

STATE OF WASHINGTON
SUPREME COURT

RECEIVED
JUN - 3 2025
Washington State
Supreme Court

Case #: 1042574

COA II

) Case No.: 58869-2
)
)
) MOTION FOR ACCELERATED REVIEW
)
) Treated as a Petition for Review
)
)
)
)

PRESENTED BY:

Ebrima Darboe,

PETITIONER

1. IDENTITY OF MOVING PARTY

COMES NOW, Ebrima Darboe, PRO SE, CURRENTLY DOMICILED AT THE CEDAR CREEK
CORRECTIONS CENTER, P.O. Box 37 LITTLE ROCK, WA 98556, ASKS THIS HONORABLE
COURT FOR AN ACCELERATED REVIEW RAP 18.12 RAP 1.2(C0) AND RAP 18.8 (A).

2. STATEMENT OF RELIEF SOUGHT

PETITIONER, Ebrima Darboe, ASKS FOR AN ACCELERATED REVIEW SO THAT IF A
DECISION IS MADE IN HIS FAVOR PETITIONER WOULD NOT BE PAST HIS RELEASE DATE.

3. FACTS RELEVANT TO MOTION

PETITIONER WAS CONVICTED OF attempted 2nd-
degree burglary ON CASE # 22-1-00424-34 IN
Thurston COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT. PETITIONER WAS SENTENCED TO 38.25 MONTHS.

PETITIONER HAS SINCE FILED A motion to recall mandate FOR invited error
+ ineffective assistance. (see: Exhibit #1)

1 4. GROUND'S FOR RELIEF AND ARGUMENT

2 PETITIONER BELIEVES THAT IF THE APPEALS COURT RULES IN THE PETITIONER'S FAVOR
3 THAT HE WOULD BE CLOSE TO, OR PAST, HIS RELEASE DATE, AND THIS HONORABLE COURT
4 HAS IT IN IT'S POWER TO GRANT AN ACCELERATED REVIEW UNDER RAP 18.12, RAP 1.2,
5 AND RAP 18.8.

6
7 DATED THIS 28th. DAY OF MAY, 2025

8 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

9
10 BY, Ebrima Darboe

11 Olympic C-11-L DOC# 404269

12 CEDAR CREEK CORRECTIONS CENTER

13 P.O. BOX 37 OLYMPIC UNIT

14 LITTLE ROCK, WA 98556
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

(Exhibit # 1)



Nielsen Koch & Grannis PLLC

The Denny Building
2200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 1250
Seattle, Washington 98121

Phone: (206) 623-2373
Fax: (206) 623-2488
www.nwattorney.net

Dana M. Nelson
nelsond@nwattorney.net

RECEIVED
JUN - 3 2025

Washington State
Supreme Court

May 7, 2025

Ebrima Darboe, 404269
Cedar Creek Corr. Center
P.O. Box 37
Littlerock, WA 98556

COA No. 58869-2-II

Dear Mr. Darboe,

Much has happened in your case that I was unaware of until yesterday. Let me fill you in. Without my knowledge, a decision was entered in your case on April 1, 2025. Apparently, the court sent me a copy by email, but I missed it somehow. My apologies for not letting you know sooner.

I'm sorry to report the court affirmed your conviction. The court held the doctrine of invited error precluded review of our challenge to the jury instructions, since defense counsel helped in crafting them (specifically attempted second degree burglary). The court held trial counsel did not commit ineffective assistance when helping with the instructions because there was a strategic reason for him to ask for attempted second degree burglary, namely to avoid conviction on a more serious offense, attempted first degree burglary.

I have read the court's decision very carefully. Regretfully, I do not believe there are further grounds for review.

Unfortunately, there is no right to have the Washington Supreme Court review a Court of Appeals decision. That court only accepts review as a matter of discretion. And the court only accepts review of cases in which the decision is in conflict with a decision of the Supreme Court or with another decision of the Court of Appeals, or if a significant question of law under the state or federal constitution is involved, or if the decision involves an issue of substantial public interest that should be resolved by the Supreme Court. In my opinion, your case does not meet these limited criteria. It is even less likely for the Supreme Court to review an unpublished Court of Appeals decision.

For these reasons, I will not be seeking further review on your behalf. There is no right to counsel on a petition for review.


Ordinarily, you would have the right to pursue further review on your own. You would have the right to file a motion for reconsideration with the Court of Appeals within 20 days of the court's opinion. If you choose not to move for reconsideration, but wish instead to seek review by the Supreme Court, **you would have the right to file a petition for review with the Court of Appeals within 30 days from the date of the Court of Appeals opinion.** Ordinarily, if you first filed for reconsideration, and you did not prevail, you could then file a petition for review within 30 days of the ruling denying reconsideration.

I say "ordinarily" because there is a wrinkle due to the fact I did not see the court's opinion until yesterday. Now, the deadline has passed. The court has issued the "mandate" meaning the opinion of the court of appeals is final.

I am trying to fix this mistake so that you may still seek review if you wish. I have filed a motion to recall the mandate, explaining my mistake and asking the court to recall the mandate so that you may file for reconsideration or a petition for review, if you so choose.

The opinion, the mandate and the motion to recall are enclosed. I am sorry about the mix up. Hopefully, the court will grant the motion to recall. I will let you know as soon as I hear anything.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Dana M. Nelson".

Dana M. Nelson
Attorney



Nielsen Koch & Grannis PLLC

The Denny Building
2200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 1250
Seattle, Washington 98121

Phone: (206) 623-2373
Fax: (206) 623-2488
www.nwattorney.net

Dana M. Nelson
nelsond@nwattorney.net

May 21, 2025

Ebrima Darboe, 404269
Cedar Creek Corr. Center
P.O. Box 37
Littlerock, WA 98556

COA No. 58869-2-II

Dear Mr. Darboe,

I have not heard anything from the court on the motion to recall the mandate.

Therefore, I think they are waiting to see if you file anything before they act. The court will act in a way to minimize its workload.

Accordingly, if you plan to file a petition for review, I would do so now. If you file it, I think there is a good chance the court will grant the motion to recall the mandate.

If you don't file a petition by the first week of June (because that will be 30 days from my motion to recall), the court will likely deny the motion to recall because it will see there is no need to do so.

If you do not plan to petition for review, you need not take any action. The court will deny the motion to recall and your case will become final in due course.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'Dana M. Nelson'.

Dana M. Nelson
Attorney

Ebrima Darboe, #404269
Cedar Creek Corr. Center
P.O. Box 37
Littlerock, WA 98556

TACOMA WA 983
OLYMPIA WA
29 MAY 2025 PM 3 L



To Court Clerk
Washington Supreme Court
Temple of Justice
P.O. Box 40929
Olympia, WA 98504-0929

THIS WAS MAILED BY AN INCARCERATED
INDIVIDUAL CONFINED AT A
WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS FACILITY. ITS CONTENTS
MAY BE UNCENSORED.

JH 5-28-25



THIS ENVELOPE IS RECYCLABLE AND MADE WITH 30% POST CONSUMER CONTENT 

© USPS 2019

April 1, 2025

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

DIVISION II

STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Respondent,

v.

EBRIMA DARBOE,

Appellant.

No. 58869-2-II

UNPUBLISHED OPINION

CHE, J. — Ebrima Darboe appeals his conviction for attempted second degree burglary.

After ending their romantic relationship, Darboe and Aalysha Walker remained in contact with each other. One day, Walker told Darboe to not come to her home. Darboe came anyway and began banging on the door, kicking it while holding a pocketknife in his hand. The State charged Darboe with attempted first degree burglary. The State’s proposed jury instructions included instructions for attempted first degree burglary and the lesser offense of attempted second degree burglary. The parties discussed and agreed on modifications to the State’s proposed to-convict instructions. Darboe submitted modified proposed to-convict instructions for both attempted burglary crimes. The trial court gave Darboe’s instructions. The jury acquitted Darboe on attempted first degree burglary but found him guilty of attempted second degree burglary.

Darboe argues the trial court erred by instructing the jury on attempted second degree burglary because that crime excludes dwellings, and his counsel was ineffective for inviting that error.

We hold that the invited error doctrine precludes review of Darboe's claim that the trial court erred in giving his proposed attempted second degree burglary instruction and that Darboe did not receive ineffective assistance of counsel.

Accordingly, we affirm Darboe's conviction for attempted second degree burglary.

FACTS

BACKGROUND

Darboe and Walker were in a romantic relationship. In April 2022, the two had broken up but remained in contact with each other. Walker lived at her parents' house but planned to move. During a phone call, Darboe became upset after Walker would not tell him where she would move.

Darboe demanded Walker return the gifts he had given her, including a purse and flowers. Darboe spoke in a "really aggressive" tone and told Walker he was going to drive to her to retrieve his belongings. 7 Rep. of Proc. (May 9, 2023) (RP) at 484. Walker told Darboe not to come. She put the items on the porch because she "didn't want him to have any reason to try to come in the house." 7 RP at 486.

After the phone call, Darboe came to the house, banged on the door with his fist, told Walker to let him in, and said that he wanted his belongings back. Walker could see Darboe through a window next to the door. Walker told Darboe she was going to call the police. He walked away, returned, banged on the door with his fist, kicked the door "[l]ike he was trying to

break the door down,” and then “flashed a knife at” Walker. 7 RP at 485-86. Darboe then “bang[ed] on the door with [the] knife in his hand.” 7 RP at 486. The knife “looked like a big pocketknife,” and at one point, Darboe pointed it downward and “kind of thrust[ed] it” once. 7 RP at 487-88. Darboe ran away when he heard Walker on the phone with the police.

Deputy Tanner Fijolek responded and saw a footprint on the door. Around that time, Deputy Nathan Anderson stopped Darboe’s vehicle in Walker’s neighborhood. He observed a bouquet of flowers and a purse in the vehicle. Walker confirmed the purse and flowers were items Darboe had given her. Deputy Fijolek found no knife on Darboe’s person or in the vehicle.

The State charged Darboe with attempted first degree burglary as a crime of domestic violence, while armed with a deadly weapon.

JURY INSTRUCTIONS AND SENTENCING

The State’s first amended proposed jury instructions included instructions for attempted first degree burglary and the lesser offense of attempted second degree burglary.¹ After the parties had “significant discussion” about the State’s proposed to-convict instructions, Darboe presented modified proposed to-convict instructions for both attempted burglary crimes. 7 RP at 635.

¹ When the parties initially discussed jury instructions, the State indicated that it intended to amend the charges to include attempted residential burglary—domestic violence and attempted first degree criminal trespass. Defense counsel responded that she would need to research issues related to the potential amendments. But it appears that the State never moved to amend the charges.

The trial court gave Darboe's modified proposed attempted second degree burglary to-convict instruction as Instruction 20.² Instruction 20 laid out the following elements of the crime:

- (1) That on or about April 28, 2022, the defendant did an act that was a substantial step toward the commission of burglary in the second degree
- (2) That the act was done with the intent to commit burglary in the second degree, and
- (3) That the act occurred in the State of Washington.

Clerk's Papers (CP) at 44.

The jury acquitted Darboe of attempted first degree burglary but found him guilty of attempted second degree burglary and found the crime involved domestic violence by special verdict. The trial court eventually sentenced Darboe to 38.25 months, the low end of the standard range.

ANALYSIS

I. INSTRUCTIONAL ERROR

Darboe argues the trial court erred when it instructed the jury on the inferior degree offense of attempted second degree burglary because there was no evidence that the "building" at issue was anything other than a dwelling, which Darboe contends is an element of second degree burglary. Br. of Appellant at 8. We decline to review this claim of error.

The invited error doctrine generally prohibits a party from setting up an error at trial and then complaining of said error on appeal. *State v. Momah*, 167 Wn.2d 140, 153, 217 P.3d 321

² Instruction 19 states, "A person commits the crime of burglary in the second degree when he or she enters or remains unlawfully in a building with intent to commit a crime against a person or property therein." CP at 43. Instruction 10 states, "Building, in addition to its ordinary meaning, includes any dwelling." CP at 34.

(2009). Under the invited error doctrine, the party may not request a jury instruction and then complain upon appeal that the requested instruction was given. *State v. Gentry*, 125 Wn.2d 570, 645, 888 P.2d 1105 (1995). In determining whether the invited error doctrine applies, a reviewing court considers whether the defendant affirmatively assented to the error, materially contributed to it, or benefited from it. *In re Pers. Restraint of Coggin*, 182 Wn.2d 115, 119, 340 P.3d 810 (2014).

Darboe invited the error he now raises on appeal. Darboe does not dispute that he participated in “significant discussion” about the State’s originally proposed to-convict instructions and that Darboe submitted the modified proposed instruction he now claims was erroneously given. Darboe also benefited from the attempted second degree burglary instruction because the jury convicted him of the lesser offense. Therefore, the invited error doctrine precludes our review of this issue.

II. INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL

Darboe also argues that his counsel was ineffective for agreeing to instruct the jury on a lesser offense that was not supported by the facts of the case and that Darboe was prejudiced by this error. We disagree.

A criminal defendant has a right to have effective assistance of counsel. U.S. CONST. amend. VI; WASH. CONST. art. I, §22.

To succeed on a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel, a defendant must show both deficient performance and resulting prejudice. *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668, 687, 104 S. Ct. 2052, 80 L. Ed. 2d 674 (1984). Deficient performance falls below an objective standard of reasonableness. *State v. Bertrand*, 3 Wn.3d 116, 128, 546 P.3d 1020 (2024). We

strongly presume that counsel's performance was effective. *Bertrand*, 3 Wn.3d at 130. To rebut this presumption, a defendant must show that there was no possible legitimate trial strategy or tactic that would explain counsel's performance. *State v. Grier*, 171 Wn.2d 17, 33, 246 P.3d 1260 (2011).

To show prejudice, a defendant must demonstrate a reasonable probability that the trial outcome would have been different absent counsel's deficient performance. *Bertrand*, 3 Wn.3d at 129. Merely showing that errors had some conceivable effect on the outcome of the proceeding is inadequate. *Strickland*, 466 U.S. at 693. If a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel does not support a finding of either deficiency or prejudice, it fails, and we do not need to address both factors of the inquiry. *Strickland*, 466 U.S. at 697.

"[W]hether to request a jury instruction on lesser included offenses is a tactical decision." *State v. Witherspoon*, 180 Wn.2d 875, 886, 329 P.3d 888 (2014).

Because Darboe's attorney made a legitimate tactical decision when he requested a lesser offense instruction, Darboe fails to show deficient performance and thus fails to meet his burden of showing ineffective assistance of counsel under *Strickland*.


CONCLUSION

We hold that the invited error doctrine precludes review of Darboe's claim that the trial court erred in giving his proposed attempted second degree burglary instruction and that Darboe did not receive ineffective assistance of counsel.

Accordingly, we affirm Darboe's conviction for attempted second degree burglary.


No. 58869-2-II

A majority of the panel having determined that this opinion will not be printed in the Washington Appellate Reports, but will be filed for public record in accordance with RCW 2.06.040, it is so ordered.




Che, J.

We concur:



Maxa, J.



Cruiser, C.J.