

92841-0

Thu 2/25/2016 1:03 PM

**FILED**  
E MAR 2 2016 CRB  
WASHINGTON STATE  
SUPREME COURT

**NO.**

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON**

**STATE OF WASHINGTON**

**Respondent**

**v.**

**MICHAEL FREDERICK WELLS**

**Petitioner**

**PETITION FOR REVIEW**

**JAMES J. SOWDER**  
**WSBA# 9072**  
**Attorney for Petitioner**  
**1600 Daniels Street**  
**P. O. Box 27**  
**Vancouver, WA 98666-0027**  
**(360) 695-4792**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

A.	Identity of Petitioner	1
B.	Court of Appeals Decision	1
C.	Issues Presented for Review	1
D.	Statement of the Case	3
E.	Argument why Review Should be Accepted	5
F.	Conclusion	8
G.	Appendix	10
	Court of Appeals Decision	11

## TABLE OF CASES

<u>State v. Keodara</u> , ___ Wn. App. ___ (No. 70518-1-I, December 7, 2015)	2
<u>State v. Thein</u> , 138 Wn.2d 139 (1999)	5
<u>State v. Sanchez</u> , 74 Wn. App. 763 (1994)	8

### **A. IDENTITY OF PETITIONER**

Michael Frederick Wells asks this court to accept review of the Court of Appeals decision terminating review designated in Part B of this petition.

### **B. COURT OF APPEALS DECISION**

Petitioner is asking this court to review the Court of Appeals, Division II decision reversing the trial court's suppression order in State v. Michael Frederick Wells, COA No. 46818-2-II, filed January 26, 2016 (Attached as Appendix A). The trial court ruled the affidavit for search warrant did not support probable cause to search Mr. Wells' vehicle. There was no nexus between the arrest of the passenger of the vehicle, who in a search incident to arrest controlled substances were discovered in her purse, and Petitioner's vehicle to find probable cause to search the vehicle.

### **C. ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW**

1. Was there substantial evidence to support the trial courts findings of fact and order granting suppression and as a result should not be disturbed by the Court of Appeals?
2. Did the trial court abuse its discretion in finding a fact supporting its decision to suppress by making a decision that is manifestly unreasonable or a decision that is on untenable grounds for untenable reasons, and therefore should not be disturbed by the Court of Appeals?
3. Does the findings of fact made by the trial court support its conclusion of

lack of probable cause to detain Mr. Wells to search his vehicle, and therefore the trial court's decision should not be disturbed by the Court of Appeals.

4. Was the trial court's decision to suppress supported by substantial evidence and not manifestly unreasonable or made for untenable grounds for untenable reasons.

5. Considering the totality of the circumstances did (1) Mr. Wells' mere association with a suspected drug dealer, (2) Mr. Wells' prior drug convictions from over 10 years ago, (3) the fact that Mr. Wells had marijuana in his vehicle, and (4) the arrest of the passenger on a warrant and in a search incident to arrest controlled substances were discovered in her purse provide probable cause for the search of Mr. Wells' vehicle?

6. The Court of Appeals decision in this case is in conflict with State v. Keodara, \_\_\_ Wn. App. \_\_\_ (Court of Appeals, Division I, No. 70518-1-I, December 7, 2015). In Keodara the court held the warrant is invalid because there was no specific nexus between the events alleged to have occurred and the items authorized to be searched (cell phone). In Mr. Wells' case the search warrant allowed the officers to search for controlled substances anywhere in the vehicle, search for cell phones, and any electronic storage devices, as well as all locked containers. The issuing magistrate accepted the affiant's generalized descriptions of innocuous events such as associations by Mr. Wells with a suspected drug dealer at a donut shop to conclude there was probable cause to search his vehicle.

By accepting broad conclusionary statements of the affiant in a search warrant affidavit the particularity requirement of the Fourth Amendment is not satisfied. At page 8, of the search warrant affidavit in Mr. Wells' case the officer states his general observations of Mr. Wells and the passenger who was arrested, Nora Thomas. The officer states his knowledge through training and experience to conclude there is probable cause to search the vehicle and all locked and unlocked containers, including cell phones, although cell phones were not searched in this case.

7. The determination for probable cause to search Mr. Wells' car is based on Mr. Wells' associations without a nexus to specific illegal activity in the car.

#### **D. STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

The statement of the case is contained in the trial court's findings of fact and conclusions of law on petitioner's motion to suppress and order of dismissal.

A confidential informant informed the police Brian Valdez was selling methamphetamine. The police conducted surveillance on Valdez and observed him park at a Krispy Kreme Donuts in Vancouver, Clark County, Washington. The police observed Petitioner's Camaro drive in the same parking lot. Valdez exited his vehicle and sat in Petitioner's Camaro for approximately two minutes.

The surveillance team did not observe any exchange of items between Valdez and Petitioner. A woman accompanied Valdez and a woman later identified as Nora Thomas accompanied Petitioner. The women entered the

Krispy Kreme Donut shop while Valdez was in Petitioner's vehicle. The women exited Krispy Kreme and one woman entered the vehicle of Valdez and Nora Thomas entered Petitioner's vehicle. Sergeant Hoss maintained surveillance on the Camaro and followed it to the Goodwill Store in Hazel Dell, Clark County, Washington. Sergeant Hoss observed the petitioner and Nora Thomas go inside the Goodwill Store for approximately one hour then left in the Camaro. Sergeant Hoss followed the Camaro and stopped Petitioner when he observed the vehicle's rear tire hit a curb. When Sergeant Hoss approached the vehicle he observed Nora Thomas was not wearing a seat belt. Upon issuing an infraction for not wearing a seat belt he discovered Nora Thomas had an outstanding warrant from the Department of Corrections. Sergeant Hoss asked Nora Thomas to step out of the vehicle which she did while holding her purse. Sergeant Hoss searched her purse incident to arrest based on the outstanding warrant and discovered a methamphetamine pipe and a small amount of methamphetamine consistent with personal use.

Detective Stevens arrived at the scene and observed a small metal safe on the floor in front of the driver's seat of Mr. Wells' vehicle and a zippered bank pouch wedged between the driver's seat and the center console. As part of the search warrant affidavit the affiant reported Detective Stevens, based on his training and experience, believed these items are often used to store/hide controlled substances and money by narcotic dealers. Petitioner was questioned

and admitted he had a small amount of marijuana in the vehicle but denied any other controlled substances. The officers searched petitioner and Nora Thomas' criminal histories and learned each had convictions for possession of controlled substance. Detective Stevens requested a K-9 Unit to conduct a sniff of the vehicle. The vehicle was detained but Petitioner was advised he was free to go.

Officer Starbuck arrived with K-9, Ory who was trained prior to Initiative 502 and would give an affirmative alert to a wide variety of controlled substances including marijuana. K-9 Ory demonstrated an affirmative alert to the odor of drugs at the passenger side door handle, bottom seam of the driver's side door near the rear of the rear of the door and the bottom front portion of the passenger door seam.

A search warrant was granted and when executed methamphetamine, marijuana, a scale and approximately \$12,000 in cash was discovered. The controlled substances were found in the small black Sentry Safe brand lockbox. The marijuana was located by the driver's seat and additional controlled substances were located in the trunk.

#### **E. ARGUMENT WHY REVIEW SHOULD BE ACCEPTED**

The decision of the Court of Appeals is in conflict with another decision of the Court of Appeals, State v. Keodara, \_\_\_ Wn. App. \_\_\_ (Court of Appeals, Division I, No. 70518-1-I, December 7, 2015). It is also in conflict with the decision of the Supreme Court in State v. Thein, 138 Wn.2d 139 (1999). Both

cases stand for the proposition that a search warrant cannot be based on generalized descriptions of innocuous events and conclusory statements of law officers. Keodara, as in other cases, required a specific nexus between the events alleged to have occurred and the items requested to be searched; in Keodara it was a cell phone.

In petitioners case the judge issuing the search warrant concluded that based on petitioners association with Mr. Valdez (drug dealer), the petitioner's prior felony drug convictions in 2002, the arrest of the passenger of the vehicle who had controlled substances in her purse, and the K-9 sniff of the vehicle by a dog trained prior to Initiative 502 who may have alerted to marijuana in the vehicle, there was probable cause to search the vehicle.

None of the above shows a nexus of illegal activity to the vehicle which is probable cause to believe controlled substance or evidence of a crime would be within the vehicle. The state is arguing guilt by association is a sufficient basis to search a vehicle.

The issues presented by petitioner are significant under the state and federal constitutions. The particularity requirement of the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution and Article 1, § 7 of the State Constitution is in respect to the private affairs of a citizen in the state of Washington. As noted in the above paragraph petitioner has mere association with a person of interest to the drug task force and a dated history of drug convictions. Individually or

combined none of the factors mentioned in the affidavit for search warrant are sufficient to find a nexus of criminal activity to justify a search of petitioner's vehicle.

It is also a matter of substantial public interest that should be determined by the Supreme Court the nexus of alleged criminal activity required to issue a search warrant.

The search warrant for petitioner's Camaro authorized the officers to search for paraphernalia, cell phones, storage devices which included memory, sim cards, incoming calls, outgoing calls, text messages, and voicemail. The items were to be "examined and analyzed by a trained detective and generated into an examination report for evidence purposes." There is absolutely no restraint as to what the officers can do with this evidence. The warrant also authorized the officers to look for stolen property such as jewelry which has no connection whatsoever to the police monitoring Valdez; and all locked containers capable of containing evidence in the above listed crimes.

If this case is allowed to stand it opens a wide door for the search of all possible cell phone items, electronic items, and in general any items within the vehicle merely because of petitioner's prior drug convictions and a passenger who was arrested on a DOC warrant, not associated with petitioner's vehicle, and in a search incident to her arrest drugs were discovered in her purse.

Finally, the Supreme Court should accept this case for review because the

trial court made a decision supported by substantial evidence and there is no authority for the Court of Appeals to disturb based on the officers conclusionary statements of alleged drug dealing. The trial court did not abuse its discretion in making its decision to suppress. The trial court's decision is not manifestly unreasonable or based on untenable grounds for untenable reasons.


#### F. CONCLUSION

The Supreme Court should grant review of the Court of Appeals, Division II, decision over-turning the trial court's decision supported by substantial evidence and the states lack of evidence presented by the state of a nexus of criminal activity to the petitioner and his vehicle. The mere fact he has a passenger in the vehicle who has controlled substance should not "open the door" to the search of his vehicle by conclusionary statements of petitioners associations by officers. The K-9 sniff is of no merit because (1) the dog was trained to alert to the odor of marijuana (which is legal) and (2) K-9's smell odors and an odor is not testable. An odor should not provide probable cause to search houses, containers, or vehicles. There is no way of knowing how old the odor may be given the dogs sensitivity of smell. Just because there is an odor it does not lead to an inference there are drugs of substance; "some does not mean more." In State v. Sanchez, 74 Wn. App. 763 (1994) the court held probable cause to believe an informant obtained drugs from the house does not give enough to believe under the facts presented that "some means more."

Petitioner maintains the stop was a pretext stop and should be a basis for review by the Supreme Court. Petitioner requests that this Court accept his case for review.

DATED this 25 day of February, 2016.

Respectfully submitted,

  
JAMES J. SOWDER WSBA# 9072  
Attorney for Petitioner

# APPENDIX

January 26, 2016

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON**

**DIVISION II**

STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Appellant,

v.

MICHAEL FREDERICK WELLS,

Respondent.

No. 46818-2-II

UNPUBLISHED OPINION

JOHANSON, C.J. — The State of Washington appeals the trial court orders granting Michael Wells’s motion to suppress the evidence obtained during the search of his vehicle and dismissing the case for insufficient evidence. The State argues that the trial court erred by excluding the drug dog’s alerts when determining whether probable cause supported the search warrant and by concluding that the circumstances did not establish probable cause to issue the search warrant. We hold that even without considering the drug dog’s alerts, the search warrant affidavit was sufficient to establish probable cause. We also reject Wells’s argument that we should affirm on alternative grounds because the officers unlawfully expanded the scope of the search to allow for the drug dog’s search, and we hold that Wells’s claim that there was a material omission in the search warrant affidavit has no merit. Accordingly, we reverse the trial court and remand for further proceedings.

## FACTS

### I. BACKGROUND

On September 10, 2013, law enforcement officers were conducting a surveillance operation focused on Brian Valdez after a confidential informant had informed the police that Valdez was selling methamphetamine. While surveilling Valdez, the officers observed him park at a donut shop. Wells then arrived and parked his vehicle next to Valdez. Valdez got into Wells's vehicle. After about 20 minutes, two females came out of the donut shop. Valdez returned to his vehicle, and Wells left with one of the women.<sup>1</sup>

An officer followed Wells to a Goodwill Store. Wells and his passenger, Nora Thomas, spent more than an hour in the store. When Wells and Thomas eventually left the store, the officer followed them and stopped the vehicle after observing Wells's vehicle swerving and its rear tire hitting a curb. Upon stopping the vehicle, the officer observed that Thomas was not wearing her seatbelt and then determined she had an outstanding warrant "stemming from a Possession of a Controlled Substance charge." Clerk's Papers (CP) at 17. Thomas also had a prior conviction for possession of a controlled substance. The officer arrested Thomas on the warrant, searched her purse, and found what appeared to be a methamphetamine pipe and a small amount of methamphetamine inside the purse.

Another officer observed "a small metal safe/lockbox" on the vehicle's floor in front of the driver's seat and a zippered bank pouch wedged between the driver's seat and the center console. CP at 17. When the officers questioned Wells, he admitted there was a small amount of marijuana,

---

<sup>1</sup> In the search warrant affidavit, the officers did not describe observing Valdez and Wells exchanging any items.

No. 46818-2-II

about the size of a quarter, in the vehicle. The officers learned that Wells also had at least four prior convictions for possession of controlled substances. They then requested a K-9 unit to conduct a sniff of the vehicle.

The K-9 officer arrived with his dog Ory, who was trained prior to the effective date of Initiative 502.<sup>2</sup> Ory was trained to alert to “methamphetamine, crack cocaine, cocaine, marijuana[,] and heroin,” and he was capable of detecting “minuscule amounts” of these substances. CP at 19. Ory could not, however, communicate which substance he detected or how much of the substance was present. Ory alerted to “the passenger side door handle, the bottom seam of the driver’s side door near the rear of the door, and the bottom front portion of the passenger door seam.” CP at 20.

Based on the facts described above, the officers obtained a search warrant allowing them to search the vehicle. The officers found 1.6 grams of marijuana by the driver’s seat, methamphetamine and heroin in the trunk, a scale, and \$12,030.

## II. PROCEDURE

The State charged Wells with two counts of possession of a controlled substance with intent to deliver (methamphetamine and heroin). Wells moved to suppress the evidence found during the vehicle search. He argued that (1) the initial stop was pretextual, (2) the officers unlawfully exceeded the scope of the traffic stop, (3) the dog sniff could not have led to probable cause because

---

<sup>2</sup> Initiative 502, effective December 6, 2012, legalized marijuana for recreational use, thus decriminalizing the possession of small amounts of marijuana for individuals over 21 years of age. LAWS OF 2013, ch. 3, § 20; *see also* RCW 69.50.4013(3). Wells could legally possess one ounce of useable marijuana. RCW 69.50.4013(3), .360(3)(a).

Ory could have smelled the drugs found on Thomas or the legal marijuana Wells said was in the vehicle, and (4) there were deliberate omissions in the search warrant affidavit.<sup>3</sup>

The trial court entered a written order granting the motion to suppress. In the written order granting the motion, the trial court stated,

Ory's positive alert when he sniffed the car does not establish probable cause. "Generally an 'alert' by a trained drug dog is sufficient to establish probable cause for the presence of a controlled substance." *State v. Jackson*, 82 Wn. App. 594, 606[, 918 P.2d 945] (1996). However, "Ory was trained and certified prior to the effective date of Initiative 502. Ory is trained in the detection of methamphetamine, crack cocaine, cocaine, marijuana, and heroin. Ory cannot communicate which of these substances he has detected." *Search Warrant Affidavit* at 7. Further the dog cannot determine the quantity of any controlled substance. Thus, *a positive alert does not show probable cause absent evidence to suggest the dog alerted to something other than the marijuana in the car, or the methamphetamine that was already found in Ms. Thomas'[s] purse.* In contrast to the nexus established in *Maddox*<sup>4</sup> by the sale of methamphetamine to a confidential informant inside the defendant's home, no factual information in the affidavit shows a nexus between criminal activity and Mr. Wells'[s] vehicle. The only criminal activity connected to the defendant was erratic driving. Without a factual nexus, the evidence obtained pursuant to the warrant must be suppressed.

....  
In this case, *dog's alert must be excluded from a review of probable cause* since, as stated above, Ory cannot communicate whether he has detected marijuana or a different drug, and no other evidence suggests what substance he alerted to.

---

<sup>3</sup> Specifically, Wells asserted that the affidavit deliberately omitted the following information, which was present in one of the officers' written reports:

Nora Thomas came out of the [Goodwill] store and started walking around the parking lot. A vehicle pulled up to Nora and she got into the passenger side of the vehicle. This vehicle was parked on the north area of the parking lot. Less than 5 minutes later Nora got out of the vehicle and went back into the store and the vehicle left.

CP at 11 (emphasis omitted). Wells argued that this information would have shown that there was "no nexus between the defendant and Nora Thomas's activities in the Goodwill parking lot," that she was "acting independently of the defendant," and that there was no connection between the drugs in her purse and the vehicle. CP at 11.

<sup>4</sup> *State v. Maddox*, 152 Wn.2d 499, 505, 98 P.3d 1199 (2004).

No. 46818-2-II

The other facts in this case do not show a nexus connecting Mr. Wells'[s] vehicle to criminal activity.

CP at 67-69 (emphasis added).

The trial court also issued written findings of fact and conclusions of law. The written findings of fact are described in the facts section above and were consistent with the facts stated in the search warrant affidavit. In its written conclusions of law, the trial court stated, *inter alia*, that Ory's positive alert did not establish probable cause because he was also trained to alert to marijuana, a legal substance, and could not have determined the quantity of marijuana and that the suspicious activity alone does not rise to the level of probable cause. The trial court then concluded that because the evidence was suppressed, there was insufficient evidence to go to trial and dismissed the case for insufficient evidence.

The trial court also concluded that the stop was not pretextual. Although there was discussion during the suppression hearing about whether the officers had lawfully expanded the scope of the search to allow the dog sniff, the trial court did not enter any findings of fact or conclusions of law addressing this issue. The trial court did not reach the material omission argument.<sup>5</sup>

The State appeals.

---

<sup>5</sup> Wells raised this issue in his motion to dismiss, but the trial court did not address this issue. We address it here in the interest of judicial economy.

## ANALYSIS

### I. LEGAL STANDARDS

“We review de novo the trial court’s legal conclusion of whether evidence meets the probable cause standard.” *State v. Powell*, 181 Wn. App. 716, 723, 326 P.3d 859 (citing *State v. Neth*, 165 Wn.2d 177, 182, 196 P.3d 658 (2008)), *review denied*, 181 Wn.2d 1011 (2014). Although we apply a de novo review standard, we also give great deference to the issuing judge’s assessment of probable cause and resolve any doubts in favor of the search warrant’s validity. *Powell*, 181 Wn. App. at 723 (citing *State v. Chenoweth*, 160 Wn.2d 454, 477, 158 P.3d 595 (2007)). The issuing judge “is entitled to make reasonable inferences from the facts and circumstances set out in the affidavit.” *State v. Maddox*, 152 Wn.2d 499, 505, 98 P.3d 1199 (2004). When reviewing the issuing judge’s decision to issue a search warrant, our review is limited to the four corners of the affidavit. *Neth*, 165 Wn.2d at 182.

A judge may issue a search warrant only if the affidavit establishes probable cause. *State v. Thein*, 138 Wn.2d 133, 140, 977 P.2d 582 (1999). To establish probable cause, the affidavit supporting the search warrant must “set[ ] forth facts and circumstances sufficient to establish a reasonable inference that the defendant is probably involved in criminal activity and that evidence of the crime can be found at the place to be searched.” *Thein*, 138 Wn.2d at 140. The affidavit must establish “a nexus between criminal activity and the item to be seized, and also a nexus between the item to be seized and the place to be searched.” *Thein*, 138 Wn.2d at 140 (quoting *State v. Goble*, 88 Wn. App. 503, 509, 945 P.2d 263 (1997)).

## II. PROBABLE CAUSE

The State argues that the trial court erred in concluding that the search warrant affidavit was not sufficient to establish probable cause.<sup>6</sup> Even excluding the dog-sniff evidence,<sup>7</sup> we agree.

The affidavit showed that (1) Wells had had recent contact with an individual suspected of selling methamphetamine, although the search warrant affidavit did not suggest that the surveillance team observed any exchange of items between Wells and Valdez, (2) Wells admitted that there was a small amount of marijuana in the vehicle, (3) Wells had several prior convictions for unlawful possession of a controlled substance, (4) Thomas's purse contained a small amount of methamphetamine and a methamphetamine pipe, (5) Thomas was arrested on an outstanding warrant related to a drug offense, (6) Thomas had a prior conviction for unlawful possession of a controlled substance, and (7) the officers observed a small metal safe on the floor in front of the driver's seat and a zippered bank pouch between the driver's seat and the center console.

---

<sup>6</sup> Specifically, the State argues that the trial court (1) failed to accord the issuing magistrate the proper level of deference, (2) reviewed the search warrant in a hyper-technical manner by reviewing whether each individual fact in isolation was sufficient to establish probable cause rather than considering the affidavit as a whole, and (3) improperly resolved doubts concerning the existence of probable cause against the search warrant's validity. But because we review the trial court's assessment of probable cause to issue a search warrant issue de novo, we do not address these specific allegations. *Neth*, 165 Wn.2d at 182.

<sup>7</sup> Because we hold that the search warrant affidavit was adequate without considering the dog sniff and because we review the trial court's assessment of probable cause de novo, we need not address whether the trial court should have considered the dog-sniff evidence. Furthermore, although Wells asserts that the trial court refused to consider the dog sniff, the trial court's conclusion of law 4 and its statements in its order granting the motion to suppress demonstrate that the trial court considered this information—it merely determined that it did not establish probable cause. *See* CP at 68 (“[A] positive alert does not show probable cause absent evidence to suggest the dog alerted to something other than the marijuana in the car, or the methamphetamine that was already found in Ms. Thomas'[s] purse.”); CP at 74 (“K-9 dog Ory's positive alert when he sniffed the vehicle does not establish probable cause.”).

The existence of the prior convictions for unlawful possession of a controlled substance, Wells's admitted possession of marijuana, and Thomas's possession of methamphetamine and a methamphetamine pipe demonstrated that Wells and Thomas were likely drug users. *State v. Vickers*, 148 Wn.2d 91, 111 n.51, 59 P.3d 58 (2002) ("Prior convictions may be used as one *factor* when determining probable cause. *See State v. Clark*, 143 Wn.2d 731, 749, 24 P.3d 1006 (2001)) (emphasis added). But the fact that Wells and Thomas were likely drug users does not, alone, establish a nexus between the item to be seized (controlled substances) and the place to be searched (Wells's vehicle).

However, several factors supported a finding of probable cause to believe that Wells's vehicle contained illegal controlled substances: observing Wells with a suspected drug dealer, Wells's admission that there was marijuana in his vehicle, the small metal safe on the floor by the driver's seat, the zippered bank pouch near the driver's seat, and Thomas's possession of drugs while inside the vehicle. Although no single factor is sufficient, when we consider the factors as a whole, we are convinced probable cause exists. Given our deferential treatment of the issuing magistrate's decision and that we resolve any doubts in favor of the search warrant's validity,<sup>8</sup> we hold that these factors are sufficient to establish a reasonable inference that Wells or Thomas were probably involved in criminal activity and that evidence of this activity could be found in the vehicle. Accordingly, the trial court erred in concluding that the search warrant affidavit did not establish probable cause.

---

<sup>8</sup> *Powell*, 181 Wn. App. at 723.

### III. WELLS'S ALTERNATIVE GROUNDS ARGUMENT

Wells argues that we should affirm the trial court on alternative grounds. Specifically, he argues that the detention of the vehicle to allow for the dog sniff violated his constitutional rights because it exceeded the time needed to issue the infraction. Because we hold that there was sufficient evidence to establish probable cause to search the vehicle without reference to the dog sniff, this argument does not show that the magistrate erred in issuing the warrant.

### IV. DELIBERATE OMISSION ISSUE

Finally, even though the trial court did not reach Wells's deliberate omission argument, we do so here in the interest of judicial economy. Even presuming that Wells showed that the officers deliberately or recklessly omitted the information about Thomas engaging in suspicious behavior outside the Goodwill store while Wells remained in the store, this argument has no merit.

If the issue is a deliberate or reckless omission in a search warrant affidavit, "those omitted matters are considered as part of the affidavit." *State v. Garrison*, 118 Wn.2d 870, 873, 827 P.2d 1388 (1992). "If the affidavit with the matter . . . inserted . . . remains sufficient to support a finding of probable cause, the suppression motion fails." *Garrison*, 118 Wn.2d at 873.

Here, although Thomas's behavior outside the Goodwill store did not directly implicate Wells, it did provide additional evidence that Thomas may have been engaged in drug-related activities during the time she was with Wells, which increases the probability that there would be drug evidence in Wells's vehicle after they left the Goodwill. Because this additional fact would increase, rather than decrease, the likelihood that evidence of a crime would be found in Wells's vehicle, Wells's omission argument has no merit.

No. 46818-2-II

Accordingly, we reverse the trial court's suppression order and remand for further proceedings.

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

*Johanson, C.J.*  
JOHANSON, C.J.

We concur:

*Worswick J*  
WORSWICK, J.

*Maxa, J.*  
MAXA, J.

**IN THE APPEALS COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON  
DIVISION II**

STATE OF WASHINGTON,	)	No.
Respondent,	)	
v.	)	DECLARATION OF
	)	SERVICE
MICHAEL FREDERICK WELLS,	)	
<u>Petitioner.</u>	)	

I, REBA D. GRAHAM, legal assistant to JAMES J. SOWDER, Attorney for Petitioner, certify and declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington, on the 25<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2016, I personally mailed the Petitioner's Petitioner for Review to David Ponzoha, Clerk, Court of Appeals, Division II, hand delivered a copy of the same to Aaron Bartlett, Deputy Prosecuting Attorney, and mailed a copy of the same to the petitioner, Michael Wells, at the below listed addresses.

David Ponzoha, Clerk  
Court of Appeals, Division II  
950 Broadway, Suite 300  
Tacoma, WA 98402

Michael Wells, DOC #742827  
Larch Corrections Center  
15314 NE Dole Valley Rd.  
Yacolt, WA 98675

Aaron Bartlett  
Deputy Prosecuting Attorney  
P O Box 5000  
Vancouver WA 98666-5000

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

DATED this 25<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2016.



REBA D. GRAHAM, Legal Assistant to  
JAMES J. SOWDER WSBA #9072  
Attorney for Petitioner