1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6	OKANOGAN COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT					
7	FOR THE STATE OF WASHINGTON					
8 9	STATE OF WASHINGTON,))	Case No. 15-1-00202-1			
10	Plaintiff, v.))	MOTION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS ANDWARRANT IN AID OF WRIT OF			
1	JAMES FAIRE,)	HABEAS CORPUS			
12	Defendant.)				
13	Detendant.)				
4 5	1	I.O REI	MEDY BEING SOUGHT			
6	COMES NOW JAMES FAIRE, by and through counsel of record, Stephen Pidgeon, and					
7	MOVES this court for a Writ of Habeas Corpus in the form presented herewith together with an					
8	Order Issuing the Writ of Habeas Corpus and a Warrant in Aid of Writ of Habeas Corpus.					
9			2.0 BASIS			
20	A. Statement of Preliminary Facts					
21			10 2015 II. marketer interneteder immediateler and			
22			une 19, 2015. He was taken into custody immediately, and			
23	remains in custody in the Okanogan County Jail.					
24	An attorney was appointed to represent Mr. Faire on June 23, 2015. A Notice of Appearance					
25	was filed on June 24, 2015.					
An affidavit of indigency was filed by James Faire on June 29, 2015.						

MOTION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS AND WARRANT IN AID OF WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS - Page $1 \ {\rm of} \ 7$

1	On August 18, 2015, the attorney representing James Faire withdrew. Thereafter, Mr. Faire		
2	was not represented by counsel, but he remained in custody.		
3	Nonetheless, the Court continued with status hearings on September 14, 2015, October 12,		
4	2015, November 16, 2015, December 14, 2015, and entertained a motion to continue on December		
5 6	14, 2015, prior to Mr. Faire having new counsel provided. On November 16, 2015, the court		
7	considered a letter from James Faire to the court, Mr. Faire proceeding without benefit of counsel.		
8	B. Points and Authorities		
9	Where a man is not a free man in the commonly accepted sense, where he is in custody, he		
10	where a man is not a nee man in the commonly accepted sense, where he is in custody, he		
	falls within the reach of habeas corpus relief. Jones v. Cunningham, 371 U.S. 236, 9 L.Ed.2d 285,		
11 12	S.Ct. 373, 92 A.L.R.2d 675 (1963).		
12	In City of Tacoma v. Heater, 67 Wn.2d 733, 735-6, 409 P.2d 867 (1966), the Court citing		
14	Gideon v. Wainwright, 372 U.S. 335, 9 L.Ed.2d 799, 83 Sup. Ct. 792, states that the following		
15	portion of the Sixth Amendment was incorporated into the due process clause of the Fourteenth		
16	Amendment, and is therefore binding upon the states:		
17	In all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right to have the assistance of		
18 19	counsel for his defense. Gideon v. Wainwright, op. cit.		
20	Where the language of the state constitution is similar to that of the federal constitution, the		
21	language of the state constitutional provision should receive the same definition and interpretation as		
22	that which has been given to a like provision in the federal constitution by the United States Supreme		
23	Court. State v. Schoel, 54 Wn.2d 388, 341 P.2d 481. Consequently, the Gideon case, supra, means		
24	that every defendant has a constitutional right to counsel in all criminal prosecutions.		
25			
26			

MOTION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS AND WARRANT IN AID OF WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS - Page $2 \ {\rm of} \ 7$

A defendant's right to be heard through his own counsel is unqualified. *Chandler v. Fretag*,
 348 U.S. 3, 99 L.Ed. 4, 75 Sup. Ct. 1.

3	In Hamilton v. Alabama, 368 U.S. 52, 7 L.Ed.2d 114, 82 Sup. Ct. 157, a new test was devised			
4	to ascertain when the right to counsel attaches. The right arises "at any critical stage in a criminal			
5				
6	proceeding." In White v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 59, 10 L.Ed.2d 193, 83 Sup. Ct. 1050, the Supreme			
7	Court held that a preliminary hearing was a "critical stage" in the Maryland proceeding. The			
8	reason for the court's holding appeared to be that a defendant's plea of guilty entered in a preliminary			
9	hearing without counsel, could later in the trial on the merits be introduced in evidence against him.			
10	Thus, the court found that the preliminary hearing was a "critical stage" and required counsel to be			
11	appointed for the accused for a preliminary hearing.			
12	appointed for the accused for a premimary hearing.			
13	This is in accord with Haynes v. Washington, 373 U.S. 503, 10 L.Ed.2d 513, 83 Sup. Ct.			
14	1336, where state officers held an accused incommunicado for 19 hours and refused to permit him to			
15	make a telephone call to his wife or lawyer until after he confessed. The Supreme Court held that his			
16	confession was involuntary and inadmissible under the due process clause of the Fourteenth			
17	Amendment. City of Tacoma v. Heater, 67 Wn.2d 733, 737-8, 409 P.2d 867 (1966), citing Haynes,			
18				
19	supra.			
20	In the case In re Pettit v. Rhay, 62 Wn.2d 515, 383 P.2d 889, the rule of the Hamilton and			
21	White cases, supra, was applied in granting a writ of habeas corpus and setting aside a conviction.			
22	The Court held that a "critical stage in a criminal proceeding" arose at a preliminary hearing			
23	where the defendant was denied counsel and the evidence adduced in the preliminary hearing			
24	was used to convict him of the charge.			
25	was asea to convict min of the charge.			
26				

MOTION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS AND WARRANT IN AID OF WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS - Page ${\bf 3}$ of ${\bf 7}$

1	In State v. Krozel, 24 Conn. Supp. 266, 190 A.2d 61, a judgment of guilty was set aside, on		
2	the ground that the defendant had been denied his constitutional right to assistance of counsel. The		
3	defendant was arrested on suspicion of driving while intoxicated. He was taken to the police barracks		
4 5	and given sobriety tests, after which he was charged with the offense. The defendant's requests that		
6	he be allowed to call his attorney and his wife were denied. This refusal was based on the policy of		
7	the police department to forbid any accused suspected of intoxication to make a call or to use a		
8	telephone for a 4-hour period after his arrest. Here, the state has denied Mr. Faire counsel for nearly		
9	four months, and has considered statements of Mr. Faire on December 9, 2015, delivered to the court		
10	without benefit of counsel.		
11	In the case of <i>In re Newbern</i> , 175 Cal. App.2d 862, 1 Cal. Rptr. 80, 78 A.L.R.2d 901, the		
12 13	defendant was discharged from custody where he was denied an opportunity to procure a blood test		
13 14	on a charge of intoxication and thus was prevented from obtaining evidence necessary to his defense.		
15	The court held that this was a denial of due process.		
16	In Winston v. Commonwealth, 188 Va. 386, 49 S.E.2d 611, where the defendant was arrested		
17	and jailed for driving while intoxicated, and was not brought before the committing authority for 4		
18			
19	1/2 hours, and where the statute directed that the arresting officer produce the defendant "forthwith"		
20	before a committing authority, the charge had to be dismissed, the court stating at 395:		
21	It is perfectly apparent, too, from what has been said, that as a result of his illegal detention		
22	the defendant has been forever deprived of material evidence which might have supported his		
23	claim that he was innocent of the charge under which he was held. According to the		
24	undisputed medical testimony, after the lapse of the time during which he was held in jail, a		
25 26	physical examination would have been useless and ineffectual.		
_0			

MOTION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS AND WARRANT IN AID OF WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS - Page 4 of $7\,$

City of Tacoma v. Heater, 67 Wn.2d 733, 738-9, 409 P.2d 867 (1966), citing Winston v. 1

Commonwealth, supra. 3 Here, Mr. Faire has been completely deprived of the ability to muster any defense for more 4 than six months, and snow has fallen on the situs of the event, exculpatory evidence is eroding and 5 decaying with time as memories fade, and physical evidences dissipates with time. 6 It is essential to the effective preparation of his defense that the defendant be permitted to 7 8 communicate with his attorney immediately after he is charged, in order to secure assistance of 9 counsel in the pretrial period as required by the constitutional standards. It is a denial of the right to 10 counsel to proceed with multiple status conferences, to entertain motions and to consider statements 11 made by the defendant without benefit of counsel. 12 Okanogan County is in violation of RCW 9.33.020 (5) which provides: 13 No officer or person having the custody and control of the body or liberty of any person under 14 15 arrest, shall refuse permission to such arrested person to communicate with his friends or 16 with an attorney, nor subject any person under arrest to any form of personal violence, 17 intimidation, indignity or threats for the purpose of extorting from such person incriminating 18 statements or a confession. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be guilty 19 of a misdemeanor. [1909 c 249 § 359....] 20 21 City of Tacoma v. Heater, 67 Wn.2d 733, 740, 409 P.2d 867 (1966). 22 This statute is in harmony with the "critical stage" rule laid down by the Supreme Court in 23 Hamilton v. Alabama, supra. Under the "critical stage" rule, the denial to the defendant of the 24

26

25

2

MOTION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS AND WARRANT IN AID OF WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS - Page 5 of 7

assistance of his attorney after the officers had conducted their tests and questioning, violated his

1	constitutional right to have counsel and due process, and any conviction obtained thereafter is void.		
2	City of Tacoma v. Heater, 67 Wn.2d 733, 741, 409 P.2d 867 (1966),		
3	A defendant's Sixth Amendment right to counsel arises at any critical stage in a criminal		
4	prosecution. State v. Judge, 100 Wn.2d 706, 675 P.2d 219 (1984), citing Coleman v. Alabama, 399		
5	U.S. 1, 26 L.Ed.2d 387, 90 S.Ct. 1999 (1970); United States v. Wade, 388 U.S. 218, 18 L.Ed.2d		
6 7	1149, 87 S.Ct. 1926 (1967).		
8	The denial of counsel [directly after charging] prevented the defendant's effective preparation		
9	for his defense to the charge against him. <i>City of Seattle v. Orwick</i> , 113 Wn.2d 823, 784 P.2d 161		
10			
11	U.S. 977, aff'd on remand, 94 Wn.2d 858, 620 P.2d 999 (1980).		
12	Mr. Faire has been denied the assistance of counsel on multiple occasions, each worthy of		
13 14	dismissal of the charges against him, and each constituting violations of his Sixth Amendment rights		
15			
16			
17	Section 3 of the washington's Constitution.		
18	3.0 EVIDENCE UPON WHICH MOVANT RELIES		
19	Petitioners rely upon the following:		
20	1. The Declaration of Stephen Pidgeon, and the docket in this case.		
21	2. The files and records herein.		
22	4.0 ORDER AND WRIT		
23	A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS [proposed] accompanies this petition.		
24	An Order – To Issue Writ of Habeas Corpus and Warrant in Aid of Writ of Habeas Corpus		
25	[proposed] accompanies this petition.		
26	·r · r · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		

MOTION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS AND WARRANT IN AID OF WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS - Page ${\bf 6}$ of ${\bf 7}$

1	Dated this 2 nd day of February, 2016.	
2		
3		
4		Stephen Pidgeon, WSBA #25265
5		1523 132 Street SE, STE C-350
6		Everett, Washington 98208 (425)605-4774
7		Attorney for James Faire
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		