

COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO
OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

FILED
COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION II

2014 MAR 21 PM 2:30

STATE OF WASHINGTON

BY _____
DEPUTY

STATE OF WASHINGTON)
)
 Respondent,)
)
 v.)
)
 THUMAS, SOPHIA F.)
 (your name))
)
 Appellant.)

No. 45101-8-II

STATEMENT OF ADDITIONAL
GROUNDS FOR REVIEW

I, SOPHIA F. THUMAS, 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

INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL- ATTACHED.

Additional Ground 2

JURY BIAS - ATTACHED.

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

Date: 3/21/14

Signature: Sophia F. Thomas

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
I certify that I mailed
1 copies of SAG
to K Proctor
& S Cunningham
3/21/14
Date Signed

COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO
OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE OF WASHINGTON)	
)	
Respondent,)	No. 45101-8-II
)	
v.)	
)	STATEMENT OF ADDITIONAL
THOMAS, SOPHIA F.)	GROUND FOR REVIEW
)	
Appellant.)	
_____)	

ADDITIONAL GROUND 1: INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL

My trial attorney's performance fell below an objective standard of reasonableness and, his performance gives rise to a reasonable probability that, had he performed adequately, the result would have been different.

My trial attorney failed to communicate each and every plea offer that the State provided. Had I been informed that the State had accepted my counter-offer, I would have accepted. In October of 2012, I received 2 job offers; one from Meteorcomm and one from Starbucks. The companies ran a pre-employment background check which showed an open status of criminal charges against me. Meteorcomm immediately withdrew their offer of employment but, Starbucks was willing to wait for my criminal case to be resolved so that I could begin work. I asked my trial attorney to inform the State that I was willing to plea to a drug charge but not a money laundering charge. Starbucks' application only required disclosure of crimes of dishonesty such as embezzlement and money laundering. My trial attorney never informed me that the State was willing to accept my counter-offer; therefore, I exercised my right to trial.

Starbucks eventually withdrew their offer of employment because they couldn't wait for my case to be resolved. I was informed, during the sentencing hearing, that the State was willing to accept my counter-offer, when the State discussed their bargaining attempts that I had allegedly rejected.

My trial attorney failed to inform me that I had an option to a bench or jury trial. He made a unilateral decision to try this case before a jury. Due to the esoteric and technical nature of my charges, I would've elected to try this case via a bench trial.

My trial attorney did not spend an adequate amount of time preparing my defense. He did not interview any of my witnesses; in fact, with the exception of my family, his first conversation with my witnesses was the day they testified. My sister and I made arrangements with my witnesses and my trial attorney to meet at my place of employment and my trial attorney failed to appear; however, a couple of my witnesses did appear. My sister and I provided questions to my trial attorney for the majority of my witnesses. Neither of us are attorneys. It is my opinion that, had he met with my witnesses prior to the day of their testimony, direct examination would've been detailed and effective.

My trial attorney was actively campaigning for a judicial seat in the City of Des Moines, County of King, State of Washington, during my pre-trial and trial phase. It is my belief that my case was an afterthought to him. He spent a minimal amount of time preparing my defense and focused all of his efforts upon his campaign.

ADDITIONAL GROUND 2: BIASED JUROR

One of the jurors is the ex-husband of my former co-worker and friend. They had a very tumultuous divorce. I brought this issue to the attention of my attorney and he failed to address it. Two of my witnesses also recognized the juror as the ex-husband of a co-worker and made attempts to discuss this situation with my trial attorney. Their attempts were not acknowledged and messages were not returned.

Date: 3/21/14

Sophia F. Thomas

Sophia F. Thomas, Appellant