

COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO
OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

FILED
COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION II

2014 MAR -5 PM 12:04

STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE OF WASHINGTON)
)
Respondent,)
)
v.)
)
William Caietti III)
(your name))
)
Appellant.)

No. 45306-1-II

BY lm
DEPUTY

STATEMENT OF ADDITIONAL
GROUNDS FOR REVIEW

~~I, William Caietti III~~, 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

On pg. 9 of Brief of Appellant under Findings of Facts, on pg. 10 the Judge concluded (see number 6) that I, the defendant, was present at my own sentencing under the 1998 Clallam cause and "was aware of the consecutive nature of his sentence." This assertion is factually incorrect. I was at the time ignorant of such a component during the entire proceedings of my trial and sentencing. And in fact, was not made aware of the "consecutive dilemma" until I received notification from WDOC, in 2012.

Additional Ground 2

Under Conclusions of Law, again I find the same language on pg. 11 (see number 5). I quote, "defendant was present at sentencing and was aware of the consecutive nature of the sentence, the defendant is not prejudiced by the correction of the sentence..." This is just not true. I had no knowledge of the consecutive nature of my sentence nor was I informed of such either by my then attorney or the prosecutor. Though I am now well aware of the current law regarding such, at the time of sentencing, I was unaware and uninformed.

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

Date: February 27, 2014

Signature: William Caietti III