FILED
SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
7/9/2018 1:42 PM
BY SUSAN L. CARLSON
CLERK

SUPREME COURT NO. 96023-2

### SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Respondent,

٧.

RICHARD CHARLES WHITAKER,

Petitioner.

### ANSWER TO PETITION FOR REVIEW AND CROSS-PETITION

DANIEL T. SATTERBERG King County Prosecuting Attorney

DONNA L. WISE Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorney Attorneys for Respondent

> King County Prosecuting Attorney W554 King County Courthouse 516 3rd Avenue Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 477-9497

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	, F	Page
Α	IDENTITY OF RESPONDENT	1
B.	COURT OF APPEALS DECISION	1
C.	ADDITIONAL ISSUE PRESENTED FOR REVIEW	1
D.	STATEMENT OF THE CASE	2
E.	ARGUMENT	2
	<ol> <li>ANY ERROR IN THE ANSWER TO THE JURY QUESTION WAS INVITED BY WHITAKER AND CANNOT BE THE BASIS FOR REVERSAL</li> </ol>	3
F.	CONCLUSION	4

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Table of Cases

Page

## A IDENTITY OF RESPONDENT

The State of Washington is the Respondent in this case.

## B. <u>COURT OF APPEALS DECISION</u>

The Court of Appeals decision at issue is <u>State v. Whitaker</u>, No. 76128-5-I, filed June 11, 2018 (unpublished).

## C. ADDITIONAL ISSUE PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

If this Court accepts review of this case, the State seeks cross-review of the following additional issue the State raised in the Court of Appeals, which was not reached by that court:

1. The Court of Appeals concluded that the trial court's response to a jury question regarding justifiable homicide was an accurate statement of the law. As an alternative ground to affirm, the State renews its argument that because Whitaker advocated for and approved the original instruction on justifiable homicide and approved the answer to the jury question, any error in the answer was invited error.

### D. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Defendant Richard Whitaker was convicted of murder in the second degree with a firearm enhancement and unlawful possession of a firearm in the first degree. CP 65-67, 81-82. The relevant facts are set forth in the State's briefing before the Court of Appeals. Brief of Respondent at 3-8.

The Court of Appeals affirmed the convictions in a unanimous unpublished opinion. State v. Whitaker, 76128-5-I (Wash. Ct. App. June 11, 2018) (unpublished).

## E. <u>ARGUMENT</u>

The State's briefing at the Court of Appeals adequately responds to the issues raised by Whitaker in his petition for review.

If review is accepted, the State seeks cross-review of an alternative argument it raised in the Court of Appeals but that the court's decision did not address. RAP 13.4(d); Whitaker, slip op. at 8 n.2. The provisions of RAP 13.4(b) are inapplicable because the State is not seeking review, and believes that review by this Court is unnecessary. However, if this Court grants review, in the interests of justice and full consideration of the issues, this Court

also should grant review of the alternative argument raised by the State in the Court of Appeals, that any instructional error was invited error. RAP 1.2(a); RAP 13.7(b). That argument is set forth below.

 ANY ERROR IN THE ANSWER TO THE JURY QUESTION WAS INVITED BY WHITAKER AND CANNOT BE THE BASIS FOR REVERSAL.

Even if the answer to the jury question could have been confusing and was error, Whitaker is precluded from seeking reversal on that basis, because he invited the claimed error. Instruction 15, which defines justifiable homicide, was the instruction that he proposed. CP 24, 48. He joined in the drafting of the answer to the jury question about the components of justifiable homicide and specifically agreed to the language used. 10/13/16 (corrected) RP 7-8.1

A defendant who invites error may not claim on appeal that he is entitled to reversal based on that error. State v. Studd, 137 Wn.2d 533, 546, 973 P.2d 1049 (1999). The invited error doctrine bars relief even as to an instructional error of constitutional

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> As to the report of proceedings for October 13, 2016, pages 125-31 were replaced by a version of the transcript corrected by the trial court, by order of the Court of Appeals; that corrected transcript is referenced as 10/13/16 (corrected) RP.

magnitude. <u>State v. Henderson</u>, 114 Wn.2d 867, 870, 792 P.2d 514 (1990). The invited error doctrine applies to self defense instructions. <u>Studd</u>, 137 Wn.2d at 546-47; <u>State v. Woods</u>, 138 Wn. App. 191, 197, 156 P.3d 309 (2007).

Invited error is not a bar to review of a separate claim of ineffective assistance of counsel. <u>Studd</u>, 137 Wn.2d at 550-51. That claim must be analyzed separately.

## F. CONCLUSION

The State respectfully asks that the petition for review be denied. However, if review is granted, in the interests of justice the State seeks cross-review of the issue identified in Sections C and E, supra.

DATED this \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ day of July, 2018.

Respectfully submitted,

DANIEL T. SATTERBERG
King County Prosecuting Attorney

### KING COUNTY PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE - APPELLATE UNIT

July 09, 2018 - 1:42 PM

### **Transmittal Information**

Filed with Court: Supreme Court

**Appellate Court Case Number:** 96023-2

**Appellate Court Case Title:** State of Washington v. Richard Charles Whitaker

**Superior Court Case Number:** 16-1-00019-0

### The following documents have been uploaded:

960232\_Answer\_Reply\_20180709134135SC075862\_9469.pdf

This File Contains:

Answer/Reply - Answer to Petition for Review

The Original File Name was 96023-2 - Answer to Petition for Review and Cross-Petition.pdf

### A copy of the uploaded files will be sent to:

- Sloanej@nwattorney.net
- dobsonlaw@comcast.net
- nelsond@nwattorney.net
- paoappellateunitmail@kingcounty.gov

#### **Comments:**

Sender Name: Wynne Brame - Email: wynne.brame@kingcounty.gov

Filing on Behalf of: Donna Lynn Wise - Email: donna.wise@kingcounty.gov (Alternate Email: )

### Address:

King County Prosecutor's Office - Appellate Unit W554 King County Courthouse, 516 Third Avenue

Seattle, WA, 98104 Phone: (206) 477-9497

Note: The Filing Id is 20180709134135SC075862