

FILED
SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
6/4/2025 9:15 AM
BY SARAH R. PENDLETON
CLERK

Case #: 1042604

NO. _____
(Court of Appeals No. 86847-1-I)

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF WASHINGTON

STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Respondent,

v.

YOON BANG,

Appellant.

PETITION FOR REVIEW

TODD MAYBROWN, WSBA #18557
Allen, Hansen, Maybrown & Offenbecher, P.S.
600 University Street Suite 3020
Seattle, WA 98101
Phone: (206) 447-9681
Fax: (206) 447-0839
Email: todd@ahmlawyers.com

ATTORNEY FOR PETITIONER

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Authorities.....	ii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. IDENTITY OF PETITIONER.....	2
III. CITATION TO COURT OF APPEALS DECISION	3
IV. ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW	3
V. STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	4
VI. ARGUMENT	11
A. Standard for Acceptance of Review	11
B. The Court of Appeals’ Decision Conflicts with Decisions from other Courts.....	12
1. This Court Should Accept Review to Confirm That RCW 9A.16.050 Identifies Two Separate and Distinct Versions of Self-Defense	12
2. This Court Should Accept Review to Clarify How and When a Prosecution Makes an Election in a Multiple Acts Case	19
VII. CONCLUSION	27
Proof of Service	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

State Cases

<i>Election Contest Filed by Coday v. Election Contest Filed by Coday,</i> 156 Wn.2d 485 (2006)	13
<i>State v. Allery,</i> 101 Wn.2d 591 (1984)	19
<i>State v. Bobenhouse,</i> 166 Wn.2d 881 (2009)	21
<i>State v. Brenner,</i> 53 Wn. App. 367 (1989)	18
<i>State v. Brightman,</i> 155 Wn.2d 506 (2005)	16, 17
<i>State v. Brown,</i> 21 Wn.App.2d 541, <i>review denied</i> , 199 Wn.2d 1029 (2022).....	18
<i>State v. Carson,</i> 184 Wn.2d 207 (2015)	26
<i>State v. Coleman,</i> 159 Wn.2d 509 (2007)	20, 21
<i>State v. Corbett,</i> 158 Wn. App. 576 (2010)	24, 25
<i>State v. Erickson,</i> No. 83758-3-I, 2024 Wash. App. LEXIS 566 (Wash. Ct. App. Mar. 25, 2024)	24
<i>State v. Kitchen,</i> 110 Wn.2d 403 (1988)	21

<i>State v. Lefaber</i> , 128 Wn.2d 896 (1996)	19
<i>State v. Mills</i> , 154 Wn.2d 1 (2005)	1
<i>State v. O'Hara</i> , 167 Wn.2d 91 (2009)	1
<i>State v. Painter</i> , 27 Wn. App. 708 (1980)	19
<i>State v. Petrich</i> , 101 Wn.2d 566 (1984)	20
<i>State v. Weaver</i> , 198 Wn.2d 459 (2021)	17
<i>State v. Wentz</i> , 149 Wn.2d 342 (2003)	18
<i>State v. Williams</i> , 136 Wn. App. 486 (2007)	25-26

State Statutes

RCW 9A.15.050	1, 2
RCW 9A.16.050	<i>passim</i>

Other

Wash. State Const. art. I, § 22	20
---------------------------------------	----

I. INTRODUCTION

To satisfy the constitutional demands of a fair trial, the jury instructions, when read as a whole, must correctly tell the jury of the applicable law, not be misleading, and permit the defendant to present his theory of the case.” *State v. O’Hara*, 167 Wn.2d 91, 105 (2009) (*citing State v. Mills*, 154 Wn.2d 1, 7 (2005)). Comprehensive instructions are particularly critical in cases involving claims of self-defense.

Petitioner Yoon Bang’s attempt to advance a claim of self-defense at trial was gravely impaired by the trial judge’s instructions (and lack of instructions) to the jury. First, notwithstanding exceptions by both the prosecution and defense, the judge refused to provide any instructions regarding the defense under RCW 9A.15.050(2). Second, during deliberations, the jury twice asked for clarification whether the charges related to a particular shooting incident. But, even after identifying the apparent unanimity concern, the judge failed to provide a *Petrich* instruction.

Yet the Court of Appeals found no error in the judge's instructions and affirmed Bang's conviction. In so ruling, the Court determined that any instruction under RCW 9A.15.050(2) would have confused the jury. The Court agreed this was a multiple acts case but concluded there was no need for a *Petrich* instruction. The Court further concluded Bang's right to a unanimous verdict was not impaired when the judge advised the jury to consider the evidence "as a whole" when evaluating the murder charges. Finally, after highlighting a short section from closing argument, the Court concluded the prosecutor made an election even though the jury questions unmistakably pointed to the very opposite conclusion.

II. IDENTITY OF PETITIONER

Yoon Bang, the Appellant below and Petitioner herein, asks this Court to grant the review.

III. CITATION TO COURT OF APPEALS DECISION

The Court of Appeals affirmed Bang's convictions in an unpublished decision. *See State v. Bang*, No. 86847-1-I (May 5, 2025). A copy of the decision is attached as *Appendix A*.

IV. ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

1. Whether this Court should accept review to confirm that RCW 9A.16.050 identifies two separate and distinct versions of self-defense?

2. Whether this Court should accept review to determine whether a defendant's right to a unanimous verdict is violated where the trial court instructs the jury to consider the evidence "as a whole" in a multiple acts case?

3. Whether this Court should accept review to determine whether a *Petrich* instruction is required in a multiple acts case where the jurors pose two separate questions regarding the act or acts to be considered in a multiple acts case?

4. Whether this Court should accept review to clarify what is necessary for the prosecution to make a clear election in a multiple acts case?

V. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

A detailed recitation of the facts is set out in the Opening Brief. *See BOA at 7-39*. A more concise summary is as follows.

Yoon Bang was arrested after he shot and killed Scott Howard at the Bang residence in Spanaway. Bang shot Mr. Howard two separate times, after Howard refused to leave the Bang home and then threatened Bang (and Bang's property) with a large hammer.

The Pierce County Prosecuting Attorney charged Bang with two counts of murder – premeditated murder in the first degree (Count I) and felony murder in the second degree (Count II) – along with a single count of assault in the first degree (Count III). Adding to this confusion, the prosecutor requested instructions on a lesser offense charge of intentional murder in the second degree as to Count I when the case proceeded to trial.

Upon reviewing the State's Amended Information, the assigned trial judge criticized the prosecutor's decision to charge multiple overlapping offenses. RP_7-9. In particular, the judge cautioned that the charging decision might "create kind of a mess and confusion for the jury." RP_11.¹

In opening argument, the prosecutor indicated Bang's conduct was premeditated and intentional from the outset and claimed the State's evidence would demonstrate "many turning points" that led to the unjustified killing of Howard. RP_375. Defense counsel, by contrast, told the jury that Howard was the sole aggressor, and that Bang was acting in defense of himself, his wife and his property when he fired both shots. RP_380-87.

The defense moved to dismiss Count 1 at the close of the State's case. RP_1164-65. In response, the prosecutor argued

¹ Prior to the close of trial, the State filed a "corrected" amended information. CP_213-14. The new information included a modification of Count III only. RP_1322. Mr. Bang was arraigned on that information after the close of evidence. RP_1323.

the evidence was sufficient to prove the murder charge and claimed the charge could be based upon the first shot or the second shot. RP_1167-68. The judge denied the defense motion and, along the way, explained that the evidence did not allow him to clearly state which shot was fired first. RP_1169-70.

Bang, who was 74 years old at the time of trial, testified at length regarding in support of the claim of self-defense. RP_1182-1224. Bang was injured, and became disabled, after serving in Vietnam. RP_1184-85. Bang and his wife (who is five years his senior) moved to Washington a few years after his discharge. RP_1185; 1189-90. Bang and his wife moved to their home in Spanaway two years prior to the incident. RP_1187.

Bang first met Howard at a Home Depot store, and he subsequently contacted Howard to ask if he was interested in remodeling a bathroom at Bang's home. RP_1193-94. Howard accepted the offer, and they reached an agreement regarding compensation and the scope of work. RP_1194-99. Howard subsequently enlisted a friend, Joseph Criss, to assist with the

work. The project did not go well. Over time, Bang became frustrated with Howard's behavior and the quality of his work.

An altercation commenced shortly after Bang directed Howard to stop work and leave his home. RP_1206. Howard refused and stated he would not leave until he was paid in full. RP_1207. Instead, Howard threatened to destroy portions of Bang's home if he wasn't paid immediately. RP_1207-09. Howard then pushed Bang out of the way and ran towards his truck. RP_1208. Bang became concerned Howard would return with a weapon and was also worried about the safety of his wife. RP_1209-10. Bang then went to the garage to locate his pistol. RP_1211-12.

Howard reentered the Bang home – this time holding a large hammer – and said: "I'm not leaving until I get paid and this is my last day I'm here." RP_1214. After Bang again refused to pay, Howard rushed out of the bathroom toward the hallway. RP_1214. In response, Bang fired one shot as Howard

turned towards him with the hammer. RP_1215-16. Howard then fell to the ground.

Bang, who began to shake uncontrollably, then asked Criss to call 911. RP_1218. And Bang searched for his phone as he waited for police to arrive. RP_1219-21. As Bang was walking through the bedroom, Howard grabbed Bang's ankle and Bang nearly fell over. RP_1221-23. Howard, who was still holding the hammer in his right hand, appeared to be moving from his original position. Bang then fired a second shot at Howard because he was afraid of what Howard might do next. RP_1224.

The defense proposed instructions based upon both prongs of RCW 9A.16.050, and defense counsel argued for the inclusion of both WPIC 16.02 and WPIC 16.03 (and related instructions). RP_1313-15. In support of the defense under RCW 9A.16.050(2), counsel argued that Howard had committed several felony offenses – including assault in the second degree and residential burglary – while inside the Bang residence. After

consulting with the office's appellate unit, the prosecutor agreed the defense had presented sufficient evidence to support the inclusion of **both** WPIC 16.02 and 16.03. RP_1312.

The trial judge disagreed with both parties and refused to include any instruction based upon WPIC 16.03. RP_1315-17.² The prosecutor took exception to the judge's ruling – including the failure to include an instruction with the definition of residential burglary. RP_1317-18. Likewise, the defense took exception to the judge's failure to include WPIC 16.03 and for the failure to include an instruction with the definition of the felony of residential burglary. RP_1319.

During deliberations, the jury expressed confusion regarding the overlapping charges and instructions. Initially, the jury posed the following question:

CAN WE GET CLARIFICATION IF EACH
COUNT IS ASSOCIATED WITH A SPECIFIC
SHOT.

² The final instructions are found at CP_225-51.

CP_224. After meeting with the parties, the trial judge identified a constitutional concern: “What’s troubling me here is that it’s like a – it’s a little *Petrich* thing, jury unanimity.” RP_1416. But the prosecutor told the judge not to “do anything” and indicated that any response would amount to a comment on the evidence. RP_1418. During this discussion, defense counsel acknowledged the prosecutor had made a specific election as to Count III. RP_1423. But none of the participants – not the judge, not the prosecutor, not defense counsel – suggested the prosecutor had made an election as to Counts 1 or II. Based upon this discussion, the judge provided clarification regarding Count III but made no mention of Counts I and II.

Soon thereafter, the jury submitted an additional question in relation to this same topic:

PLEASE CLARIFY IF COUNT 1 IS SPECIFIC
TO A SPECIFIC SHOT OR THE INCIDENT IN
ITS TOTALITY. PLEASE DO THE SAME FOR
COUNT 2.

CP_222.

Once again, the judge expressed concerns about the way the case had been charged. But, rather than answer the jury's question directly, the judge provided the following supplemental instruction: "You should consider the evidence as a whole as to all counts." CP_222. Based on the two responses, the jury was left with the impression that the assault charge (Count III) was to be treated differently than the murder charges (Counts I and II).

The following day, the jury returned verdicts of not guilty as to the charged offenses in Count I, Count II, and Count III. RP_1438; CP_215-19. But the jury returned a verdict of guilty as to the lesser offense of intentional murder in the second degree. CP_216.

VI. ARGUMENT

A. Standard for Acceptance of Review

RAP 13.4(b) sets forth the standard to support a petition for review: "(1) If the decision of the Court of Appeals is in conflict with a decision of the Supreme Court; or (2) If the decision of the Court of Appeals is in conflict with another

decision of the Court of Appeals; or (3) If a significant question of law under the Constitution of the State of Washington or of the United States is involved; or (4) If the petition involves an issue of substantial public interest that should be determined by the Supreme Court.” RAP 13.4(b).

All factors are present in this case.

B. The Court of Appeals’ Decision Conflicts with Decisions from other Courts.

1. This Court Should Accept Review to Confirm That RCW 9A.16.050 Identifies Two Separate and Distinct Versions of Self-Defense

Pursuant to RCW 9A.16.050, homicide is justifiable when committed either:

- (1) In the lawful defense of the slayer, or his or her husband, wife, parent, child, brother, or sister, or of any other person in his or her presence or company, when there is reasonable ground to apprehend a design on the part of the person slain to commit a felony or to do some great personal injury to the slayer or to any such person, and there is imminent danger of such design being accomplished; or

- (2) In the actual resistance of an attempt to commit a felony upon the slayer, in his or her presence, or upon or in a dwelling, or other place of abode, in which he or she is.

Id.

Whenever the defendant identifies some credible evidence the homicide occurred in circumstances that meet the requirements of RCW 9A.16.050, that defendant is entitled to an instruction on justifiable homicide. *See, e.g., State v. Brightman*, 156 Wn.2d 506, 520 (2005). The requirements of section (1) are met “where the defendant reasonably fears the person slain is about to commit a felony upon the slayer or inflict death or great personal injury, and there is imminent danger that the felony or injury will be accomplished.” *Id.* at 520-21. WPIC 16.02 is patterned after RCW 9A.16.050(1). To meet the requirements of section (2), “the defendant [must] act[] in actual resistance against an attempt to commit a felony on the slayer.” *Id.* at 521. WPIC 16.03 is patterned after RCW 9A.16.050(2). Under both

sections, the slayer's use of deadly force must be reasonably necessary under the circumstances. *See id.* at 523.

The defenses under section (1) and (2) of RCW 9A.16.050 are distinctive – and each prong is captured in a separate pattern instruction. WPIC 16.02 captures the statutory defense as set forth in section (1)); WPIC 16.03 captures the statutory defense as set forth in section (2).

Bang attempted to advance a claim of self-defense under both prongs of RCW 9A.16.050, and defense counsel asked the judge instruction pursuant to both WPIC 16.02 and 16.03. CP_84-85. In support of the request for an instruction under WPIC 16.03, counsel contended the deceased was engaged several felonies – including assault and residential burglary – such that Bang was justified to use lethal force when he fired the first shot and the second shot. CP_89-94

The State agreed the defense was entitled to these instructions and the prosecutors so advised the judge:

What I indicated via e-mail to the Court, to Ms. Winnie, and Defense yesterday was that after the discussing the matter with my appellate unit, we believe that while the victim was not actually engaged in either assault in the second degree or residential burglary, the State believes that the Defense made a *prima facie* showing that would support inclusions of both of those instructions. Upon further discussion with my appellate unit, we indicated to both – we indicated to Defense this morning that the State had no objection to including either 16.02 with the intent to commit a felony and the intent to commit – to inflict great personal injury in 16.02, or include 16.02 with just the language of intent to inflict great personal injury. And then 16.03 for the resistance to a felony.

RP_1310-11.³

Yet the trial judge refused to instruct under section (2).

The judge also refused to provide any instruction regarding the definition of any of the alleged felonies (such as residential burglary). RP_1315-16. Rather than leave this question with the jury and allow Bang to argue his theory of the case, the judge's instructions were tainted by his own personal conclusions:

³ Based upon this concession, the State argued that there was no need for additional instructions to say that assault is a felony. RP_1312-13.

“[Howard is] not committing a burglary or a malicious mischief in there.” RP_1316.

Both parties took exception to the judge’s refusal to give the requested instructions. RP_1318 (prosecutor’s exception); RP_1318-19 (defense’s exception). Yet the judge remained steadfast and disregarded the parties’ arguments. At the least, the judge should have provided instructions under WPIC 16.03, WPIC 60.02.01, WPIC 60.02.02, and WPIC 2.09.⁴ But the jury heard none of these instructions.

In *Brightman*, this Court underscored the distinction between sections (1) and (2) of Washington’s self-defense statute. Notably, the Court explained that section (2) “addresses situation in which a felony or attempted felony is already in progress.” 155 Wn.2d at 521. However, when presented with questions regarding the two prongs of the self-defense statute –

⁴ In addition, the Court would have been justified in instructing the jury on the crimes of malicious mischief, robbery, and felony harassment.

and the potential application of WPIC 16.02 and 16.03 – lower courts have reached conflicting results.

In *State v. Ackerman*, 11 Wn.App.2d 304 (2019), Division I explained: “Given the disjunctive structure of the statute, the requirements of great personal injury and imminent danger in subsection (1) do not relate to subsection (2).” *Id.* at 314. As such, the court found error where the trial court had failed to instruct under the second prong. *See id.*⁵

By contrast, Division II rejected the approach in *Ackerman*. *See State v. Bogdanov*, 27 Wn.App.2d 603, *rev. denied*, 2 Wn.3d 1008 (2023). Instead, the court concluded the defendant was not entitled to an instruction under the second prong of the statute and opined that an instruction under WPIC 16.02 allowed the defense to present the same arguments

⁵ This Court cited the *Ackerman* decision with approval in *State v. Weaver*, 198 Wn.2d 459, 468 (2021).

available under WPIC 16.03.⁶ *See also State v. Brown*, 21 Wn.App.2d 541, *review denied*, 199 Wn.2d 1029 (2022).

The Court of Appeals adopted Division II’s approach in this case. In the Court’s view, the trial judge did not err in failing to instruct under RCW 9A.16.050(2) because “an instruction based on WPIC 16.03 and burglary would unnecessarily confuse the jury when the underlying felony was assault with the hammer and Bang’s theory of defense was fear of and resistance to the assault.” *Appendix A at 14*.

The Court’s logic is skewed. Here, Bang’s best and strongest defense to the overlapping murder charges was his contention that Howard intended to commit a felony offense while inside the Bang residence. And the uncontradicted evidence strongly supported Bang’s claim that Howard was committing the felony offense of residential burglary. Thus, it is

⁶ The *Bogdanov* court, in turn, relied upon *State v. Brenner*, 53 Wn.App. 367 (1989), which was reversed by this Court, albeit on other grounds, in *State v. Wentz*, 149 Wn.2d 342 (2003).

not surprising that both the prosecution and defense urged the trial judge to provide necessary instructions consistent with WPIC 16.03.

This Court should grant review and resolve the conflict created by cases like *Ackerman* and *Bagdonov*.

2. **This Court Should Accept Review to Clarify How and When a Prosecution Makes an Election in a Multiple Acts Case**

“The standard for clarity in a jury instruction is higher than for a statute; while we have been able to resolve ambiguous wording of [statutes] via statutory construction, a jury lacks such interpretive tools and thus requires a manifestly clear instruction.” *State v. LeFaber*, 128 Wn.2d 896, 902 (1996). As a result, the instructions, when read as a whole, must make the relevant legal standard “manifestly apparent to the average juror.” *Id.* at 900 (internal quotation marks omitted) (*quoting Allery*, 101 Wn.2d at 595 (*quoting State v. Painter*, 27 Wn.App. 708, 713 (1980), *review denied*, 95 Wn.2d 1008 (1981))).

Washington criminal defendants have a constitutional right to a unanimous jury verdict. *See* WASH. CONST. ARTICLE I, SECTION 22. To protect a criminal defendant's right to be convicted only if found guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, the jury must be unanimous as to the act constituting the crime charged. *See generally State v. Petrich*, 101 Wn.2d 566, 569 (1984). "When the prosecution presents evidence of multiple acts of like misconduct, any one of which could form the basis of a count charged, either the State must elect which of such acts is relied upon for a conviction or the court must instruct the jury to agree on a specific criminal act." *State v. Coleman*, 159 Wn.2d 509, 511 (2007). An election or instruction that all twelve jurors must agree that the same underlying act has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt "assures a unanimous verdict on one criminal act." *Id.* at 512. Without either an election or a unanimity

instruction in a multiple acts case, omission of the unanimity instruction is presumed to be prejudicial. *See id.*⁷

The determination whether a unanimity instruction was required turns on whether the prosecution constituted a “*multiple acts case*.” *State v. Bobenhouse*, 166 Wn.2d 881, 892 (2009) (emphasis in original). A multiple acts prosecution occurs when “several acts are alleged and any one of them could constitute the crime charged.” *Kitchen*, 110 Wn.2d at 411. For example, the prosecution for a single count of rape based on evidence of multiple, separate acts, “each of which is capable of satisfying the material facts required to prove” the charged crime, constitutes a multiple acts case. *See Bobenhouse*, 166 Wn.2d at 894.

In pressing for a murder conviction, the prosecutor claimed Bang engaged in several “distinct events” that would

⁷ In *State v. Kitchen*, 110 Wn.2d 403 (1988), the Court clarified this holding and emphasized that a reviewing court must use the standard for constitutional error. *See id.* at 405-06.

support a conviction. RP_1335. During deliberations, it became clear the jury was confused by the State's overlapping charges and the court's instructions. Perhaps most notably, the jury twice asked for clarification whether each count was based on a "specific shot." CP_224. Ultimately, the judge provided a supplemental instruction regarding the assault charge (Count III) but refused to provide any instruction regarding the murder charges (Count I and II).

Here, the State chose to charge – and present – a multiple acts case. But the jury was confused by the prosecutor's tactics which led them to pose a series of questions regarding the underlying basis (or bases) for the murder charges. The judge immediately identified a constitutional concern upon review of the first jury question and described the problem as a "*Petrich* thing, jury unanimity." RP_1416. But, even after a second request for clarification, the judge failed to provide a unanimity instruction and instead directed the jury to consider the evidence "as a whole as to all counts." CP_222.

To this day, it remains unclear whether the jury was unanimous as to the act that was the basis for the murder conviction. Did some jurors rely exclusively upon the first shot? Did some jurors rely exclusively upon the second shot? Did some of the jurors rely upon both shots? There is no way to know.

Pointing to a portion of the prosecutor's closing argument, the Court of Appeals determined the prosecutor made an election when she "associated the second shot" with the homicide charges. *See Appendix A at 6.* But this conclusion cannot be squared with the judge's instructions – including the supplemental instruction for the jury to consider the evidence "as a whole" when evaluating the murder charges. Moreover, on this record, the jury would not have reasonably concluded the prosecutor intended to make such an election.⁸

⁸ It is also noteworthy that the Court of Appeals made no mention of the trial judge's determination that the evidence at trial did not clearly demonstrate which shot was first or second (RP_1169-70) when it announced this conclusion.

First, the jury was never provided an instruction under WPIC 4.26, which would usually be expected in a case where there is a clear election. While not mandated in all circumstances, this instruction was recently endorsed in *State v. Erickson*, 2024 Wash. App. LEXIS 566 (2024) (unpublished). *See also State v. Corbett*, 158 Wn.App. 576, 592 (2010) (emphasizing that jury instructions clearly conveyed “there were four counts related to four specific incidents of abuse that they were to consider”).

Notably, the relevant comments make plain that such an instruction is often necessary: “In order to avoid confusing jurors who have heard evidence of multiple acts, it may be advisable to instruct jurors that they must reach a unanimous verdict with respect to the specific occurrence relied upon.” WPIC 4.26, Comment. Here, the jurors were never so informed.

Second, the jury’s confusion was unmistakable. In fact, as the jurors deliberated over Bang’s fate, they twice asked the judge for clarification regarding the underpinnings of the murder charges. And when the jury specifically asked whether each

count was based on a “specific shot,” the judge did not identify a clear election as the murder charges. Rather, the judge instructed the jurors to “consider the evidence as a whole . . .” RP 1429-1431.⁹

Division I recently summarized the constitutional unanimity requirements that have developed since *Petrich* in *State v. Aguilar*, 27 Wn.App.2d 905, 924-25 (2023) (internal citations omitted). “To avoid constitutional error, any election must ‘clearly identify’ the act on which the charge in question is based.” *Id.* (citations omitted). Accord *State v. Williams*, 136 Wn.App. 486 (2007) (holding there was no election where the State emphasized one act over another, but did not expressly

⁹ As such, the jury was left with the impression the assault charge was to be treated differently than the murder charges. Ultimately, the jury convicted Bang of the lesser included charge of intentional murder in the second degree. It remains unclear which of the “distinct events” would have led this conviction.

elect to rely only on one of the acts).¹⁰ The prosecutor did not make a clear election in this case.

Even if the prosecutor was attempting to make such an election, the judge's supplemental instruction would have vitiated that election. In fact, the trial judge's instruction made plain that the prosecutor clearly chose not to elect a specific act.

This Court should accept review and confirm that a defendant's right to a unanimous verdict is violated where the trial court instructs the jury to consider the evidence "as a whole" in a multiple acts case. Moreover, this Court should clarify what is necessary for the prosecution to make a clear election in a multiple acts case.

¹⁰ Notably, the jury's verdict in this case presents some of the concerns this Court identified in *State v. Carson*, 184 Wn.2d 207, 227 n.18 (2015), because, unlike *Carson*, the jury did not return guilty verdicts on all counts.

VII. CONCLUSION

For all of these reasons, and in the interests of justice, this Court should accept review and reverse the decision of the Court of Appeals.

Appellant certifies this document contains 4,239 words, excluding those portions exempt under RAP 18.17.

Respectfully submitted this 4th day of June, 2025.

/s/ Todd Maybrown

TODD MAYBROWN, WSBA #18557

OID #91110

Attorney for Appellant

Allen, Hansen, Maybrown & Offenbecher, P.S.

600 University Street Suite 3020

Seattle, WA 98101

Phone: (206) 447-9681

Fax: (206) 447-0839

Email: todd@ahmlawyers.com

PROOF OF SERVICE

Sarah Conger swears the following is true under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington:

On the 4th day of June, 2025, I filed the above Appellant's Petition for Review via the Appellate Court E-File Portal through which Respondent's counsel will be served.

I have also made arrangements for service of Petition for Review on Appellant.

s/Sarah Conger

Sarah Conger, Legal Assistant

OID #91110

ALLEN, HANSEN, MAYBROWN & OFFENBECHER, P.S.

600 University Street, Suite 3020

Seattle, WA 98101

206-447-9681

Fax: 206-447-0839

alex@ahmlawyers.com

APPENDIX A

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Respondent,

v.

YOON MYONG BANG,

Appellant.

No. 86847-1-I

DIVISION ONE

UNPUBLISHED OPINION

MANN, J. — Yoon Myong Bang appeals his conviction for murder in the second degree. Bang argues the trial court (1) violated his constitutional right to a unanimous verdict, (2) erred by failing to instruct the jury on the defense theory of self-defense, (3) unconstitutionally made improper comments throughout the proceeding, and (4) abused its discretion by excluding evidence of the victim’s prior misconduct and use of illegal substances. We affirm.

I

Bang met Scott Howard at a Home Depot. Howard told Bang he was a general contractor and gave Bang his contact information. Bang later called Howard and asked if he was interested in remodeling a bathroom at the Bang residence in Spanaway.

Howard agreed to do the project and Bang agreed to pay Howard about \$2,500 for his labor.

Howard asked a colleague, Joseph Criss, to assist on the project to set the tile. Howard struggled to complete the plumbing necessary to finish the project and so Criss ended up doing more of the work. Bang expressed concern about the plumbing and the quality of Howard's work to both Criss and Howard. As the project continued, Bang became increasingly frustrated with Howard.

On August 28, 2021, the project was nearing completion and Howard was eager to get paid. Howard and Criss reinstalled the bathroom toilet and it began leaking. This upset Bang who then told Howard to leave and that he was not going to pay him. Bang and Howard argued, both growing angrier. Howard threatened to break the tile with a hammer if Bang did not pay him. Howard hit the bathroom counter with the hammer to make some noise and said "what are you going to do about it." Howard exited the bathroom, going past Bang into the bedroom.

Criss, hearing a gunshot, came out of the bathroom and into the bedroom where Bang told him he shot Howard and to call 911. Criss went outside to call 911, leaving Bang inside. Bang was looking for his phone and stepping over Howard when he felt Howard grab his ankle, nearly causing him to fall. Bang, seeing Howard still holding the hammer, shot Howard in the head again, killing him. While outside on the phone with 911, Criss heard the second shot. When police officers arrived, Bang stated to an officer, "I shot him."

Bang was initially charged with murder in the first degree while armed with a firearm (count 1) and murder in the second degree while armed with a firearm (count 2).

The information was later amended to include a third count of assault in the first degree while armed with a firearm (count 3). Bang asserted a defense of justifiable or excusable homicide.

The State moved to exclude evidence of Howard's character or reputation for violence and any specific instances of violent conduct by Howard. The trial court granted the motion, subject to reconsideration outside the jury's presence. The State also moved to exclude evidence of Howard's history of drug use and the positive toxicology results for methamphetamine. Bang objected to the exclusion of the toxicology report because it would substantiate his observations of Howard's behavior at the time of the shooting. The trial court granted the State's motion, subject to additional information from a witness that methamphetamine contributed to Howard's behavior.

At trial, Criss testified about the argument leading up to the shooting and described Bang and Howard as arguing in the bathroom with Bang telling Howard to leave and Howard refusing. Criss testified that Bang raised a gun, told Criss to get out of the way, then Howard bolted out of the bathroom and Bang followed. Bang testified that Howard did not know of the gun when Howard pushed past him out of the bathroom with the hammer in his hand. Bang said he followed Howard because he was concerned of what Howard would do and where he was going. Bang testified that as Howard went to leave the bedroom, he turned toward Bang and raised the hammer leading Bang to shoot Howard. Bang testified that right before he shot his gun, Howard saw the gun and was surprised.

The jury found Bang not guilty of counts 2 (murder in the second degree) and 3 (assault in the first degree). The jury convicted Bang of murder in the second degree as a lesser included crime of count 1 (murder in the first degree).

II

Bang argues the trial court violated his constitutional right to a unanimous verdict because it failed to give a unanimity instruction to the jury on counts 1 (murder in the first degree) and 2 (murder in the second degree). Bang asserts the jury was not clearly informed that the State made an election as to which act to rely on for the murder charges. We disagree.

A

Criminal defendants have a right to a unanimous jury verdict. WASH. CONST. art. 1, § 21; State v. Ortega-Martinez, 124 Wn.2d 702, 707, 881 P.2d 231 (1994). When the State presents evidence of multiple acts that could constitute the crime charged, it generally must either (1) tell the jury which act to rely on in its deliberations, or (2) the court must instruct the jury that it must unanimously agree on which specific act supports the conviction. State v. Kitchen, 110 Wn.2d 403, 409-11, 756 P.2d 105 (1988). The former is known as an “election” and the latter is known as a “Petrich instruction” after State v. Petrich, 101 Wn.2d 566, 572, 683 P.2d 173 (1984), abrogated on other grounds by Kitchen, 110 Wn.2d at 403. Failure by the State to elect and by the trial court to give a Petrich instruction can be a constitutional error because of “the possibility that some jurors may have relied on one act or incident and some another, resulting in a lack of unanimity on all of the elements necessary for a valid conviction.” Kitchen, 110 Wn.2d at 411. “Whether or not a unanimity instruction was required in a

particular case is a question of law reviewed de novo.” State v. Lee, 12 Wn. App. 2d 378, 460 P.3d 701 (2020).

An election by the State need not be incorporated in the information or ratified by the court. State v. Carson, 184 Wn.2d 207, 227, 357 P.3d 1064 (2015). The State may elect by clearly identifying and telling the jury the particular act on which particular charges is based. Carson, 184 Wn.2d at 227. For example, in State v. Thompson, 169 Wn. App. 436, 290 P.3d 996 (2012), the State properly elected when it clearly identified the act on which the charge was based and did not mention the other act. In that case, the defendant argued the sexual motivation allegations related to three charges required a unanimity instruction because there was evidence of two acts: touching of a victim’s arm and instructing a victim to disrobe. This court disagreed because the State specifically elected the act of instructing the victim to disrobe by telling the jury “[b]ut if you find after your good deliberations that one of the purposes for what he did towards [disrobing victim] was for his sexual gratification, [he] is guilty.” Thompson, 169 Wn. App. at 475.

In contrast, in State v. Aguilar, 27 Wn. App. 2d 905, 924-25, 534 P.3d 360 (2023), the State did not make a clear election for acts underlying one count of rape because throughout trial the State repeatedly opined that more than one rape occurred. Similarly, in State v. Williams, 136 Wn. App. 486, 497, 150 P.3d 111 (2007), there was no election where the State emphasized one act over another, but did not expressly elect to rely only on one of the acts.

B

During closing argument, the State associated the first shot with count 3 (assault in the first degree) and the second shot with count 1 (murder in the first degree):

I'm going to go through these counts in chronological order, so I'm going to start with Count 3. Then I'm going to address Counts 1 and 2.

....

[Bang] pointed that gun at [Howard], at his face, and he shot him in the eye. And that destroyed Scott Howard's eye. And Dr. Williams testified that the destruction of his eye rendered him blind in that eye; [i]n other words, a permanent loss of a function of a body part. So the State has proved each element of the crime of assault in the first degree.

So moving on to the second shot, the shot that killed Scott Howard. Instruction No. 10 addresses murder in the first degree. . . . Dr. Williams testified that second shot, the shot that lacerated his spinal cord that entered through his left cheek, Scott Howard's left cheek, was rapidly fatal. He died because of that bullet. The defendant admitted firing that shot. So the State has proved beyond a reasonable doubt that Scott Howard died as a result of the defendant's acts.

Did he act with intent to cause the death of Scott Howard? Again, this is the second shot.

The State went on to discuss count 2 (murder in the second degree), an element of which includes first or second degree assault and again referred to the second shot:

Count 2 is Instruction No. 22 . . . So the defendant committed—did the State prove that the defendant committed either assault in the first degree or assault in the second degree? We've already talked about assault in the first degree.

....

Finally, did the defendant cause the death of Scott Howard in the course of and in furtherance of the crime of assault in the first degree or assault in the second degree? Absolutely. The State has proved that beyond a reasonable doubt. He died as a result of the gunshot wound to the cheek that lacerated his tongue, lacerated his larynx, lacerated his spinal cord.

The State has proved beyond all reasonable doubt all four elements of murder in the second degree.

As in Thompson, the State made a clear election. In closing argument, the State clearly elected the second shot as the act supporting count 1 by expressly, and more than once, referring to the second fatal shot (also known as the shot to the cheek) and by never mentioning the first shot. The State also elected the second shot as the act supporting count 2 when it expressly referred to the shot to the cheek. And, in addition to its closing remarks, the State made express elections in its opening statement when it associated counts 1 and 2 with the second shot and count 3 with the first shot. Making a clear election satisfies the unanimity concern.

C

Bang also points to the trial court's mention of Petrich, while discussing jury questions during deliberations, and the court's response to the jury to consider the evidence "as a whole as to all counts" as supporting his unanimity claim.

During deliberations, the jury asked the trial court to "clarify if count 1 is specific to a specific shot or the incident in its totality. Please do the same for count 2." The trial court answered that the jury should "consider the evidence as a whole as to all counts." The jury also asked for "clarification if each count is associated with a specific shot." In discussion with counsel, the trial court noted that the question raised an issue like a "Petrich thing, jury unanimity" and continued:

[T]he State elected that the shot involving the cheek was the homicide shot. And Counts 1 and 2 are essentially three different ways because we have a lesser—three different ways of contemplating—complete a murder of some sort, premeditated murder, intentional murder without premeditation, and felony murder. And that's all associated with the shot to the cheek. None of that is associated with the shot above the forehead. And—and if—he's not acting with self-defense, then he's either committing an assault, which is the felony murder, or he's committing intentional murder. He's not committing an assault in and of itself.

Because if he committed an assault that resulted in the death, which is there's no doubt that that's what happened, then he's guilty of felony murder and he can't be guilty of the assault one.

. . . .
I'm clarifying what the charges are. Now, if the defense really doesn't want me to do that, I won't. But I think there's a danger here to the defense.

Defense counsel agreed. Accordingly, the trial court told the jury that the "State's charge in count 3 is associated with the gunshot to Scott Howard's eyebrow."

The trial court's response to the jury repeated the election of the first shot for the charge in count 3. The trial court did not err by clarifying charges or instructing the jury to consider all the evidence for counts 1 and 2.

Because the State clearly elected which act supported each count, Bang's argument fails. A unanimity instruction was not required and there was no violation of Bang's constitutional right to a unanimous verdict.

III

Bang argues the trial court violated his right to present a complete defense when it refused to instruct the jury on justifiable homicide in resistance of a felony under RCW 9A.16.050(2) and WPIC 16.03. We disagree.

A

A trial court's refusal to give a self-defense instruction based on a factual dispute is reviewed for an abuse of discretion. State v. Brightman, 155 Wn.2d 506, 519, 122 P.3d 150 (2005). A refusal to give the instruction based on a ruling of law is reviewed de novo. Brightman, 155 Wn.2d at 519. "Jury instructions are sufficient when they allow counsel to argue their theory of the case, are not misleading, and when read as a

whole properly inform the trier of fact of the applicable law.” State v. Killingsworth, 166 Wn. App. 283, 288, 269 P.3d 1064 (2012) (internal quotation marks omitted).

“A defendant is entitled to an instruction on justifiable homicide when he or she has raised some credible evidence, from whatever source, to establish that the killing occurred in circumstances that meet the requirements of RCW 9A.16.050.” Brightman, 155 Wn.2d at 520. But “a defendant is not entitled to repetitious instructions.” State v. Bogdanov, 27 Wn. App. 2d 603, 618, 532 P.3d 1035, review denied, 2 Wn.3d 1008 (2023).

RCW 9A.16.050 provides homicide is justifiable when committed either:

- (1) In the lawful defense of the slayer, or his or her husband, wife, parent, child, brother, or sister, or of any other person in his or her presence or company, when there is reasonable ground to apprehend a design on the part of the person slain to commit a felony or to do some great personal injury to the slayer or to any such person, and there is imminent danger of such design being accomplished; or
- (2) In the actual resistance of an attempt to commit a felony upon the slayer, in his or her presence, or upon or in a dwelling, or other place of abode, in which he or she is.

Under both subsections of RCW 9A.16.050, the use of deadly force must be reasonably necessary under the circumstances. Brightman, 155 Wn.2d at 523. RCW 9A.16.050(2) specifically “addresses situations in which a felony or attempted felony is already in progress.” Brightman, 155 Wn.2d at 521. As this court explained in State v. Ackerman, 11 Wn. App. 2d, 304, 314, 453 P.3d 749 (2019):

While subsection (1) concerns justifiable homicide in the defense of self and others, subsection (2) regards justifiable homicide in resistance to a felony. Although subsection (1) requires, in part, “some great personal injury to the slayer or to any such person” and “imminent danger of such design being accomplished,” subsection (2) does not contain such language. Given the disjunctive structure of the statute, the requirements

of great personal injury and imminent danger in subsection (1) do not relate to subsection (2).

B

The trial court instructed the jury on justifiable homicide using WPIC 16.02,¹ which is based on RCW 9A.16.050(1):

It is a defense to the crimes in Counts I, II, and III that the homicide or assault was justifiable as defined in this instruction.

Homicide is justifiable when committed in the lawful defense of the slayer or the slayer's wife or any person in the slayer's presence or company when:

- (1) The slayer reasonably believed that the person slain intended to commit a felony or inflict death or great personal injury;
- (2) The slayer reasonably believed that there was an imminent danger of such harm being accomplished; and
- (3) The slayer employed such force and means as a reasonably prudent person would use under the same or similar conditions as they reasonably appeared to the slayer, taking into consideration all the facts and circumstances as they appeared to him, at the time of the incident.

The State has the burden of proving beyond a reasonable doubt that the homicide was not justifiable. If you find that the State has not proved the absence beyond a reasonable doubt, it will be your duty to return a verdict of not guilty.

Bang proposed instructing the jury on both RCW 9A.16.050(1) and .050(2) using both WPIC 16.02 and WPIC 16.03. Bang's proposed WPIC 16.03 instruction provided:

It is a defense to a charge of murder that the homicide or assault was justifiable as defined in this instruction.

Homicide is justifiable when committed in the actual resistance of an attempt to commit a felony upon the slayer or in the presence of the slayer

¹ 11 WASHINGTON PRACTICE: WASHINGTON PATTERN JURY INSTRUCTIONS: CRIMINAL 16.02, at 183 (5th ed. 2024) (WPIC).

or upon or in a dwelling or other place of abode in which the slayer is present.

The slayer may employ such force and means as a reasonably prudent person would use under the same or similar conditions as they reasonably appeared to the slayer, taking into consideration all the facts and circumstances as they appeared to him at the time of the incident.

During argument, defense counsel asserted that the instruction was necessary:

It does not include the language in 16.02 that it must be imminent. It's a lesser offense meaning my client doesn't have to believe it's imminent. But if it's happening in his home and it's reasonably prudent based on what he's seeing, that's a defense. 16.02 . . . doesn't include the dwelling component or, and also adds that we believe it's imminent.

The trial court declined to include WPIC 16.03 based on the facts of the case:

[THE COURT]: [H]ere we have a situation where the decedent was invited into the place, was working there regularly, had been there for a couple of weeks, had been in and out of the house regularly, that the argument began in the home, if you will, and that of itself does create some special difference in terms of imminence. . . .

MR. AUSSERER: My response to that, Judge, would be that he was already asked to leave. He was not.

THE COURT: There was evidence that he was, in fact, leaving.

MR. AUSSERER: And then turned around.

THE COURT: Right. So at that point, he's not committing a burglary or a malicious mischief in there. He's potentially committing an assault.

The trial court noted that it was up to the jury to figure out the disputed facts of whether

Howard was in fact leaving when he turned toward Bang and was shot:

His intent is to commit an assault right there, presumably. It's not that he intended to remain in order to commit the assault. I mean, if he wanted to commit the assault, he could have struck Mr. Bang in the bathroom.

Now, there's a dispute here as to whether or not Mr. Howard knew that Mr. Bang had a handgun at that point in time. According to Mr. Criss's testimony, Mr. Howard knew he had the gun. That's why he was leaving

so suddenly. Under Mr. Bang's theory of events, he didn't realize that he had the gun until he turned and saw it. . . .

So that's up to the jury to sort all that out what happened there, but I don't think, under the circumstances in this case, it would be appropriate. And I think it would be confusing to sort of create a different standard because it happened in the house of itself. This is not about a residential burglary. This is about potentially an assault to Mr. Bang that he defended himself from.

C

Bang first argues that because there was evidence Howard committed burglary close in time to the shooting, the court should have given an instruction under RCW 9A.16.050(2). Bang relies on Ackerman. Conversely, the State argues that the jury was properly instructed with WPIC 16.02 and that giving WPIC 16.03 would have been unnecessarily duplicative. The State relies on State v. Brenner, 53 Wn. App. 367, 376, 768 P.2d 509 (1989), overruled on other grounds by State v. Wentz, 149 Wn.2d 342, 68 P.3d 282 (2003). We agree with the State.

In Ackerman, the court modified WPIC 16.03 so that it said "violent felony," and included language similar to that found in WPIC 16.02: "slayer reasonably believed that the violent felony threatens imminent danger of death or great personal injury." 11 Wn. App. 2d at 312. This court determined that "the requirements of great personal injury and imminent danger in subsection (1) do not relate to subsection (2)." Ackerman, 11 Wn. App. 2d at 314. Citing Brightman, the court added that the use of deadly force must be reasonable and that requirement is encompassed in WPIC 16.03 by its use of the following language: "slayer may employ such force and means as a reasonably prudent person would use under the same or similar conditions as they reasonably appeared to the slayer." Ackerman, 11 Wn. App. 2d at 314. The court held that the trial

court erred because it misstated the requirements of RCW 9A.16.050(2) when it instructed the jury to consider reasonable belief of imminent danger. Ackerman, 11 Wn. App. 2d at 314-15.

In Brightman, the defendant argued that fear of death or great bodily injury was not required to justify deadly force when the defendant acted in self-defense to an attempted robbery of \$20. 155 Wn.2d at 510, 521. Brightman's theory was that the killing was not justified under RCW 9A.16.050(1) because he did not fear the victim, but the killing was justified under subsection (2). The court cited Brenner and agreed with its conclusion that each act of deadly force must be reasonably necessary under the circumstances. Brightman, 155 Wn.2d at 522-23. The court held that the trial court did not err by refusing to give a justifiable homicide instruction "because Brightman freely admitted that he did not fear [the victim]." Brightman, 155 Wn.2d at 523-24.

In Brenner, the trial court gave an instruction that homicide is justifiable "when the defendant reasonably believes that the person slain intends to inflict death or great personal injury and there is imminent danger of such harm being accomplished," and did not give an instruction on justifiable homicide in resistance of a felony. 53 Wn. App. at 375. This court determined the instruction was proper because it allowed the defendant to argue his "more narrow actual resistance of a felony within the broader language of reasonable belief of intent," and the defendant's proposed instruction "simply repeats the substance" of the instruction given. Brenner, 53 Wn. App. at 377. Similarly, in State v. Boisselle, 3 Wn. App. 2d 266, 291, 415 P.3d 621 (2018), rev'd on other grounds, 194 Wn.2d 1, 448 P.3d 19 (2019), this court held that because the defendant "was already arguing that he was resisting death or great bodily harm,"

consistent with WPIC 16.02, the proposed instruction, WPIC 16.03, would have been repetitious.

Here, unlike in Ackerman, the trial court did not modify the jury instructions to misstate the law. Moreover, Bang was able to argue his theory of defense under WPIC 16.02. At trial, Bang's theory of self-defense was that he was afraid of Howard and that Howard would use the hammer against him or his wife. During his testimony, Bang stated that he shot Howard the first time because he feared that Howard was about to hit him with a hammer. Bang also stated that he shot Howard a second time because he was again afraid that Howard was going to hit him with a hammer.

The trial court decided that under the facts of the case, which were disputed as to whether Howard was in fact leaving when he was shot, an instruction based on WPIC 16.03 and burglary would unnecessarily confuse the jury when the underlying felony was the assault with the hammer and Bang's theory of defense was fear of and resistance to the assault. Like the defense theory in Boisselle, there is no substantive difference between Bang using deadly force because he feared Howard intended to strike him with the hammer, and using deadly force in active resistance of Bang's attempted burglary. The given instruction did not misstate the law and it allowed Bang to argue his theory of the case. And Bang does not persuade that the given instruction misled the jury. Thus, the trial court did not abuse its discretion by refusing to instruct the jury under WPIC 16.03.

D

Bang also contends that under either justifiable homicide instruction, WPIC 16.02 or 16.03, the trial court should have also issued an instruction based on WPIC 2.09.

WPIC 2.09 instructs the jury that a particular crime as a felony, “[blank] is a felony.” Here, the jury was instructed that homicide is justified if Bang reasonably believed Howard intended to commit a felony or inflict death or great personal injury. The jury was also instructed that “a person commits the felony crime of assault in the second degree when he or she assaults another with a deadly weapon.” (Emphasis added.) Bang’s theory of defense was that he was afraid of death or great bodily injury from Howard using the hammer against him. Bang fails to explain how the lack of an instruction based on WPIC 2.09 renders the justifiable homicide instruction deficient or resulted in prejudice. And this court presumes the jury followed the trial court’s instructions. State v. Emery, 174 Wn.2d 741, 754, 278 P.3d 653 (2012).

E

Finally, Bang asserts the jury was not properly instructed that self-defense could apply to the lesser included offense of count 1 and points to the trial court’s failure to include self-defense in the “to convict” instruction for the lesser included offense. We disagree.

The jury was given “to convict” instructions for each count. The fact the trial court did not include justifiable homicide in the instruction on the lesser included offense of count 1 is inconsequential. None of the “to convict” instructions included a reference to justifiable homicide. Related to count 1, the jury was instructed that “a person commits the crime of murder in the second degree as a lesser crime to count 1,” when the person has intent to cause death but without premeditation. And the trial court gave “to convict” instructions for the “lesser crime of murder in the second degree in count 1.” And the jury was instructed that justifiable homicide was a defense to count 1. The trial

court did not misstate the law or mislead the jury on the theory of self-defense and “jurors are presumed to follow their instructions.” Emery, 174 Wn.2d at 754.

The jury was properly instructed on justifiable homicide and the trial court did not violate Bang’s constitutional right to present a complete defense.

IV

Bang argues the trial court made improper comments in violation of article IV, section 16 of the Washington Constitution. We disagree.

A

Under article IV, section 16 of the Washington Constitution, a judge is prohibited from conveying to the jury his or her personal opinion about the merits of the case or from instructing the jury that a fact at issue has been established. State v. Hartzell, 156 Wn. App. 918, 938, 237 P.3d 928 (2010). The purpose of prohibiting judges from commenting on the evidence is to “prevent the jury from being influenced by the trial judge’s opinion of the evidence submitted.” State v. Hansen, 46 Wn. App. 292, 300, 730 P.2d 706 (1986). “The determination of whether a comment on the evidence is improper depends on the facts and circumstances in each case.” State v. Eaker, 113 Wn. App. 111, 117-18, 53 P.3d 37 (2002), review denied, 149 Wn.2d 1003 (2003).

A comment on the evidence occurs “only if the court’s attitude toward the merits of the case or the court’s evaluation relative to a disputed issue is inferable from the statement.” Hansen, 46 Wn. App. at 300. “A judge need not expressly convey his or her personal feelings on an element of the offense; it is sufficient if they are merely implied.” State v. Jackman, 156 Wn.2d 736, 744, 132 P.3d 136 (2006). Generally, “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.” State v. Brush, 183 Wn.2d 550, 565-66, 353 P.3d 213 (2015) (Wiggins, J., concurring in part and concurring in result). Because the constitution prohibits judicial comments on the evidence, a claimed error based on such a comment involves a manifest constitutional error that Bang may raise for the first time on appeal. State v. Levy, 156 Wn.2d 709, 719-20, 132 P.3d 1076 (2006).

B

Bang points to two comments by the trial court during examination of the pathologist but fails to provide supporting argument or authority to persuade us that the comments were improper and simply concludes the comments were highly prejudicial. The trial court’s comments were in response to an objection and a cross-examination question on expertise related to travel of the bullet through space:

THE COURT: I don’t know that that’s what this is really getting at, to be honest with you, but it’s not the traveling through the space that’s the problem because if it’s through space, there’s nothing but gravity and the air in the room that’s affecting it.

But the bigger issue for all of you is, did it continue to travel in any particular path, and is that path a true path based upon what we see from the trajectory rods for that particular wound? That’s really what you’re getting at, I think if anybody understands what any of us is talking about by now. I’ll let the doctor answer, if he can.

Q: . . . the bullet would have been coming from above his head through his cheek and then out through the back from right to left?

A: It was a downward trajectory.

A: Again, downward trajectory through the body.

Q: Because you’re only talking about through body, not space?

A: Exactly.

Q: All right.

THE COURT: But above has a couple of connotations here, so I just want to make sure we’re clear. Because if this is the head, above could be this

way in general, or if the face is like this, above could be that way, too. So when you are asking if the shot is from above, see what I'm saying? It's ambiguous.

Bang also points to the trial court's comments during his testimony but again fails to provide supporting argument or authority. The trial court's comment was in response to defense counsel's objection to the State's questions about gun safety:

THE COURT: Well, we have some testimony from Mr. Bang that he had been in the Army, that he had been in combat. I take it from that it's a reasonable inference that he has some familiarity with firearms. He has also indicated he has owned a weapon for many years and that he previously owned a revolver among—in addition to the weapon we have here. So he has some familiarity with firearms, it's not unreasonable for counsel to explore what that understanding might be. I don't know about the specifics of these so-called four rules of gun safety, but certainly

MR. AUSSERER: He testified that he's not aware of those four specifics.

THE COURT: She can ask him about them, and maybe he knows about them sort of independently without them being known as the four rules of gun safety. I mean, I don't know. But in general, I'm going to allow her to inquire about his—

MR. AUSSERER: Understood, thank you.

THE COURT: —experiences and knowledge about this.

Assuming, without deciding, that the trial court's comment was improper, any such error was harmless. "A judicial comment is presumed prejudicial and is only not prejudicial if the record affirmatively shows no prejudice could have resulted." Levy, 156 Wn.2d at 725. There is also a presumption that the jury follows the trial court's instructions. Emery, 174 Wn.2d at 754. Accordingly, even when a trial court makes an improper comment, the error may be cured by a jury instruction to disregard any comments on the evidence. Hizey v. Carpenter, 119 Wn.2d 251, 271 830 P.2d 646 (1992).

Here, jury instruction 1 told the jury to disregard such comments:

Our state constitution prohibits a trial judge from making a comment on the evidence. It would be improper for me to express, by words or conduct, my personal opinion about the value of testimony or other evidence. I have not intentionally done this. If it appeared to you that I have indicated my personal opinion in any way, either during trial or in giving these instructions, you must disregard this entirely.

Because this court presumes the jury follows the instructions of the trial court, any alleged error here would have been cured by the instruction.

V

Bang argues the trial court violated his constitutional right to present a defense and abused its discretion by excluding all evidence of Howard's character and drug use.

At trial, Bang objected to the State's motion in limine to exclude reputation evidence that supports Bang's assertion that Howard was the aggressor. It was undisputed that Bang did not know of Howard's reputation. And the trial court decided that Howard's reputation for making verbal threats of physical violence was irrelevant absent testimony that Howard made such threats in this case. The court added that if, for example, there was such testimony by Bang, and the character evidence became relevant, the court would consider admissibility of the character testimony outside the jury's presence. But Bang never sought a final decision on the evidence and thus waived any error in excluding it. State v. Carlson, 61 Wn. App. 865, 875, 812 P.2d 536 (1991) ("when a ruling on a motion in limine is tentative, any error in admitting or excluding evidence is waived unless the trial court is given an opportunity to reconsider its ruling").


Second, Bang argues the trial court abused its discretion by excluding the toxicology report. But the trial court did not exclude the toxicology report and instead, in response to a request by defense counsel, reserved its ruling pending further development:

MR. AUSSERER: What I will do is ask to have a . . . supplemental interview, I guess, with the medical examiner and be more specific. Because our conversation was very surface level and so what I would ask the Court to do is reserve until I have that conversation.

THE COURT: All right. . . . with respect to the toxicology results, I guess I'll reserve that for the moment.


Bang did not to pursue this inquiry further or seek to introduce the toxicology report as trial progressed and so the trial court was not given an opportunity to reconsider admissibility. Accordingly, Bang waived any error related to excluding the toxicology report. Carlson, 61 Wn. App. at 875. Bang fails to establish the trial court abused its discretion or that his constitutional rights were violated.

We affirm.



WE CONCUR:





ALLEN, HANSEN, MAYBROWN, OFFENBECHER

June 04, 2025 - 9:15 AM

Filing Petition for Review

Transmittal Information

Filed with Court: Supreme Court
Appellate Court Case Number: Case Initiation
Appellate Court Case Title: State of Washington, Respondent v. Yoon Myong Bang, Appellant (868471)

The following documents have been uploaded:

- PRV_Petition_for_Review_20250604091517SC484400_4736.pdf
This File Contains:
Petition for Review
The Original File Name was Bang Petition for Review.pdf

A copy of the uploaded files will be sent to:

- Alex@ahmlawyers.com
- PCpatcecf@piercecountywa.gov
- Theodore.Cropley@piercecountywa.gov
- pcpatcecf@piercecountywa.gov

Comments:

Sender Name: Sarah Conger - Email: sarah@ahmlawyers.com

Filing on Behalf of: Todd Maybrown - Email: todd@ahmlawyers.com (Alternate Email: sarah@ahmlawyers.com)

Address:
600 University Street
Suite 3020
Seattle, WA, 98101
Phone: (206) 447-9681

Note: The Filing Id is 20250604091517SC484400