washington, represented by the Pacific County Prosecutor, is the Petitioner herein.

II. CITATION TO COURT OF APPEALS DECISION

The State seeks review of the Unpublished Opinion, filed May 12, 2014, and Order Denying Motion for Reconsideration, filed June 5, 2014. A copy of the decision is in the Appendix, at pages A 1 – 17. A copy of the order denying petitioner’s motion for reconsideration is in the Appendix at page A 18.

III. ISSUE PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

The defendant, Brian Brush, was found guilty of Murder in the First Degree and was given an exceptional sentence of 1060 months. The trial court in part imposed an exceptional sentence because the defendant committed an aggravated domestic violence crime by engaging in multiple incidents of domestic violence over a prolonged period of time. The trial court used WPIC 300.17 (Instruction No. 26, Appendix A 19) and instructed the jury that “prolonged period of time” means “more than a few weeks.” The Court of Appeals, Division I, ruled that Instruction No. 26 was an improper comment on the evidence and held that the

be sustained on this ground. The issue presented for review is whether WPIC 300.17 as given to the jury in Instruction 26 was an improper judicial comment on the evidence.

IV. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The Defendant Brian Brush was convicted by jury of first degree murder and ordered to serve an exceptional sentence of 1,060 months. The Court of Appeals Division One has upheld the conviction, but reversed the exceptional sentence.

The facts of the offense are incorporated from the Respondent's Brief in Court of Appeals No. 43056-8-II.

On September 11, 2009, at approximately 4:40 p.m., three police officers were on foot patrolling the beach in the City of Long Beach when they watched Brian Brush murder his girlfriend, Lisa Bonney, with a shotgun. RP (11/ 28/ 11) 76 -83, 89 -91, 98 -103, 107 -113. The officers heard one shot, followed by a pause, and then several other shots. RP (11/ 28/ 11) 98. They saw Mr. Brush rack back the shotgun slide to reload the shotgun in an angry manner. RP (11/ 28/ 11) 83, 98. Mr. Brush was observed "violently chambering the next round" like he "was just trying to tear the shotgun apart to get another round chambered." RP (11/ 28/ 11)

116. Mr. Brush first shot Ms. Bonney in the abdomen at less than three feet. The remaining shots were within three to nine feet. RP (11/ 28/ 11) 114; (11/ 29/ 11) 71.

A number of other individuals observed the shooting. Two tourists were having lunch with their family when they saw Mr. Brush and Ms. Bonney having a discussion. Ms. Bonney was not acting aggressively towards Mr. Brush. RP (11/ 28/ 11) 127, 133. Ms. Bonney attempted to leave, and pulled out of Mr. Brush' s grasp; Mr. Brush then went to the back passenger compartment of his pickup truck, retrieved his shotgun, and shot Ms. Bonney. RP (11/ 28/ 11) 121 - 123, 134-136. Both tourists watched officers arrest Mr. Brush. RP (11/ 28/ 11) 124, 138. 6

Dr. Clifford Nelson conducted the post -mortem examination of Ms. Bonney. RP (11/ 30/ 11) 14 -16. Dr. Nelson has been a forensic pathologist since 1992. He began his career in Atlanta, Georgia in 1993 and is presently a Deputy State Medical Examiner for Oregon and a forensic pathologist for Pacific, Wahkiakum, Cowlitz, Skamania, Klickitat and Clark counties. He also serves as a crime scene analyst in criminal death investigations. RP (11/ 30/ 11) 11 - 14.

At trial, Dr. Nelson testified that Ms. Bonney was shot four times. According to Dr. Nelson, the first shotgun wound, across the abdomen, would not have killed Ms. Bonney, but it would have been extremely

painful. This shot occurred at a range of four to five feet. RP (11/ 30/ 11) 21 - 24, 44. The second shot hit Ms. Bonney's back. The shotgun was held from the waist. This wound penetrated the muscles in the back and broke the lower lumbar and upper cervical vertebral bodies – blowing apart the lower part of her spine, lacerating the mesentery, and shredding her aorta and small and large bowel. This shot also shredded the inferior vena cava and perforated the duodenum. According to Dr. Nelson, this fatal shot was fired within three and a half feet from Ms. Bonney. It was from such a close range that it imbedded the shot cup (wadding separating the pellets from the gun powder in the shotgun shell) inside of Ms. Bonney. RP (11/ 30/ 11) 26 - 27, 32, 34.

The third shot entered Ms. Bonney's buttocks and, by itself, would have been sufficient to cause Ms. Bonney's death. RP (11/ 30/ 11) 37.

Mr. Brush's final shot destroyed Ms. Bonney's head. This was from close range, within three and one-half feet. The bursting rupture wound exploded the bones of the skull, ejecting Ms. Bonney's brain. RP (11/ 30/ 11) 39- 42.

Mr. Brush's use of violence was atypical for this kind of crime. Dr. Nelson has investigated hundreds of homicides over his 19 years as a forensic and crime scene analyst. He described this homicide as one of the two worst he has observed in terms of being gratuitously violent and

causing damage far in excess of the level of violence necessary to kill someone. RP (11/ 30/ 11) 46 -50.

Forensic psychiatrist Dr. Christiane Tellefsen testified for the defendant, Brian Brush, saying, "He described being fairly obsessive-compulsive in the way that he approaches things. He's a perfectionist. Everything has to be his way. He's fairly rigid and I think the word that is commonly used these days is controlling." RP (11/20/11) 48.

Mr. Brush was primarily interested in Ms. Bonney because of the way she looked. Dr. Tellefsen testified that, "He [Mr. Brush] described Lisa as a very beautiful woman and it was highly – he was highly infatuated with her and the notion that she was interested in him was very exhilarating to him and being around her brought him up out of his depression." RP (11/20/11) 50.

When Mr. Brush saw Ms. Bonney immediately before he killed her, she looked particularly beautiful. The decedent's coworker, Mary Kay Ramage, testified that she saw Ms. Bonney just before Mr. Brush shot her. "She looked very, very pretty. She had a little orange and yellow sundress on, sandals on, and, you know, just looked very summery and wanting to be a part of the parade thing, part of the festivities." RP (11/29/11) 33, 43.

The events of September 11, 2009, were part of an ongoing pattern of domestic violence. Mr. Brush and Ms. Bonney had a dating relationship for almost two years, living together for much of this time. RP (11/ 29/ 11) 126, (11/ 30/ 11) 47 - 59, (12/ 6/ 11) 176. During an argument with Ms. Bonney in 2008, Mr. Brush kicked Ms. Bonney out of his home and threatened to have the locks changed. RP (12/ 6/ 11) 192. In July 2009, Ms. Bonney and Mr. Brush had an argument. Mr. Brush became violent, bashing a chair over a couch and breaking a bottle of wine on a counter before entering the garage where Ms. Bonney locked the door. Consequently, Mr. Brush struck Ms. Bonney's BMW several times with a hammer. PR (12/ 5/ 11) 52 -53, 134 -35.

Following this event, Mr. Brush and Ms. Bonney agreed to not contact each other, but Mr. Brush repeatedly violated that agreement. During a counseling appointment, Mr. Brush threatened Ms. Bonney with financial ruin. RP (12/ 5/ 11) 140 -141. Over the course of the next two months, Mr. Brush pursued the relationship with Ms. Bonney in an obsessive way. According to the Defense expert witness, Mr. Brush was pathological about the relationship. He sent Ms. Bonney a threatening email and repeatedly harassed her. RP (12/ 5/ 11) 55, 138, 159. Mr. Brush also stalked Ms. Bonney at a concert, and then followed her to a friend's house. Mr. Brush banged on the windows and doors until Ms.

Bonney came out to talk with him. RP (12/ 5/ 11) 138 - 139. Ms. Bonney called her daughter, Elizabeth Bonney, immediately after Mr. Brush had confronted Ms. Bonney at her friend's home. Ms. Bonney was crying as she described the events, RP (12/ 5/ 11) 187. On the following day, when Ms. Bonney recounted the events; she was bawling and physically shaking. Elizabeth indicated that she had never seen her mother so scared. RP (12/ 6/ 11) 178 - 187.

As Elizabeth and her mother left her home, they watched observed Mr. Brush in his truck. Mr. Brush accelerated towards Elizabeth and her mother. Ms. Bonney, fearing they would be struck, yelled, "He's not stopping. Run." RP (12/ 6/ 11) 179. The pair ran two blocks and hid. RP (12/ 6/ 11) 189. Ms. Bonney was shaking, crying, and throwing up as a result of her fear. RP (12/ 6/ 11) 190. While the pair ran from Mr. Brush, he left a message on Ms. Bonney's phone threatening to post naked photographs of Ms. Bonney on her office door. RP (12/ 6/ 11) 191. Mr. Brush then sent a text message to Ms. Bonney threatening to turn Ms. Bonney into the Oregon tax authority for receiving unemployment insurance. RP (12/ 6/ 11) 191.

The trial began in November 2011. The Defense raised a general objection to the exceptional sentence instructions, but did not otherwise

oppose the State's proposed instructions. RP (12/ 5/ 11) 231 - 298, RP (12/ 6/ 11) 2 -52, 104 -106, 198 -209.

The jury found Mr. Brush guilty of First Degree Murder. RP (12/ 6/ 11) 119. The jury also found via special verdicts that 1) Mr. Brush and Ms. Bonney were members of the same household or family; 2) Mr. Brush was armed with a firearm when the crime was committed; 3) Mr. Brush' s conduct during the commission of the crime manifested deliberate cruelty to the victim; 4) the victim' s injuries exceeded the level of bodily harm necessary to satisfy the elements of the offense; and 5) the crime was an aggravated domestic violence offense. RP (12/ 6/ 11) 119 - 122.

After the second phase of the trial, the jury found that Mr. Brush committed an aggravated domestic violence offense based on an ongoing pattern of psychological abuse over a prolonged period of time. RP (12/ 6/ 11) 229.

The trial judge found that, with the jury's special verdicts, there was sufficient evidence to support an exceptional sentence. Mr. Brush was given an exceptional sentence of 1060 months.

Mr. Brush timely appealed.

The Court of Appeals reversed the exceptional sentence and remanded for resentencing. It held that none of the jury's findings regarding the aggravating factors could be sustained, but allowed the

impanelling of a new jury to consider evidence with regard to whether there were multiple incidents of domestic violence over a prolonged period of time under RCW 9.94A.535(3)(h)(i).

The Court of Appeals held that Jury Instruction No. 26 (*see* Appendix, A 19) was an improper comment on the evidence. The relevant section of the opinion reads as follows:

The jury also returned special verdicts finding Brush's crime was an "aggravated domestic violence offense" under RCW 9.94A.535(3)(h)(i) and (iii). CP at 232. Subsection (3)(h)(i) authorizes the jury to find an aggravating factor if:

(i) The offense was part of an ongoing pattern of psychological, physical, or sexual abuse of the victim manifested by multiple incidents over a prolonged period of time;...

Brush argues that the jury's special verdict on subsection (3)(h)(i) should be vacated because the trial court's instruction on that aggravating factor – Jury Instruction 26 – was an improper comment on the evidence. Specifically, he challenges that portion of the instruction emphasized below:

An 'ongoing pattern of abuse' means multiple incidents of abuse over a prolonged period of time. The term 'prolonged period of time' means more than a few weeks.

Supp. CP at 229; *see also*, 11A Washington Practice: Washington Pattern Jury Instructions: Criminal 300.17, at 720 (3d ed. 2008).

The Washington State Constitution, article IV, section 16, provides "[j]udges shall not charge juries with respect to matter of fact, nor comment thereon, but shall declare the law." A judge impermissibly comments on the evidence when he conveys a personal attitude toward the merits of the case. *State v. Ratliff*, 121 Wn. App. 642, 646, 90 P.3d 79 (2004). An instruction improperly comments on the evidence if the instruction resolves a disputed issue of fact that should have been left to the jury. *State v. Eaker*, 113 Wn. App. 111, 118, 53 P.3d 37 (2002). When a judge comments on the evidence in a jury instruction, we presume prejudice and the burden is on the State to show that the defendant was not prejudiced unless the record affirmatively show that no prejudice could have resulted. *State v. Jackman*, 156 Wn.2d 736, 743, 132 P.3d 136 (2006).

In *State v. Becker*, 132 Wn.2d 54, 64-65, 935 P.2d 13231 (1997), the conviction was reversed because the language in a special verdict form resolved a factual dispute about whether a youth program was a school. The court concluded "[b]y effectively removing a disputed issue of fact from the

jury's consideration, the special verdict form relieved the State of its burden to prove all the elements of the sentence enhancement statute."

Here, the jury instruction informed the jury, as a matter of law, that more than a few weeks was a prolonged period of time. Since there was evidence presented during the trial that the alleged domestic violence lasted for more than a few weeks, the instruction resolved any factual dispute whether the domestic violence was over a prolonged period of time. Thus, the instruction relieved the State of proving this element of the aggravating factor.

The State, relying on *State v. Barnett*, 104 Wn. App. 191, 203, 16 P.3d 74 (2001), argues that Instruction 26 merely defined the term "prolonged period of time" and that the definition of a term is a question of law on which the jury may be properly instructed. But because *Barnett* was decided before *Blakely v. Washington*, 542 U.S. 296, 124 S.Ct. 2531, 159 LEd.2d.403 (2004), the issue of whether the abuse was over a prolonged period of time was a matter for the court to decide, and not the jury. Since *Blakely*, "responsibility for these determinations [has moved] to the jury as a matter of constitutional right." *State v. Epefanio*, 156 Wn. App. 378, 392, 234 P.3d 253 (2010). As such, whether a period of time is prolonged is an issue of fact for the jury to determine. And because Instruction 26 resolved that question for them it was a comment on the evidence and thus, error. In addition, we presume that Brush is prejudiced by this error. The State makes no argument that he was not and we are unable to affirmatively state based on the record that none occurred. Accordingly, this ground for the exceptional sentence cannot be sustained.

Court of Appeals, Unpublished Opinion at A 11 – 12

The State is now contesting this holding.

V. ARGUMENT

The State's Petition for Review demonstrates a significant question of law under the Constitution of the State of Washington and United States, and involves issues of substantial public interest that should be determined by the Supreme Court.

**WASHINGTON PATTERN CRIMINAL JURY
INSTRUCTION 300.17 IS NOT AN IMPROPER
COMMENT ON THE EVIDENCE**

WPIC 300.17 and its companion WPIC 300.16 are among many Washington Pattern definitional instructions used every day in courts across the state. Both pattern instructions state that a “prolonged period of time” means “more than a few weeks.” These instructions in part define what is necessary for a determination of aggravated domestic violence.

The issue of what constitutes a “prolonged period of time” is a question of law. As stated in *State v. Epefanio*:

In *State v. Barnett*, we concluded that “[t]wo weeks is not a prolonged period of time” in a case involving a defendant's rape and sexual abuse of a girlfriend. 104 Wn.App. 191, 203, 16 P.3d 74 (2001). We noted that “[c]ases from this state suggest that years are required.” In *State v. Harris*, Division One of this court concluded that four events over six months constituted a prolonged period of time. 123 Wn.App. 906, 915, 99 P.3d 902 (2004), *review granted*, 154 Wn.2d 1032, 119 P.3d 852 (2005).

Since both of these cases were decided, the United States Supreme Court has moved responsibility for these determinations to the jury, as a matter of constitutional right. *Blakely v. Washington*, 542 U.S. 296, 124 S.Ct. 2531, 159 L.Ed.2d 403 (2004). Here, there is no challenge to the propriety of the special verdict form or the other instructions. CP at 130 (Instruction 11); *see* CP at 132 (Instruction 13). And Mr. Epefanio could certainly argue that the time frame was not “prolonged,” even assuming sexual contact during the relevant time frame. The jury's finding on these questions is entitled to great deference. *State v. Bencivenga*,

137 Wn.2d 703, 708–09, 974 P.2d 832 (1999). At some point, the courts could and may conclude, as a matter of law, that a given time frame is not “prolonged”; we will not do so here.

156 Wn.App. 378, 391, 234 P.3d 253 (2010)

Further, the Comment to WPIC 300.16 contains the following language:

The cases discussing a “prolonged period of time” have not set a minimum length of time. Compare *State v. Atkinson*, 113 Wn.App. 661, 671–72, 54 P.3d 702 (2002), review denied, 149 Wn.2d 1013, 69 P.3d 874 (2003) (domestic violence abuse occurring over period of 7 to 10 months, during which time at least three incidents of abuse required the victim to seek medical attention, was sufficient to establish an ongoing pattern of abuse); *State v. Bell*, 116 Wn.App. 678, 684, 67 P.3d 527, review denied, 150 Wn.2d 1023, 81 P.3d 120 (2003) (with respect to an offense occurring in July of 2001, the court stated that “whether the abuse began in September 2000, Christmas 2000, or spring 2001, the abuse was prolonged”); and *State v. Daniels*, 56 Wn.App. 646, 784 P.2d 579 (1990) (multiple beatings within the five-month charging period was sufficient to support a pattern of abuse over a prolonged period); with *State v. Barnett*, 104 Wn.App. 191, 16 P.3d 74 (2001) (two weeks is not sufficient to prove a pattern of sexual abuse over a prolonged period of time for purposes of the domestic violence aggravating circumstance at former RCW 9.94A.390(2)(h)); and *State v. Quigg*, 72 Wn.App. 828, 841, 866 P.2d 655 (1994) (sexual abuse over a period of three days is insufficient to demonstrate an ongoing pattern).

The Pattern Jury Instruction Committee attempted to incorporate the holding of the *Barnett* decision by defining “prolonged period of time” as being more than two weeks. The Court of Appeals in the current case held in an unpublished opinion that this was a comment on the evidence.

If the Court of Appeals is correct, the Supreme Court needs to provide guidance as to what “prolonged period of time” means, and how to convey this definition without being an impermissible comment on the evidence. While the Washington pattern jury instructions are not binding on the court, they are persuasive authority. *State v. Mills*, 116 Wn.App. 106, 116 n. 24, 64 P.3d 1253 (2003).

Instruction No. 26 is not a comment on the evidence because, in addition to correctly stating the law, it does not assume the truth of any material fact concerning which there is conflicting evidence. *Cf. Ulmer v. Ford Motor Co.*, 75 Wn.2d 522, 533, 452 P.2d 729 (1969).

Until the Supreme Court addresses this issue, practitioners will likely continue to use WPIC 300.16 and 300.17 without any certainty regarding the appropriateness of these instructions. The attendant confusion makes this an issue that the Supreme Court needs to resolve. In this instance, WPIC 300.17 does not compel the result reached by the Court of Appeals. In defining the phrase “a prolonged period of time,” as “more than a few weeks,” this WPIC still allows the trier of fact to determine whether there are facts to support the legal standard. Therefore, WPIC 300.17 is no more a comment on the evidence than any other WPIC found in the Chapter 2 definitions of the WPIC.

Article 4, section 16 of the Washington Constitution states that “Judges shall not charge juries with respect to matters of fact, nor comment thereon, but shall declare the law.” “A statement by the court constitutes a comment on the evidence if the court’s attitude toward the merits of the case or the court’s evaluation relative to the disputed issue is inferable from the statement.” *State v. Lane*, 125 Wn.2d 825, 838, 889 P.2d 929 (1995). “The touchstone of error in a trial court’s comment on the evidence is whether the feeling of the trial court as to the truth value of the testimony of a witness has been communicated to the jury.” *Id.* “The purposed of prohibiting judicial comments on the evidence is to prevent the trial judge’s opinion from influencing the jury.” *Id.*

A judge’s jury instruction constitutes a comment on the evidence if it indicates the judge’s personal evaluation of the merits or allows an inference that the judge either believed or disbelieved some of the evidence. *State v. Deal*, 128 Wn.2d 693, 703, 911 P.2d 996 (1996). But an instruction that merely accurately states relevant law is not a comment on the evidence. *State v. Woods*, 143 Wn.2d 561, 591, 23 P.3d 1046 (2001).

In this case, the WPIC instructions in question permitted the parties to argue their theories of the case, did not mislead the jury, and


properly informed the jury of the applicable laws. *See State v. Willis*, 153 Wn.2d 366, 370, 103 P.3d 143 (2005). In short, an instruction that does no more than accurately state the law pertaining to an issue in the case does not constitute an impermissible comment on the evidence by a trial judge under article 4, section 16, of the Washington Constitution. *City of Seattle v. Smiley*, 41 Wn.App. 189, 192, 702 P.2d 1206 (1985).

The Court of Appeals concluded that the relevant WPIC mandated a specific factual conclusion and therefore was a comment on the evidence. However, a closer look at Instruction No. 26 reveals that the jury still had to determine whether there were facts which met the legal definition articulated in this instruction. Thus, the Court of Appeals erred in holding that Instruction No. 26 (WPIC 300.17) was a comment on the evidence. This is an issue of major significance because an approved WPIC has been disapproved. Because this Court of Appeals decision involves a significant question of law under the Constitution of the State of Washington (RAP 13.4(b)(3)) and because the decision involves an issue of substantial public interest (RAP 13.4(b)(4)), the Supreme Court should accept discretionary review.

VI. CONCLUSION

The State respectfully asks this Court to review the decision by the Court of Appeals that determined that WPIC 300.17 constitutes a comment on the evidence. The definition of what constitutes a “prolonged period of time” for determining the existence of an aggravated domestic violence offense will remain unsettled unless this Court resolves the issue. This issue is ripe for adjudication.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 3rd day of July, 2014.



David Burke, WSBA 16163

Pacific County Prosecutor

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE OF WASHINGTON,)
)
 Respondent,)
)
 v.)
)
 BRIAN BRUSH,)
)
 Appellant.)

No. 71067-2-1
DIVISION ONE
UNPUBLISHED OPINION
FILED: May 12, 2014

FILED
COURT OF APPEALS DIV 1
STATE OF WASHINGTON
2014 MAY 12 AM 10:31

SPEARMAN, C.J. — Brian Brush was convicted of aggravated first degree murder and ordered to serve an exceptional sentence of 1,060 months of incarceration. He appeals. We affirm the judgment and remand for resentencing.

FACTS

On September 11, 2009, at approximately 4:40 p.m., three police officers were on foot patrol at a car show in Long Beach, Washington. As they were patrolling, they heard a gunshot on the beach. When they looked in the direction of the shot, they saw Brian Brush fire a shotgun three more times, thereby killing his girlfriend, Lisa Bonney, who stood a few feet away.¹

The three officers approached Brush, their weapons drawn. When Brush, a former police officer, observed the approaching officers, he tossed the shotgun aside, walked towards the officers, and followed their commands as they secured

¹ A number of other individuals also observed the shooting. In particular, two tourists testified that they observed the shooting and Brush being taken into custody.

No. 71067-2-1/2

the area. As Brush was on the ground being handcuffed, Raymond Police Officer Arlie Boggs asked him if he had been shooting at a human being; Brush responded "yes." Verbatim Report of Proceedings (10/12/11) at 9. Boggs then read Brush Miranda² warnings. When asked if he wanted to talk to police, Brush replied, "no". VRP (10/12/11) at 12.

A short time later, Deputy Chief Heath Layman of the Cosmopolis Police Department arrived on the scene and took control of Brush from the other officers. At 4:48 p.m. Layman re-read Brush his Miranda rights from a preprinted form which included "Yes" and "No" check boxes for officers to indicate whether a suspect wished to answer questions. When Layman asked Brush if he wished to talk Brush replied that he would talk to police once he was removed from the crime scene. Layman checked the box labeled "No." VRP (10/12/11) at 54. Layman did not ask Brush, who was handcuffed, to sign the form in the space provided.

After about forty-five minutes, Brush was transported to the Pacific County Sheriff's Office, where he was interviewed by Layman and Ron Clark, the Pacific County Undersheriff. The officers recorded the interview, which commenced at 5:52 p.m. Exhibit H (5:52 p.m.).³ The beginning of the recording contains Brush's acknowledgment that he was previously advised of his constitutional rights, however the recording includes no admonishment of Miranda warnings or that the interview was being recorded.

² Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436, 86 S.Ct. 1602, 16 L.Ed.2d 694 (1966).

³ Exhibit H contains transcripts of two recorded interviews with Brush. They are distinguished herein by notation of the start time of each interview (5:52 p.m. or 7:27 p.m.).

No. 71067-2-1/3

In the 5:52 p.m. statement, Brush described his volatile relationship with Bonney and the abuse he allegedly suffered at her hands. He also indicated that he had no memory of shooting Bonney. After about thirty minutes, Brush requested an attorney and the interview stopped.

Later that evening, Layman received a phone call from Chief Flint Wright of the Long Beach Police Department. Chief Wright told Layman that Brush had changed his mind and wanted to continue talking.⁴ Layman was also informed that he was the only person to whom Brush was willing to talk. Layman returned to the Pacific County Sheriff's Office and conducted a second recorded interview of Brush, which lasted from 7:27 to 7:39 p.m. The second interview began with an admonishment of the Miranda warnings, Brush's waiver of his rights, and notice that the interview was being recorded. In this statement, Brush described how Bonney had scratched him, hit him, and verbally abused him. He told Layman that prior to the shooting he had tried to get in the truck and get away from Bonney. He also stated that he had no memory of retrieving the gun from the truck or shooting Bonney. Layman ended the interview at 7:39 p.m. after Brush reiterated that he could not remember shooting Bonney. Prior to ending the recording, Layman confirmed that Brush understood he was being charged with murder.

While incarcerated in the Pacific County Jail, Brush made a telephone call to his ex-wife, which was recorded. During the brief conversation, Brush asked

⁴ There was no testimony or other evidence detailing the nature of communications between Chief Wright and Brush or between any jail staff and Brush before Chief Wright informed Deputy Chief Layman that Brush wanted to talk again.

No. 71067-2-1/4

his ex-wife to contact his family; he also said to her three times: "I killed Lisa."
VRP (11/29/11) at 24.

Procedural History

The state charged Brush with first degree murder, and alleged as aggravating factors that (1) Brush manifested deliberate cruelty to the victim during the commission of the crime, (2) the offense involved "aggravated domestic violence,"⁵ and (3) the victim's injuries substantially exceeded the level of bodily harm necessary to satisfy the elements of the offense. RCW 9.94A.535(a),(h)(i) and (iii), and (y), respectively.⁶ CP at 11-13. The trial was bifurcated so jurors would not hear evidence of an ongoing pattern of abuse (in support of subsection (h)(i)) until the sentencing phase.⁷ In defense against the charge, Brush claimed diminish capacity, i.e., that he had a mental illness or disorder that rendered him incapable of either premeditating or forming the intent to kill Bonney.

Prior to trial, a CrR 3.5 hearing was held to determine the admissibility of Brush's statements to police. Brush asserted that all three of his statements to

⁵ As charged in this case, the State alleged pursuant to RCW 9.94A.535(3)(h): "The current offense involved domestic violence, as defined in RCW 10.99.020, or stalking, as defined in RCW 9A.46.110, and one or more of the following was present: (i) The offense was part of an ongoing pattern of psychological, physical, or sexual abuse of a victim or multiple victims manifested by multiple incidents over a prolonged period of time;... or (iii) The offender's conduct during the commission of the current offense manifested deliberate cruelty or intimidation of the victim." CP at 225.

⁶ The State also alleged a firearms aggravator under RCW 9.94A.533(3)(a) which is not disputed on appeal.

⁷ Although the State did not offer evidence of domestic violence in the guilt phase, some evidence of domestic violence was elicited from the defense psychological expert, Dr. Christiane Tellefsen. Dr. Tellefsen testified about threats Brush made to Bonney, an incident in which he stalked her after a concert, an angry confrontation at Bonney's friend's house, and the generally volatile nature of their relationship.

No. 71067-2-1/5

the police should be suppressed: the first, because it was obtained in violation of Miranda, supra.; the second and third because they were tainted by the first statement, which he argued was involuntary and coerced. He also argued that the recorded statements were obtained in violation of his right to remain silent and right to counsel. The court agreed that Brush's initial confession to shooting at a human was obtained in violation of his Miranda rights and granted his motion to suppress that statement, but it found the two statements recorded at the police station admissible.

Jury selection lasted two days. A jury, including three alternate jurors, was sworn to try the case. On the third day of trial, Juror 1 informed the court that his employer had purchased him a plane ticket for a business trip to Alaska. He had received no advance notice, and the trip was expected to last a month. Juror 1 told the court that missing the trip would cost him a \$4,000 business opportunity and create a financial hardship for him and his family, for which he was the primary earner. The juror also asserted that missing the trip would not impact his "ability to concentrate fully on the trial." VRP (11/28/11) at 18. The court excused the juror over Brush's objection.

During the guilt phase, Dr. Clifford Nelson, the medical examiner who conducted the autopsy of Bonney, testified regarding Bonney's injuries and the mechanics of the shooting. Over Brush's objection, Dr. Nelson described this homicide as one of the two worst he had observed in terms of being "gratuitously violent" and causing damage in excess of that necessary to kill someone. VRP (11/30/11) at 46.

At the close of evidence, Brush objected to the court's jury instructions defining the alleged aggravating factors, but he gave no specific reasons and did not propose any alternative instructions. He did not object to any of the special verdict forms. The jury found Brush guilty of first degree murder. The jury also found via special verdicts that (1) Brush and Bonney were members of the same household or family; (2) Brush was armed with a firearm when the crime was committed; (3) Brush's conduct during the commission of the crime manifested deliberate cruelty to the victim; (4) the victim's injuries exceeded the level of bodily harm necessary to satisfy the elements of the offense; and (5) the crime was an aggravated domestic violence offense based on deliberate cruelty and excessive bodily harm to the victim.

Following the verdicts, the second phase of the trial commenced in which the State presented evidence of a pattern of domestic violence between Brush and Bonney. The State offered testimony from Bonney's daughter, Elizabeth Bonney (herein, "Elizabeth"), regarding allegations Bonney had made about prior incidents of domestic violence involving Brush.⁸ The trial court admitted the evidence over Brush's hearsay objection. The jury returned a sixth special verdict finding that the crime was an aggravated domestic violence offense based on an ongoing pattern of abuse over a prolonged period of time.

Brush moved for a new trial based on the trial court's dismissal of Juror 1. The trial court denied the motion. The court determined the maximum standard range sentence, including the firearms enhancement was 380 months, but

⁸ Elizabeth also testified in the guilt phase, establishing that Bonney and Brush had a dating relationship of almost two years and that during much of this time they cohabitated.

No. 71067-2-1/7

imposed an exceptional sentence of 1,060 months based on the jury's special verdicts.

Brush appeals.

DISCUSSION

Brush argues that his conviction should be overturned because his three statements to police were improperly admitted at trial and because the trial court violated his right to have his trial completed by a particular tribunal. Brush also claims that the aggravating factors upon which the court relied to impose the exceptional sentence are not supported by the record. We reject Brush's challenges to the guilty finding but agree that the exceptional sentence must be reversed. Accordingly, we affirm the judgment, but remand for resentencing.

I.

Brush asserts that each of his three statements to police was obtained in violation of his rights under the Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution. He argued below, and the trial court agreed, that his initial affirmative response to the officer's question whether he was shooting at a human was inadmissible because it was the result of an interrogation which took place prior to admonishment of his constitutional rights.⁹ He now contends that the initial statement was also involuntary, thereby rendering the subsequent recorded statements to police tainted and inadmissible. He further contends that his two recorded statements were obtained in violation of Miranda.

⁹ The State does not contest this ruling on appeal.

No. 71067-2-1/8

We subject constitutional errors, including Miranda violations, to harmless error analysis. State v. Boggs, 16 Wn. App. 682, 689-90, 559 P.2d 11 (1977). To establish harmless error on appeal, the beneficiary of a constitutional error must establish beyond a reasonable doubt that the error complained of did not contribute to the verdict obtained. Id. (citing Chapman v. California, 386 U.S. 18, 24, 87 S.Ct. 824, 828, 17 L.Ed.2d 705 (1967)). Courts applying this standard have held harmless the admission of statements obtained in violation of a defendant's constitutional rights where there is overwhelming independent evidence of guilt. Id. (citing Harrington v. California, 395 U.S. 250, 251, 89 S.Ct. 1726, 23 L.Ed.2d 284 (1969)); see also State v. Nist, 77 Wn.2d 227, 234-35, 461 P.2d 322 (1969)).

Even assuming that Brush's statements to police were obtained in violation of his Fifth Amendment rights, any error in admitting the statements was harmless beyond a reasonable doubt. The record discloses that at least five eyewitnesses identified Brush as the individual they watched shoot and kill Bonney. The jury also heard the recording of Brush's jailhouse telephone call to his ex-wife, in which he confessed to the murder three times. In addition, Brush conceded at trial that he killed Bonney, arguing only that he could not have premeditated the act or formed the intent to kill her because of a mental disease or disorder. Based on these factors, we conclude any error in admitting the challenged statements was harmless beyond a reasonable doubt.

II.

Brush next contends that the two recordings of his statements at the police station were obtained in violation of the RCW 9.73.090 (the Privacy Act) and that trial counsel's failure to object on this basis constituted ineffective assistance of counsel under Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668, 104 S.Ct. 2052, 80 L.Ed.2d 674 (1984).¹⁰

The admission of evidence obtained in violation of the Privacy Act is not constitutional error and may be held harmless unless, within reasonable probabilities, had the error not occurred, the outcome of the trial would have been materially affected. State v. Howard, 127 Wn. App. 862, 871, 113 P.3d 511 (2005); State v. Cunningham, 93 Wn.2d 823, 831, 613 P.2d 1139 (1980). The parties dispute whether Brush may raise error based on a Privacy Act violation for the first time on appeal. We need not resolve the issue, because even assuming the issue is properly before us and that the recordings were erroneously admitted in violation of the Privacy Act, the error was harmless, given the overwhelming, independent evidence of Brush's guilt. For this same reason, Brush's ineffective assistance of counsel claim fails since he cannot establish, as required by Strickland, that he was prejudiced by trial counsel's failure to object to the evidence.

¹⁰ Under Strickland, a defendant claiming ineffective assistance of counsel must show that counsel was deficient and that the defendant was prejudiced by trial counsel's deficient performance. State v. Thomas, 109 Wn.2d 222, 225, 743 P.2d 816 (1987).

III.

Brush claims the trial court's dismissal of Juror 1, violated his right to be tried by a jury he helped to select. Removal of a juror is reviewed for abuse of discretion. State v. Jorden, 103 Wn. App. 221, 226, 11 P.3d 866 (2000); see also State v. Hughes, 106 Wn.2d 176, 204, 721 P.2d 902 (1986). A trial court "necessarily abuses its discretion by denying a criminal defendant's constitutional rights." State v. Iniguez, 167 Wn.2d 273, 280, 217 P.3d 768 (2009) (quoting State v. Perez, 137 Wn. App. 97, 105, 151 P.3d 249 (2007)).

We conclude the trial court's dismissal of Juror 1 was not an abuse of discretion. RCW 2.36.100(1) gives the trial court authority to excuse a person from jury service "upon a showing of undue hardship, extreme inconvenience, public necessity, or any reason deemed sufficient by the court for a period of time the court deems necessary." The law "vests... a wide discretion to be exercised in the matter of excusing persons summoned for jury service from the performance of that duty." (Emphasis added.) State v. Slert, 169 Wn. App. 766, 787, 282 P.3d 101 (2012) rev. granted in part, 176 Wn.2d 1031 (2013)(quoting State v. Ingels, 4 Wn.2d 676, 682-83, 104 P.2d 944 (1940); accord State v. Rice, 120 Wn.2d 549, 562, 844 P.2d 416 (1993)).

Here, on the third day of trial, before any evidence was heard, Juror 1 advised the court that his employer had purchased him a plane ticket to go to Alaska for employment purposes. He informed the court that he was the sole breadwinner for his family and that missing the Alaska trip would result in lost income of over \$4,000. He stated that a delay of even a day or two would cost

No. 71067-2-I/11

him the opportunity entirely. The juror also forthrightly stated that missing the trip would not impact his ability to concentrate fully on the trial. The court then found that continued service on the jury "would be an undue financial hardship on this gentleman." (VRP (11/28/11) at 21-23.

Brush argues that the trial court abused its discretion because regardless of the hardship, the juror indicated he could still perform his duties as a juror. But where such service would cause the juror undue hardship, RCW 2.36.100(1) expressly permits the judge to dismiss the juror. The trial court's finding that missing the business trip would cause Juror 1 undue hardship is supported by the record. There was no abuse of discretion.¹¹

IV.

Lastly, Brush claims that the trial court erred in imposing an exceptional sentence. On review of an exceptional sentence an appellate court must (1) make a factual inquiry to determine whether the record supports the jury's special verdict on the aggravating circumstance under a clearly erroneous standard; (2) conduct a de novo review to determine whether the trial court's reasons for imposing an exceptional sentence are substantial and compelling; and (3) make a determination as to whether the trial court abused its discretion by imposing a sentence that is clearly excessive or clearly too lenient under the abuse of

¹¹ Brush also argues that dismissal of Juror 1 violated his rights under the double jeopardy clause of the Fifth Amendment. He cites Crist v. Bretz, 437 U.S. 28, 35-36, 98 S.Ct. 2156, 57 L.Ed.2d 24 (1978), in support. In that case, charges against the defendant were dismissed on the State's motion after the jury was empaneled and sworn, but before the first witness was sworn. The State refiled the charges and the defendant moved to dismiss on double jeopardy grounds. The issue in the case was whether jeopardy attached after the jury was empaneled and sworn, as provided by the federal constitution, or after the first witness is sworn as provided by a Montana statute. The case is inapposite since Brush does not claim, nor could he, that he was at any time subject to jeopardy a second time regarding this offense.

No. 71067-2-I/12

discretion standard. State v. Fowler, 145 Wn.2d 400, 405-06, 38 P.3d 335 (2002).

Under RCW 9.94A.535(3), a trial court has substantial and compelling reasons to impose an exceptional sentence if a jury finds any of several enumerated aggravating factors. Thus, in this case, the second prong of our analysis is satisfied because the trial court expressly based the exceptional sentence on the jury's special verdicts finding four statutory aggravating factors: deliberate cruelty under subsection (3)(a); excessive injury to the victim under subsection (3)(y); and two factors related to domestic violence under subsection (3)(h)(i) and (iii). Thus, our inquiry is limited to whether the record supports the special verdicts and, if so, whether the sentence imposed was clearly excessive.

Under subsection (3)(a), a jury may find an aggravating factor if:

- (a) The defendant's conduct during the commission of the current offense manifested deliberate cruelty to the victim.

"Deliberate cruelty" requires a showing "of gratuitous violence or other conduct that inflicts physical, psychological, or emotional pain as an end in itself [T]he cruelty must go beyond that normally associated with the commission of the charged offense or inherent in the elements of the offense. . . ." State v. Tili, 148 Wn.2d 350, 369, 60 P.3d 1192 (2003) (citation omitted).

Here, the record indicates that the shooting of Bonney happened very rapidly; the entire incident was over in seconds and the actual shots occurred in rapid succession. Although the first nonlethal shot undoubtedly caused Bonney pain, there is no indication that Brush deliberately sought to inflict pain as an end

No. 71067-2-I/13

in itself or to prolong Bonney's suffering in any way. Indeed, the evidence is to the contrary; all of the eyewitnesses suggested that he fired the second lethal shot almost immediately after the first. Given this evidence, we conclude that the jury's special verdict finding "deliberate cruelty" is unsupported by the record and clearly erroneous.

The jury also returned special verdicts finding Brush's crime was an "aggravated domestic violence offense" under RCW 9.94A.535(3)(h)(i) and (iii). CP at 232. Subsection (3)(h)(i) authorizes the jury to find an aggravating factor if:

(i) The offense was part of an ongoing pattern of psychological, physical, or sexual abuse of the victim manifested by multiple incidents over a prolonged period of time;...

Brush argues that the jury's special verdict on subsection (3)(h)(i) should be vacated because the trial court's instruction on that aggravating factor—Jury Instruction 26—was an improper comment on the evidence. Specifically, he challenges that portion of the instruction emphasized below:

An 'ongoing pattern of abuse' means multiple incidents of abuse over a prolonged period of time. The term 'prolonged period of time' means more than a few weeks.

SUPP. CP at 229; see also, 11A WASHINGTON PRACTICE: WASHINGTON PATTERN JURY INSTRUCTIONS: CRIMINAL 300.17, at 720 (3d ed. 2008).

The Washington State Constitution, article IV, section 16, provides "[j]udges shall not charge juries with respect to matter of fact, nor comment thereon, but shall declare the law." A judge impermissibly comments on the evidence when he conveys a personal attitude toward the merits of the case. State v. Ratliff, 121 Wn. App. 642, 646, 90 P.3d 79 (2004). An instruction

No. 71067-2-I/14

improperly comments on the evidence if the instruction resolves a disputed issue of fact that should have been left to the jury. State v. Eaker, 113 Wn. App. 111, 118, 53 P.3d 37 (2002). When a judge comments on the evidence in a jury instruction, we presume prejudice and the burden is on the State to show that the defendant was not prejudiced unless the record affirmatively show that no prejudice could have resulted. State v. Jackman, 156 Wn.2d 736, 743, 132 P.3d 136 (2006).

In State v. Becker, 132 Wn.2d 54, 64-65, 935 P.2d 13231 (1997), the conviction was reversed because the language in a special verdict form resolved a factual dispute about whether a youth program was a school. The court concluded “[b]y effectively removing a disputed issue of fact from the jury’s consideration, the special verdict form relieved the State of its burden to prove all the elements of the sentence enhancement statute.”

Here, the jury instruction informed the jury, as a matter of law, that more than a few weeks was a prolonged period of time. Since there was evidence presented during the trial that the alleged domestic violence lasted for more than a few weeks, the instruction resolved any factual dispute whether the domestic violence was over a prolonged period of time. Thus, the instruction relieved the State of proving this element of the aggravating factor.

The State, relying on State v. Barnett, 104 Wn. App. 191, 203, 16 P.3d 74 (2001), argues that Instruction 26 merely defined the term “prolonged period of time” and that the definition of a term is a question of law on which the jury may be properly instructed. But because Barnett was decided before Blakely v.

No. 71067-2-I/15

Washington, 542 U.S. 296, 124 S.Ct. 2531, 159 L.Ed.2d.403 (2004), the issue of whether the abuse was over a prolonged period of time was a matter for the court to decide, and not the jury. Since Blakely, "responsibility for these determinations [has moved] to the jury as a matter of constitutional right." State v. Epefanio, 156 Wn. App. 378, 392, 234 P.3d 253 (2010). As such, whether a period of time is prolonged is an issue of fact for the jury to determine. And because Instruction 26 resolved that question for them it was a comment on the evidence and thus, error. In addition, we presume that Brush is prejudiced by this error. The State makes no argument that he was not and we are unable to affirmatively state based on the record that none occurred. Accordingly, this ground for the exceptional sentence cannot be sustained.¹²

Brush also challenges the jury's special verdict finding the domestic violence aggravating factor based on subsection (3)(h)(iii), which provides for such a finding if:

(h) The current offense involved domestic violence, as defined in RCW 10.99.020, and

...
(iii) The offender's conduct during the commission of the current offense manifested deliberate cruelty or intimidation of the victim.

This factor must be supported by evidence that the offender's conduct during the commission of the current offense manifested "deliberate cruelty" or "intimidation of the victim."

¹² Given our resolution of this issue we do not address Brush's argument that the testimony of Bonney's daughter in support of this aggravating factor was hearsay, improperly admitted under ER 803(a)(2), as an "excited utterance".

No. 71067-2-I/16

As previously discussed, the record in this case is insufficient to establish "deliberate cruelty." And, although the jury was properly instructed on the "intimidation of the victim" prong, the special verdict form omitted this language and substituted the "excessive bodily harm" language set forth under subsection (3)(y), discussed infra. CP at 199, 206. Under the plain language of the statute, the jury's special verdict finding an "aggravated domestic violence" offense cannot be sustained on this ground.

Subsection (3)(y) permits a jury to find an aggravating factor if:

(y) The victim's injuries substantially exceed the level of bodily harm necessary to satisfy the elements of the offense...

Brush cites State v. Stubbs, 170 Wn.2d 117, 240 P. 3d 143 (2010), for the proposition that no injury can "substantially exceed" the level of bodily harm necessary to cause death. In Stubbs, our Supreme Court considered whether subsection (3)(y) was sustained by the evidence in a first degree assault case. Id. The issue was whether any level of injury could "substantially exceed" "great bodily harm," as defined by the criminal code RCW 9A.36.011(1)(a)(c); 9A.04.110(4)(c)). The court explained that "[g]reat bodily harm,' ... encompasses the most serious injuries short of death. No injury can exceed this level of harm, let alone substantially exceed it" for purposes of subsection (3)(y). Id. at 128.


It stands to reason that, if no injury can substantially exceed "great bodily harm," which leaves the victim just short of death, then no injury can substantially exceed death. We conclude, therefore, that Stubbs precludes a finding of the subsection (3)(y) aggravating factor where, as here, the victim's death is an

No. 71067-2-I/17


element of the underlying crime. The jury's finding of the subsection (3)(y) aggravating factor was error.

The judgment of guilty is affirmed but because none of the jury's findings regarding the aggravating factors can be sustained on the record before us, the exceptional sentence in this case must be reversed. We remand for resentencing with instructions that the trial court may, if requested, impanel a jury to consider evidence of a prolonged pattern of abuse under RCW 9.94A.535(3)(h)(i). See RCW 9.94A.537(2); State v. Powell, 167 Wn.2d 672, 679-80, 223 P.3d 493 (2009), overruled on other grounds.¹³

We remand.



WE CONCUR:





¹³ We note that the jury may not consider aggravating circumstances under subsection (3)(a) because, as a matter of law, the record cannot sustain a finding of "deliberate cruelty;" subsection (3)(h)(iii) for the same reason and because the trial court did not rely on the "intimidation of the victim" language; or subsection (3)(y), which is not applicable in homicide cases.

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE STATE OF WASHINGTON


STATE OF WASHINGTON,)	
)	No. 71067-2-1
Respondent,)	
)	ORDER DENYING
v.)	MOTION TO RECONSIDER
)	
BRIAN BRUSH,)	
)	
Appellant.)	

The State of Washington filed a motion to reconsider the opinion filed in the above matter on May 12, 2014. A majority of the panel has determined this motion should be denied.

Now, therefore, it is hereby

ORDERED that the motion to reconsider is denied.

DATED this 5th day of June 2014.


Presiding Judge

FILED
COURT OF APPEALS DIV 1
STATE OF WASHINGTON
2014 JUN -5 AM 9: 29

A-18

INSTRUCTION NO. 26

To find that this crime is an aggravated domestic violence offense, each of the following two elements must be proved beyond a reasonable doubt:

- (1) That the victim and the defendant were family or household members;
and
- (2) That the offense was part of an ongoing pattern of psychological abuse of the victim manifested by multiple incidents over a prolonged period of time.

An "ongoing pattern of abuse" means multiple incidents of abuse over a prolonged period of time. The term "prolonged period of time" means more than a few weeks.

If you find from the evidence that element (1) and element (2) have been proved beyond a reasonable doubt, then it will be your duty to answer "yes" on the Special Verdict Form No. 6.

On the other hand, if after weighing all the evidence, any one of you has a reasonable doubt as to element (1) or element (2), then it will be your duty to answer "no" on the Special Verdict Form No. 6.

A - 19

SOUTH PACIFIC DISTRICT COURT

July 03, 2014 - 11:20 AM

Transmittal Letter

Document Uploaded: 710672-Other.pdf

Case Name: State of Washington v. Brian Brush
Court of Appeals Case Number: 71067-2

FILED
July 3, 2014
Court of Appeals
Division I
State of Washington

Party Respresented: State of Washington

Is this a Personal Restraint Petition? Yes No

Trial Court County: _____ - Superior Court # _____

The document being Filed is:

- Designation of Clerk's Papers Supplemental Designation of Clerk's Papers
- Statement of Arrangements
- Motion: Other
- Answer/Reply to Motion: _____
- Statement of Additional Authorities
- Affidavit of Attorney Fees
- 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:

State's Motion for Supreme Court Discretionary Review

Sender Name: Elaine M Fosse - Email: dburke@co.pacific.wa.us

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

dburke@co.pacific.wa.us
backlundmistry@gmail.com