

State v. Freih, 270 Or.App. 555 (2015)

348 P.3d 324

270 Or. App. 555
Court of Appeals of Oregon.

STATE of Oregon, Plaintiff–Respondent,
v.
Hassan Ali FREIH, Defendant–Appellant.

C112594CR; A153893.
|
Submitted Oct. 31, 2014.
|
Decided April 22, 2015.

Synopsis

Background: Defendant was convicted in the Washington County Circuit Court, [James Lee Fun, Jr., J.](#), of second-degree failure to appear. He appealed.

[Holding:] The Court of Appeals, [Lagesen, J.](#), held that defendant failed to establish that it was either “necessary” for him to miss his court date in order to avoid threatened psychological harm of failing to care for his ailing mother, or that harm remained “imminent” as of defendant’s court date, as required to demonstrate entitlement to statutory choice of evils defense.

Affirmed.

West Headnotes (6)

[1] **Criminal Law**
← Defenses in general

To be entitled to an instruction on statutory choice-of-evils defense, defendant has to offer evidence sufficient to allow the jury to find: (1) his conduct was necessary to avoid a threatened injury, (2) the threatened injury was imminent, and (3) it was reasonable for him to believe that the need to avoid that injury was greater than the need to avoid the injury that the statute he was found to have violated sought to prevent. [West’s Or.Rev. Stat. Ann. § 161.200.](#)

[4 Cases that cite this headnote](#)

[2] **Criminal Law**

← [Compulsion or necessity; justification in general](#)

Defendant charged with failure to appear for required court date failed to establish that it was either “necessary” for him to miss his court date in order to avoid threatened psychological harm of failing to care for his ailing mother, or that harm remained “imminent” as of defendant’s court date, as required to demonstrate entitlement to statutory choice of evils defense; defendant received notice of his mother’s ailing health approximately two weeks before scheduled court date, at which time he immediately flew to be with his mother, but defendant could have flown back in time for court date and then traveled back to his mother, given absence of evidence that his mother was facing imminent death and that other family members were available to care for mother, and there was no evidence regarding status of mother’s health on actual date defendant failed to appear. [West’s Or.Rev. Stat. Ann. §§ 161.200, 162.195\(1\).](#)

[Cases that cite this headnote](#)

[3] **Criminal Law**
← Instructions
Criminal Law
← Instructions

Court of Appeals would review trial court’s ruling that defendant would not be entitled to an instruction on the statutory choice-of-evils defense for legal error, in prosecution for failure to appear, viewing the record in the light most favorable to defendant to determine whether a jury permissibly could find the statutory elements of the defense from the facts or evidence contained in the record.

State v. Freih, 270 Or.App. 555 (2015)

348 P.3d 324

[2 Cases that cite this headnote](#)

[4] **Criminal Law**
🔑 Defenses in General

An affirmative defense to a criminal charge may be withdrawn from the jury's consideration only if there is no evidence in the record to support an element of the defense.

[2 Cases that cite this headnote](#)

[5] **Criminal Law**
🔑 Compulsion or necessity; justification in general

For a defendant's conduct to be "necessary" to avoid a threatened injury, as required to demonstrate entitlement to statutory choice-of-evils defense, he must show that no other course of action was available to him but to choose an evil. *West's Or.Rev. Stat. Ann. § 161.200*.

[4 Cases that cite this headnote](#)

[6] **Criminal Law**
🔑 Compulsion or necessity; justification in general

To show that the injury defendant sought to avoid was "imminent" within the meaning of the statute governing choice-of-evils defense, defendant was required to show that the threat of injury existed at the time defendant committed his offense. *West's Or.Rev. Stat. Ann. § 161.200*.

[2 Cases that cite this headnote](#)

Attorneys and Law Firms

****325** [Peter Gartlan](#), Chief Defender, and [Kyle Krohn](#), Deputy Public Defender, Office of Public Defense Services, filed the brief for appellant.

[Ellen F. Rosenblum](#), Attorney General, [Anna M. Joyce](#), Solicitor General, and [Michael S. Shin](#), Senior Assistant Attorney General, filed the brief for respondent.

Before [DUNCAN](#), Presiding Judge, and [LAGESEN](#), Judge, and [WOLLHEIM](#), Senior Judge.

Opinion

[LAGESEN](#), J.

***556** [Hassan Ali Freih](#) failed to appear for a court date in connection with misdemeanor charges against him and, as a result, was charged and convicted of one count of failure to appear in the second degree, in violation of [ORS 162.195\(1\)\(a\)](#). Freih had sought to defend against the charge on the ground that, in the light of his mother's medical condition, he had no choice but to miss his court date. On appeal, he assigns error to the trial court's pretrial ruling that he was not entitled to raise a choice-of-evils defense under [ORS 161.200](#), and thus would not be entitled to a jury instruction on the choice-of-evils defense. We affirm.

In his offer of proof in support of his claimed entitlement to present a choice-of-evils defense, Freih indicated that he would testify to the following facts at trial if he were permitted to pursue the defense:

Freih's 91-year-old mother lives in Jordan. Approximately two weeks before his scheduled court date, Freih received a phone call from his aunt in Jordan. Freih's aunt informed him that his mother was severely ill and was also suffering an infection from a recent stomach operation. Freih's mother also had hearing problems, could not walk, was in pain, and was taking multiple medications. Freih's family members in Jordan were taking care of his mother, but they wanted Freih to travel to Jordan and help them with her care.

Freih called his attorney's office but was informed that his attorney was on vacation for two weeks. Freih also contacted the trial court but was told to "talk to [his] lawyer to deal with it." Freih nonetheless immediately flew to Jordan. He did so because he "love[s] [his] mom

State v. Freih, 270 Or.App. 555 (2015)
348 P.3d 324

and * * * wanted to assist her.” He did not return for his court date two weeks later; instead, he remained in Jordan for three months.

[1] *557 ORS 161.200 sets forth the elements of the statutory choice-of-evils defense. It provides in pertinent part:

“(1) Unless inconsistent with other provisions of chapter 743, Oregon Laws 1971, defining justifiable use of physical force, or with some other provision of law, conduct which would otherwise constitute an offense is justifiable and not criminal when:

“(a) That conduct is necessary as an emergency measure to avoid an imminent public or private injury; and

“(b) The threatened injury is of such gravity that, according to ordinary standards of intelligence and morality, the desirability and urgency of avoiding the injury clearly outweigh the desirability of avoiding the injury sought to be prevented by the statute defining the offense in issue.”

ORS 161.200(1). As we have explained, to be entitled to an instruction on the defense, a defendant must offer evidence sufficient to allow the jury to find

“(1) his conduct was necessary to avoid a threatened injury; (2) the threatened injury was imminent; and (3) it was reasonable for him to believe that the need to avoid that injury was greater than the need to avoid the injury that ORS [162.195], the statute that he was found to have violated, seeks to prevent.”

Boldt, 116 Or.App. at 483, 841 P.2d 1196.

[2] **326 On appeal, Freih argues—as he did below—that that evidence as to why he missed his court date was sufficient to entitle him to present a choice-of-evils defense to the charge of failure to appear, and to receive a jury instruction on that defense. In particular, Freih argues that the evidence would be sufficient to permit a factfinder to find that it was necessary for him to commit the crime of failure to appear as an emergency measure “in order to avoid the psychological harm” that he would

suffer from “failing to care for his ailing mother.”

[3] [4] We review the trial court’s ruling that a defendant would not be entitled to an instruction on the statutory choice-of-evils defense for legal error, viewing the record in the light most favorable to the defendant to determine whether a jury permissibly could find the statutory elements of the defense from the facts² or evidence contained in the record. *State v. Boldt*, 116 Or.App. 480, 483, 841 P.2d 1196 (1992); *State v. Matthews*, 30 Or.App. 1133, 1136, 569 P.2d 662 (1977). “[A]n affirmative defense to a criminal charge may be withdrawn from the jury’s consideration only if there is no evidence in the record to support an element of the defense.” *State v. Brown*, 306 Or. 599, 605, 761 P.2d 1300 (1988).

*558 Based on the evidence provided, we disagree with Freih’s contention that he was entitled to a jury instruction on the choice of evils defense. As an initial matter, we assume without deciding that a threatened psychological harm to a defendant could, in some circumstances, qualify as a “private injury” within the meaning of ORS 161.200(1)(a) that would support the giving of an instruction on the choice-of-evils defense if the other criteria for the defense are met. See Paul H. Robinson, 2 *Criminal Law Defenses* § 124(b)(1), 47–48 (1984) (“deprivation of a defendant’s opportunity to see his dying mother” could potentially qualify as an injury under the choice-of-evils defense).

However, even accepting that the claimed psychological harm would be sufficient to invoke ORS 161.200, Freih’s offer of proof was insufficient to establish entitlement to a jury instruction on the choice-of-evils defense. Specifically, it was insufficient to permit a finding either that it was “necessary” for Freih to miss his court date in order to avoid that threatened psychological harm, or that that threatened psychological harm remained “imminent” as of Freih’s court date, as those terms have been construed by our court.

[5] First, Freih failed to demonstrate that his conduct was necessary to avoid a threatened injury. To show that criminal conduct was “necessary” within the meaning of ORS 161.200, a defendant must put forth evidence that would allow the jury to find that he had no reasonable alternative but to commit the crime. **327 *State v. Miles*, 197 Or.App. 86, 93, 104 P.3d 604 (2005) (“[F]or a defendant’s conduct to be ‘necessary’ to avoid a threatened injury, he must show that no other course of action was available to him but to ‘choose an evil.’”).

State v. Freih, 270 Or.App. 555 (2015)

348 P.3d 324

In this case, *559 Freih's offer of proof would not permit a juror to find that he had "no other course of action" available to him but to commit the crime in order to avoid the potential harm. To the contrary, the offer of proof affirmatively suggests that Freih could have appeared for his court date *and* avoided the psychological harm of not caring **328 for his mother: He could have traveled to Jordan when he did, returned for his court date two weeks later, and then traveled back to Jordan after the court date to further care for his mother. The offer of proof indicates both that Freih's mother was not facing imminent death, and that other family members were available to care for her when Freih was not available—circumstances that would have allowed Freih to fulfill his obligations to his mother and to the court, thereby avoiding both psychological harm and the failure to appear.

In sum, Freih's offer of proof does not permit a finding that this option was *not* reasonably available to him: He provided no testimony whatsoever to explain why his mother's condition would render him unable to fulfill his care obligations to her if he returned to the United States for his court date, or why this travel was not a reasonably available option. Without this evidence, no reasonable juror could find that Freih "had no other course of action" but to choose the "evil" of committing the crime of failure to appear.

[6] Next, Freih failed to establish that the injury he sought to avoid was imminent. To show that the injury that a defendant sought to avoid was "imminent" within the meaning of the statute, the defendant must show that the threat of injury existed *at the time* that he committed his

offense. *Boldt*, 116 Or.App. at 483–84, 841 P.2d 1196.

Because Freih's offense was failure to appear for a required court date, he was required to put forth evidence that would allow a jury *560 to find that the alleged threat of injury existed on the day that he was scheduled to appear. Here, Freih presented no evidence that would allow a jury to find that that threat of harm persisted on the date that he failed to appear—two weeks *after* he had left for Jordan upon receiving his aunt's phone call.

Freih's offer of proof consisted solely of testimony that, two weeks before his trial date, he had learned that his mother had an infection and needed his care at that time. Although he testified that he then remained in Jordan for three months, he did not explain whether he stayed that long because of his mother's health condition or for other reasons. The offer of proof provided no information concerning Freih's mother's health status on the date that he failed to appear in court; thus, it does not permit a finding that the threat of psychological harm that caused Freih to travel to Jordan two weeks earlier persisted at (or shortly before, given the evident travel considerations) the time of his court date. Absent this evidence, it would be speculative for a jury to find that Freih remained under a threat of "imminent" psychological harm at (or shortly before) the time that he committed the charged offense of failure to appear.

Affirmed.