

STATEMENT OF ADDITIONAL
GROUNDS FOR REVIEW

FILED
APPELLATIONS DIV
COURT OF APPEALS
STATE OF WASHINGTON
2013 JUN 14 PM 1:53

STATE OF WASHINGTON)

Respondent,)

v.)

Jeffery Michael Kinzle
(your name))

Appellant.)

No. 69451-1/WAP
H-1-00710-8
STATEMENT OF ADDITIONAL
GROUNDS FOR REVIEW

I, Jeffery Kinzle, have received and reviewed the opening brief prepared by my attorney. Summarized below are the additional grounds for review that are not addressed in that brief. I understand the Court will review this Statement of Additional Grounds for Review when my appeal is considered on the merits.

Additional Ground 1

please see following 39 pages
for complete statement of
Additional grounds with 15 issues

Additional Ground 2

please see following 39 pages
for complete statement of Additional
grounds for 15 Additional issues

If there are additional grounds, a brief summary is attached to this statement.

Date: 6-11-13

Signature: Jeffery Kinzle

To The Court of Appeals Div 1
Re Snohomish County case # 11-1-00710-8
From Jeffrey M Kinzle Doc #350557
Date: 05 ~~13~~ 2013

These following pages are to serve
as my additional grounds for appeal
in this case 11-1-00710-8

Please note that as these
pages were written at various
times the pages may contain
more than one page # 50
for the purpose and accuracy of
this statement please refer to the
page # and explanation at top of page
I sincerely thank you in advance for your
consideration fairness and justice in decision

Contence

COA 69451-1-1 / 11-1-00710-8

AReal ISSUES

- Page 1 issue: 6th Amendment Violation
Page 2+3 issue PROSECUTORIAL misconduct
Page 4 issue violation of Speady Trial
Page 5-11 issue fair and unbiased trial violation
Page 12.1 issue reversible error -Jury info
Page 12.2 issue Due proses violation
page 13.1 issue braidy violation
page 13.2 issue conflict of interest
page 13.3 issue Alchahol condition
page 14 issue Drug condition
page 15 issue Pollygraphing condition
~~Page 16-20 issue unconstitutional sentencing~~
Page 16-20 issue unconstitutional sentencing
page 21-23 issue Dueproses/disibility rights violation
page 24-26 issue reversible error/contaminated evidence
page 27-34 unconstitutional condition #s 7, 10, 12, 19, 27, 42^c

(1)

1 My 6th Amendment rights were violated many times
2 in the first 9 months where in I asked the
3 court on 4 occasions for conflict of interest
4 and ineffectual counsel due to Ms Trubloods
5 threatening, illegal, immoral, and otherwise
6 unproductive, and unprofessional actions
7 and behavior in which she did any and every
8 thing she possibly could to hinder my
9 successful investigation and purposefully
10 blocked me from any legal materials
11 information written law or legal procedure
12 that I was told by Snohomish County she was
13 the only person who was allowed and supposed to
14 give me, I first went through her
15 direct boss then through Bill Jaquett who
16 told me he could care less and not to
17 write him then on to the courts
18 where I was told by Judge Lucas ~~that~~
19 I did not have the right to waste tax
20 payers dollars and that "whatever my
21 problem just get over it your not getting
22 a new lawyer unless you pay for it with
23 your own money no matter what my problems
24 and from there I went to ACLU then
25 to a formal grievance to the Bar Association
with time I was finally given MR Cox but the damage
had already been done by purposefully destroying
labs sending to a lab known to be inferior FO
BI then regardless of my want telina lab no DNA

②

1 There was prosecutorial misconduct when
2 The State was first given evidence from the
3 FBI lab results that show N.R.'s results were
4 partially negative then later when put on
5 the stand during competency hearing N.R.
6 failed to disclose any crime had been
7 committed or even giving any emotional
8 sign that the alleged trauma had in
9 fact occurred and as this was
10 consistent with what MR Hunter had
11 written in an email to MS Trueblood
12 earlier on in my case MS True
13 blood showed me the email where
14 MR Hunter said based on the stories
15 of both girls and his investigators
16 feelings he felt that N.R. was just
17 copying R.R. story trying to help her
18 sister he also stated that as he saw
19 this as the likely happenstance that as
20 long as I plead guilty to the charge
21 I really was guilty of - his words not mine
22 that he would set it right by dropping
23 the count against N.R. and I would only
24 have the one for R.R. Now ~~was~~ if N.R.'s
25 story was true there would be absolute
26 no way for the swabs to be even
27 partially negative as she ~~stated~~ alleged
28 stated that she saw me glob the
29 cream from the tube on my hand two

3) Rear So As you can see The fact
2 show The state knew of My
3 innocents involving The particular case
4 OF NR and Not only by a showing
5 of evidence in My favor but also
6 by NR. After being found competent
7 and present and mentally Available by
8 The Court NOT only DID NOT Disclos
9 Any crime or show Any Trauma
10 or recollection of any kind that
11 a crime that allegedly occurred
12 So At This Time The Judge
13 Asked the state if They would
14 Reind The charge involving NR
15 and MR hunter even knowing the
16 evidence and The Testimony and
17 his own admission that he Believe
18 NR had copied her sisters Story
19 That night with Malishis intent
20 knowingly comited Misconduct
21 by wrongly Trying Me of a crime
22 simply because he knew that he
23 could use both childrens charges
24 That he could Push a Jury To Mak
25 a Decision of guilt based solely on
26 emotion instead of The physical evide
27 by giving a Jury Outrage That
28 Not one but 2 children were hu
29 MR hunter did This knowing I was not awi

Q

1 My right to a speedy trial and disposition were
2 violated when after an in my case I did not
3 agree with continuances of my case that
4 were agreed on by my lawyer and the state
5 2 of the 3 times this happened my PD said
6 she did not have time for my case saying her
7 caseload was too big then the 3rd time it was
8 because the state refused to supply there
9 witnesses for depositions - This actually happened
10 6 times during my case but one is sufficient
11 to make my point of violation of my rights - I was
12 told several times by Judge Lucas and Judge
13 Bowden that I did not have a legal right to
14 a speedy trial unless my lawyer and the state
15 decide I do - but this is NOT what the
16 law states. The law states that I as a
17 accused person have the right to a speedy
18 trial and disposition - Now where in the law
19 does it say that because I am accused in Snohomish
20 county Washington the rules change Nowhere does
21 it say the state or the public defender has
22 a right to waive my speedy trial without
23 my consent and Nowhere does the law
24 say that a judge gets to decide what
25 constitutional rights Snohomish County court will
26 allow its accused Nowhere in the constitution
27 does it state that if a state wants to save money
persons rights change if a PD is overworked a case
must be sent to a less busy PD - This was a grievous violation

1) The court violated my right to a fair and unbiased trial by trying me for 2 separate alleged crimes that allegedly happened at 2 separate times in 2 separate locations here in is the basis of my argument and my logic.

over the last several years the court has seen and been made aware of how juries are often easily swayed by emotional cases such as mine it has been shown over and over again that the mere mention of words like rape or child molester often in most people instantly bring about anger, hatred, fear, making jurors blindly wanting vengeance and wanting to give payback, and instilling fear that this person will get away with go free and do it again so in instances such as this it has been shown over and over again that it is already hard enough to have a trial where jurors don't feel the need to ignore the evidence and react and make decisions based on the emotions they feel on the case and the fear they feel because the news is constant saying this one or that one could not be proven guilty went free and did it again jurors often admit they feel they would rather see an innocent person convicted than take a chance that they would be respa

1) so in seeing all of this and how hard
it is to get a fair and impartial trial
on charges such as these the court
still having a duty to try these vulgar
cases as fairly as law allows has been
giving rulings on what information about
a defendant a juror is allowed to know
These rulings take into account how
if each and every juror will be able to
fairly consider and decide each and
every charge without the influence of
anything that does not specifically pertain to
each individual verdict.

Now in point for this please look at the
reasoning for the court's ruling of a
previous ^{convicted} sex offender going to trial
on a new ~~sex~~ sex offence. The
court has ruled that the jury does
not have the right to know this person was
convicted or even accused of another
sex offence because the court found
it was more likely than not that if
a juror was told this person was
convicted before the juror would
most likely draw the conclusion that
if this person did it before he must be
guilty. Now this juror ~~is~~ therefore
not having the ability to set aside
the thought of a previous conviction.

1 in his new case There by This
2 information would not by The Courts
3 own findings and rulings allow The
4 accused person a fair and unbiased Trial
5
6 So Taking These Things into consideration
7 it is my contention That by The court
8 making me be tried on both counts by
9 The same Jury at The same Time
10 I was Denied the rite To have an objectiv
11 Jury consider each individual charge
12 without the consideration of undue influence
13
14 if you break this Down Simply The Jurors
15 heard both allegations the Algeed evidence
16 and whitness testimony of both charges
17 together and as this is already an
18 emotional crapshoot according to the courts
19 own rulings because the Nature of my
20 aleged crimes witch puts the Jury standi
21 on an emotional ledge already Then say
22 the Jury held belief that I may have comite
23 one crime Then by the courts own findin
24 it is More likely than Not that if a
25 Jury Thought me guilty of one crime Then
26 regardless of The consideration of evidence
27 I must be guilty of both, Therefore I
28 Should have had 2 separate Trials To giv
- The chance to have a Jury consider only the facts of that

1

in your consideration of this spific mater
I would like to bring to your consideration a
Ruling that was made by Judge bowden
a snohomish county superior court Judge
only months prior to this case please
understand I know my case of indecent libert
is a diferent/case # and there for the

8
9
10
11

Spifics can not be used in this decis
I am going to explain what happened only
so you can understand the context that
I am using this ruling of Judge bowden

case #
00709-4
13
583-1

in regards to the situation of me
being tried for 2 seperate crimes tha
Spificaly were aleged at seperate times
and saperate places in this case at
The same time I relize the subject
matter is not the same but if you
will only consider Judge bowdens ruling
and The Reasoning behind his Decision
I belive you will understand how
This spific ruling shows a priVas
basis and an agreeing attitude from
Shohomish county court That argues
favorably in This spific matter

25
26
27
28
29

in november of 2011 I went to trial my
first day for indecent liberties in snoh
county WA intending To show the Jury
That another person who was present

9

Me by Name of Nathan Wood had only
about 1 hour previous to my alleged crime
committed almost the exact crime I
was accused of to a store clerk 50
ft away from where I allegedly comited my
crime on the store clerk next door

7

Now I was not going to just say this out of
the blue the lady store clerk that Mr.
wood Attacked and tried to rape was going
to testify to this fact.

Now on my first day The prosicutor Mathew
hunter - same as this case - requested the
Judge to prohibit Me or My Attorney
to even Allude to this incident and to
~~ban~~ exclude Any testimony of
this clerk or witnesses to MR Woods
crime stating it was a previous bad act
that had no bearing on MR. Woods testimony
of my Alleged crime.

Now After Judge bowden considered
this he ruled on the record that
that would be a previous bad act specifically
because this alleged crime happened hapened
an earlier time 1 hour before and in a difre
location 50^{ft} away to two diferent people and
therefore one crime had no bearing to the other
and was therefore not to be heard by
the Jury because MR Woods crime has

1 fore cause undue consideration of
2 not only Mr Wood testimony but in there
3 decision process of my guilt or innocenc
4 as well.

5 So what I am trying to get across here
6 is Snohomish County Superior court found
7 that 2 separate crimes of 2 separate victims
8 at two separate times in two separate
9 places even as in that case both alleged
10 victims were store clerks and crimes that
11 were only separated by about 1 hour and
12 at most 50 feet from each alleged crime
13 seen - Judge Bowden found that one
14 crime did not bear consideration by a
15 Jury to the other alleged crime as the
16 first crime would cause undue influence
17 that was not relevant to my alleged crime
18 and would therefore caused a decision
19 that was more likely to be based
20 on that as a Jury would have been
21 more likely to ignore the specific
22 evidence of my case then to be influenced
23 by what crime Mr Wood committed
24 And would therefore by this logic
25 present a Jury Decision Verdict that
26 would likely not be based solely on the
27 evidence of my specific alleged crime
28

29 So my comparison is simply this

1) both of these Alleged crimes at the
2 same time The Jury Was not able
3 to contemplate Then make a Decision
4 of my guilt or innocence With out having
5 undue influence of one crime to
6 another it has been shown by the court
7 own findings and rulings that if the
8 Average Juror after being instructed
9 to only Decide by relevant evidence
10 Then as in this case has The evadance
11 of both cases and Then Asked to make
12 a separate decision Would Not be
13 likely to only see the facts of
14 one charge at a time,
15 and This logic is Justly and reasonably
16 shown in Judge bowdens Rulings and
17 explanations

18 So in short by trying me of 2
19 Seperate crimes of 2 seperate alleged
20 victims, at 2 seperate times, in 2 seperate
21 places giving one Jury All information of
22 both alleged crimes and Requiring them to
23 use All of that information to make there
24 Decision even Though They should be
25 Seperate considerations The court
26 and The State violated My rite of
27 Due process, a fair and unbiased Trial To
28 be Tried by a Jury of My peers
29 Without influence of undue and irrelevant

1 The court committed a reversible error
 2 by allowing the Jury to hear testimony
 3 from puata SKEMENSKY witch breaks the
 4 standard rulings as MS SKEMENSKY
 5 both questioned without being a trained
 6 investigator and also conducted a phisic
 7 exam with collection of alleged evidence
 8 with the specific intent of prosecution
 9 of Me specifically from the start
 10 and as standard court procedure dictate
 11 in a case such as this that Ms. SKEMEN
 12 Testimony should have been excluded from
 13 the Jury The court committed a violati
 14 of my rites and a reversible error by
 15 allowing such testimony.

16
 17 The court committed a flagrant and obscene erro
 18 in violation of my rites to due proses
 19 and fair trial by allowing video and written
 20 interviews of Rozi leptcheck to R.R. and NA.
 21 even though the court had full viewing and
 22 reading of these interviews witch contained
 23 an obscene amount of hearsay but also show
 24 Ms leptcheck repeatedly coercing and leadin
 25 both children and also putting to the children
 26 things they did NOT say initially until after
 27 her coercion then repeting these things to
 28 both children to reinforce her coerced
 29 story into the children's own story with

13

A braidy violation ocured when Judge cortis
 Did not allow consideration for a lesser inku
 charge but instedd clearly stated that
 "The Jury Must find me guilty of the charge
 if The Jury found Me To have broken Any law
 in regards to charges" There by by his
 Duty TO convict instruction forced The
 Jury To either find me Not guilty of
 any wrong doing that nite or guilty of
 all counts There by ensuring my
 wrongfull conviction

12

There was a clear conflict of interes
 when I was not made aware until the
 Day of conviction That MR COX was
 actively Repersenting Ashly Doughtys husband
 while she was Testifying against m
 in My case and as I was NOT givi
 The oportunity To Think about This issue
 and to Decide if it would cause an
 issue in my trial Myself witch I
 belive to be a real possibility it was
 a clear conflict of interest and a reversible
 error

24

Any condition pertaining to Alchahol must be
 removed as The court violated The laws as alcha
 has not shown To be consumed by me in a Time
 elivent or Directly influant To my Aleged crimes
 s I Admitted in court on That Day I consumed 2c

removed
 has not
 elivent
 s I

1 Any condition specifically mentioning perclusion
2 of Drugs - legal or illegal - use was
3 a violation of my rites as The
4 Court itself has ruled That any
5 conditions set forth by The court
6 must be directly crime related
7 The Rules pertaining to This are
8 very specifically cut and dry and
9 They state This in very plain
10 very simple Non Negotiable
11 language purposely writtin in this
12 language so as Not to be able
13 to be interpereted in any fashion
14 other than This definition - in my case
15 The court would have to show
16 clear evadence That My aleged
17 crimes were directly caused by or
18 directly influenced by me taking
19 or in any way using Drugs. To the
20 extent of influencing my Judgement
21 or prohibitions enough for me to have
22 committed my aleged crimes ^{while} outside of
23 my Normal mindset - so To This
24 The court DID NOT at any Time During
25 My Trial bring any evidence That That
26 is what happened as a matter of fact
27 The state Never once even accused me of
28 That also Throughout my Trial There was
let any show of me using Drugs in any fashion

15
1 Any condition pertaining to polygraphing is
2 unconstitutional as it has been proven unreliable
3 it is so unpredictable it is not admissible in
4 any court in the United States and as Doc
5 has shown a track record of playing fast
6 and loose with the rules and laws the court
7 has opened a door where Doc only supposed to
8 use it for treatment purposes can will and
9 has repeatedly doled punishment by way of
10 violation for the results of polygraph
11 Doc has repeatedly used there own in these
12 same circumstance under threat of
13 violation and punishment for failure to comply
14 and as a person on Doc does not have
15 the right to court or a Judge Not on Doc
16 payroll This successfully negates due
17 process there by allowing Doc to imprison
18 me for life which is unconstitutional
19 it also happens frequently
20 I also must point out my alleged
21 crime was not classified a crime
22 of dishonesty I was never once
23 alleged to have lied This there
24 for makes this condition unconstitutional
25 by way of the courts rulings that
26 any condition by the court must be
27 crime related and show a direct
28 relevance to the alleged crime and as
29 this does not it is unconstitutional and
30 must be considered inoperative

1 I take issue with the court imposing a
2 sentence that was not only selected out
3 of proportion to the specific allegations of
4 my alleged crimes but was also by
5 adding indeterminate sentence an exception
6 sentence now by the courts own guide
7 lines and self imposed rules governing
8 sentencing The court must impose a
9 sentence that is relevant to the specific
10 allegations and circumstances of that alleged
11 crime - for example if a person steals a
12 pack of 75 & gum when caught the court
13 sentences him to 3 years in prison
14 stating as a reason to give that sentence
15 that he is a thief and they just
16 sent the last person who stole a
17 car a 3 year sentence because he
18 was a thief too Then just as in
19 my case according to the courts own
20 rulings it would not be a sentence
21 that is relevant to the specific severity
22 of allegations - in my case there was
23 no allegation of violence or force in
24 any way just as a physical evaluation
25 of both children should show no signs of
26 physical or mental trauma so a sentence
27 that is 198 months to life in prison + life in
28 DOC with the ability of DOC to send me to prison
29 at any time in my life for the rest of my life This

And as it is also an alleged crime that does not meet constitutional standards in that in another Jurisdiction My alleged crimes would not merit either a sentence of life in prison or 198 months - 16.5 years - + lifetime Doc with the possibility of a life time prison sentence possible at any time of the remainder of my natural life for alleged crimes that do not specifically include acts of physical violence by way of direct or implied threat of violence, acts of force by direct restraint or kidnapping or other direct or indirect physical abuse or threat with none of the above were alleged to have been committed by me during these alleged crimes.

So for these reasons my sentence was so grossly disproportionate to the alleged crimes that this violates my 8th Amendment - where by giving a sentence that is cruel and unusual please refer to state v Gimarelli;

where the state found the sentence constitutional and classified violent sex offence when repeatedly touched a child's abdominal area after she pushed his hand away by way of force showing

Now in reading that please look throughout ALL court records of my case at No time is there Any Allegation that either child tried to stop in Any way the Aligned crime ALSO Never once was there Any Allegation of Threa Coersion, Violence, or Restraint against these two children
 witch for all intents and purposes Makes this a Non Violant sex offence

As to the 2nd fair factor The legislative intent behind indeterminate Sentencing is and I quote WA Appellate court in 11-1-007 State V KINZLE in 2001 "was enacted part of an act concerned with Managing sex offenders in the community because of concerns that Determinate Sentencing Dose Not allow the stat to return a person on supervision in The community to prison beyond the end of his or her term"

Now in this case #1 this is not Ment to keep innocent people in prison beyond there term witch is what has been happening for the last 4 years also The Prosecutors And Judges own

to which violates the purposes behind this legislation
 Also I take issue with those
 reasons listed in that Mission
 Statement

#1 if a person breaks the law
 he goes to Jail

The only people who are rightfully
 detained in a Jail or prison are
 those who break the law

if a person has not broken the
 law then that person is innocent
 and does not by any rational means
 belong in a Jail or prison

So why then does the legislator
 want to put innocent people in Jail
 which is exactly what their Mission
 Statement says

if you can put a person who
 breaking the law in Jail
 Then what is the worry about sending
 a sex offender to Jail after his term
 if he is breaking the law he goes
 to Jail plain and simple and if
 he is not breaking the laws
 then there is no logical reason
 to return him to prison or Jail

20

Fain factor #3

in another Jurisdiction An Alleged crime that Did Not Allege Direct or indirect violence, force, threat, restraint or after physical exam Any physical Trauma, NO Allegation of pain of any kind, And Was NOT Rape, And after 1.5 years Showed & Signs of Mental Trauma

in another Jurisdiction The Sentence of this case would NOT have been 198 months to life in prison And lifetime Doc with the possibility of life in prison for the rest of my Natural life

fain factor #4

in Snohomish County My Sentence was an extreme for what the Sentence other people with similar charges

Snohomish County generally Sentence like cases to between 1-10 years

This here by Shows That This Sentence was grossly Disproportionate to the Specific Allegations of crime Making My Sentence cruel And Inhumane Making it unconstitutional

There was a violation of my right to be legally informed provided with adequate legal material and have the ability to make informed decisions and the ability to take part in the decisions of my own defense. Along with this violation it goes hand and hand that the laws and rights that are set to make sure that people with mental disabilities are guaranteed the ability to have a clear line of communication between the disabled, the court and the attorneys by way of a legal advocate if necessary to make sure the disabled understands what is happening to him, what his options are and what information is available to him that way the defendant clearly understands the proceedings and the advocate is also a conduit of communication to make sure the courts and the attorney clearly understand the defendant's words, intents and decisions. These rights that are so vital a part of due process were violated and by the violation of these rights the court prevented me from a fair trial. This is how these were violated to the best I can remember: on 3-18-11 I was arrested on 11-1-00709-4

for alignment I made the court aware of my mental disabilities and the fact that I was on social security disability when asked about financials for court appointed attorney from this point on the issue of my disabilities came before the court multiple times the issues of communication between me & my attorney were brought up and addressed by the court judges several times and even after asking for help do to my disability the only thing the court or attorneys address is if I was crazy or not regardless of the courts mandate to provide me with an advocate everybody basically said I was so stupid but the problem is I have many verifiable mental disabilities bipolar, border line personality disorder, ADHD, schizophrenia, PTSD, night terrors, clinical depression, all of these things make it difficult if not sometimes to remember, comprehend, and communicate, these issues were addressed in court the court knew these things and instead of honoring my right they treated me like I was just stupid well I may not be real smart but I am not stupid and I am smart enough to figure out that by denying my rights in this matter

13

to have a fair trial, to be informed
to take part in my own defence
by violating these rights by
repeatedly refusing to allow me
legal materials - The court refuse
me the right to make any
informed decision which effectively
took my ability to coherently
participate in these legal proceedings.

so given these violations the
court must grant me a
new trial one that I am
allowed to take part in and
make decisions in.

Contaminated
evidence
pg #24

And Admitted contaminated evidence And Violated my ^{Right} ^{to}
By Allowing the testing of possibly contaminated
Swabs Despite My several request to have
labs examined for contamination

Calendar probably/closet to 3
ON 6-10-2011 at 3:00 PM Snohomish
county court Set an order to
Allow The State crime lab to
release ~~the~~ The Swabs from
this case to FBI Lab for
testing however later that day
While the Swabs were still
in the Washington State crime
lab evidence room There was
a major break in the pipes
in which extensive water damage
and flooding occurred it was
later reported in the everett
herald that a lot of evidence
was found to be contaminated
by Defense Attorneys When I
brought this up to public defender
Cassie true blood on ^{Friday} 6-16-
by phone I was told she was
not going to act on it she said
"Since I was guilty anyway
Maybe the water would wash
the evidence away" I did not
believe that or want to let it
go so The following Tuesday 6-
7, wrote a letter explaining it

43
Prosecutor Matt Hunter and
Snohomish county superior court
clerk explaining my problem
and what Ms Truebloods
response was to my inquiry
and requesting the court
the state and the public
defenders office to conduct
an inspection of these swabs
to know whether or not they
were contaminated like a
lot of other swab evidence in
the same room was on that
day

however despite my best efforts
none of the 3 court, prosecutor
or public defender ever replied
or even acknowledged this problem
with the swab evidence

I again sent a copy of the same
letters I sent on 6-21-2011 to
Snohomish county court and Public
Defenders office on Fri 7-15-11

again with no acknowledgement
however when I went to court
again on 7-22-11 Public Defender
told me to quit writing letters
about it as she said she was
not going to be forced to waste time

6

it

So my issue here is That Despite
My repeated Attempts to have This
evidence inspected for contamination

Snohomish county Superior Court
Snohomish county prosecutors office
And Snohomish county public Defenders
office

Repeatedly ignored And refused to
Acknowledge This issue
And not only did they Refuse
to perform a simple inspection of the
swabs to insure they were not
contaminated

but with Malicious and knowing
intent after being informed of
the problem The State And the court
And the public Defenders instigated Allow
and condoned the testing of possibly
contaminated Swabs - with the
intent and purpose of allowing the
results of the testing of contaminated
evidence with the goal intent to convict
me of This crime I did not commit

for these reasons The court must grant

27
①

cover

To Nancy P. Collins
Washington Appellate project

From Jeffrey M. Kinze Doc# 350557

Case # 11-1-00710-8

3-12-13

I am sorry I know I keep writing you more and more but I just got my sentencing papers last night and saw my court imposed conditions for the first time so I needed to write to make sure you contest condition #s 7, 10, 12, 19, 27, 29, and an unnamed condition to get chemical dependency evaluation,

I have written down my reasoning and I am sure there is plenty of case law you can find about these issues. To conditions also enclosed is a request to eliminate financial debt to this case due to circumstances that make me unlikely to realistically repay this debt now or at any future time in my life.

78

②

These following court imposed conditions for case # 11-1-00710-8 are unconstitutional as they have no direct bearing or influence on my alleged crimes and therefore must be removed immediately.

The condition stating #7 do not possess or access any sexually explicit materials. Do not frequent establishments whose primary business pertains to sexually explicit or exotic material.

First off my alleged crime did not at any time allege me to possess, view, use, or portray sexually explicit or exotic material at any time before, during or after my alleged crime which makes this condition not crime related and therefore unconstitutional. Also just in case the court were to infer that I was alleged to commit a sexual deviant crime such as this that I must be stopped from engaging in viewing sexual deviant materials to keep me from doing ~~something~~ something like the crime. I

③

to first as this Alleged crime was child related The concern would half to specifically pertain to Me viewing sexually deviant mater. related to children And as it is illegal as both state And federal laws already. There should be No problem especially when my #1 court imposed condition states "obey All Municipal, county, State Tribal, And federal laws" This ^{#1} condition Already states in clear And concise language That is Not open To interpretation of Any kind That I am Not To view Any illegal sexually explicit Mater in This or Any other state, city, Province, reservation, or country. This #1 condition is Not open for Any Debate as to the Definition but condition #7 is open to Any interpretation Doc Decides To Make at That particular Time

Now part #2 is fairly simple Regardless of people's individual opinion of what sexually explicit And exotic material is whether Morally repugnant to social & Accept

(9)

The people who view it are sexually deviant themselves and therefore are liable to commit deviant acts when viewing such materials.

but the plain and simple point here is no matter what any person individually thinks about this issue we as a whole by the united states government have shown time and time again by our court rulings

and governing laws that it is unconstitutional to deny any person who is a united states citizen and over the age of 18 to view sexually explicit material or to have sexual relations with another person who is of legal age of 18 years old so long as the material viewed or sexual relations enjoyed are compliant to the letter of the law and completely consensual by all parties involved

This is also a part of why condition #10 is unconstitutional it states do not date woman or for

⑤

This condition violates my constitutional right to have consensual sexual relationships and to procreate with any willing partners so long as she is of the legal age of 18 years old and abides by the laws of the United States. It also can be interpreted to prohibit me from making a family with the United States Supreme Court states no court has the right to prohibit or limit one's ability to procreate.

As this alleged crime also did not have any content that I was involved with these girl's mother it is also not crime related and therefore unconstitutional and therefore must be removed.

Condition # 12 Do Not hold employment without first notifying of this conviction. This condition holds no bearing or direct relevance to my alleged crime as my alleged crime had & to do with work of any kind. As this is an unconstitutional condition it will also make any employm.

⑥

condition ~~18~~ # 19 find and maintain full time employment or full time school - for the rest of my life

This was also NOT crime related my job or school status had no direct or indirect bearing on my alleged crime.

I also am physically and mentally disabled per my full disability awarded by the United States Social Security Administration which prevents my full time work by order of a United States governmental Agency which is higher up the chain of command than Snohomish County Court WA State but my long standing and verifiable mental disabilities make full time schooling impossible for me so for these reasons condition # 19 is unconstitutional and there for must be removed immediately.

condition # 27 participate in substance abuse treatment as per CCO once again this was NOT crime related no allegations of drug use

(X)

condition # 29 living arrangements and employment must be approved by ccc
My alleged crime had no bearing
Director otherwise on my
place of residence or employment
I held a place of residence
That was not where this alleged
crime occurred it is therefore
not a crime related condition
Therefore unconstitutional & must be
removed

The court also overstepped the
legal bounds by ordering me to
participate in chemical dependence
evaluation

This is not a condition that
bears any direct relation to
my alleged crime it is therefore
unconstitutional and must be removed

④

I would ALSO ASK you To
Waive All ordered fines, court cost
And Any other LFO'S Related in This
case

AS The court ordered Me To
serve 198 Months to life to be
served after My sentence of 107
Months To life in case #11-1-00709-6
is served

This Totals a Minimum Sentence
of 25 years even with 10% good time
I will NOT be eligible for release
untill 11-27-2033 That is 20
years and 8 month from now

This Means I will be 50 years old
At my earliest possible release date.
I am already seriously physical
And Mentally Disabled as it is
I was already unable To work
any gainfull employment for 2 1/2 year
before I was Arrested And if
you Think To Add The Next 20
years on top of it I am sure
you can see That My possibility
to be Able To Repay The legal
system for This cause is Not
likely Now or in The future
So please Consider Taking The

GRIEVANCE AGAINST A LAWYER

RECEIVED



NOV 21 2011

WSBA OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL

Office of Disciplinary Counsel
Washington State Bar Association
1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 600
Seattle, WA 98101-2539

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

- Read our information sheet Lawyer Discipline in Washington before you complete this form...
If you have a disability or need assistance with filing a grievance, call us at (206) 727-8207.
If you prefer to file online, visit http://www.wsba.org.

INFORMATION ABOUT YOU

INFORMATION ABOUT THE LAWYER

Kinzie Jeffery M
Last Name, First Name, Middle Initial
Jeff Kinzie - 351612 -
Address
Snobomish county Jail - Everett
City, State, and Zip Code WA 98201
None - in Jail -
Phone Number
P.O. box 1452 Monroe WA 98272
Alternate Address, City, State, and Zip Code
None - in Jail
Alternate Phone Number
in Jail - No access
Email Address

Trueblood Cassie C
Last Name, First Name
1721 Hewitt Ave
Address
Everett WA 98201
City, State, and Zip Code
425-339-6300 ext # 274
Phone Number
37829
Bar Number (if known)

INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR GRIEVANCE

Describe your relationship to the lawyer who is the subject of your grievance:

- I am a client
I am a former client
I am an opposing party

- I am an opposing lawyer
Other:

Is there a court case related to your grievance? X YES NO

If yes, what is the case name and file number?

11-1-00709-4 & 11-1-00710-8

Explain your grievance in your own words. Give all important dates, times, places, and court file numbers. Attach additional pages, if necessary. Attach copies (not your originals) of any relevant documents.

I have had Cassie Trueblood on my court cases - #11-1-00709-4 & 11-1-00710-8 since 3-18-11 in this time Ms. Trueblood has threatened me both with saying she knew a lot of people in prison who would gladly kill someone with charges like mine she told me if I took the deal she would not let a bunch of prisoners know about me, she also said if I did not take her deal she would make shure she did whatever it takes she would do whatever she could to see I went to prison & lost my court cases - witch she has done to one case by burying evidence & a witness that would prove my roommate did the same thing. I am accused of not even an hr. before - and has refused every attempt I have made to gain useful legal info or prepare any kind of defence. She keeps telling me to shut up that she knows I am guilty. and she turned to me after I lost my case & said - Guess you know why you dont want to threaten your attorney.

AFFIRMATION

I affirm that the information I am providing is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge. I have read Lawyer Discipline in Washington and I understand that the content of my grievance can be disclosed to the lawyer.

Signature: Jeffery Kinzie Date: 11-19-11

Since you might just loose because a
it - refering to several alleged threat
I made to another inmate in
June & July about killing her & her
loved ones.

Now this is only a short list of
things that Cassie true blood has
done more recently she changed
tactics & after asking if I found
her attractive - I said yes - she
then propositioned me offering to
marry me if I pled guilty to my
other case - to which I responded full
her she was absolutely Fing Nuts I
then ended our P.V..

Now I dont know where her personal
interest lays in these cases but obvious
she dose have a personal stake in
seeing me convicted and I am
just about out of patence with her
illegal, immoral, abusive, and
strangly psycotic behavior. I have
tried to have her removed by
both the courts & the public def's
office all to no avail. So please
let us do whatever we can to ensure
these injustices & improper behavior can not
continue. Thank you for your time

→ CC 6/17/10 11-12-11