IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON DIVISION ONE

STATE	OF WASHINGTON,)	No. 73011-8-I	2016	
	Respondent,)			E 97
GARY	v.) CHARLES NESKEY,) Appellant.))))	UNPUBLISHED OPINION	ငာ	35
				II.	SEE.
				လ္	<u> </u>
)	FILED: July 18, 2016	25	A second

SCHINDLER, J. — For the first time on appeal, Gary Charles Neskey argues the mandatory deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) fee statute is unconstitutional as applied to an indigent defendant and violates equal protection. We considered and rejected the same arguments in <u>State v. Shelton</u>, No. 72848-2-I, slip op. at 1 (Wash. Ct. App. June 20, 2016), and <u>State v. Lewis</u>, No. 72637-4-I, slip op. at 1 (Wash. Ct. App. June 27, 2016).

Neskey also argues the court erred in ordering him to submit another DNA sample. But Neskey does not show the court abused its discretion in ordering him to submit a DNA sample. <u>Lewis</u>, slip op. at 10-11.

And because the statement of additional grounds does not inform us of the "nature and occurrence of [the] alleged errors," we do not consider it. RAP 10.10(c);

State v. Alvarado, 164 Wn.2d 556, 569, 192 P.3d 345 (2008).

We affirm the judgment and sentence.

WE CONCUR:

Duye, J.