

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

GRIEVANCE

William Scheidler,

GRIEVANT

V

State of Washington, and

Kevin Hull, individually and in any official capacity; Jesse Young, individually and in any official capacity; Michelle Caldier, individually and in any official capacity; Jan Angel, individually and in any official capacity; and

Jane and John Does, 1-100.

Defendants

GRIEVANCES PER

RCW 42.52;

Article 4, Section 31;

RCW 42.92

I. INTRODUCTION:

1. Comes now the grievant, William Scheidler, files these grievances against the named defendants for a just resolution, or an action at law will follow.

II. NAMED DEFENDANTS.

2. STATE OF WASHINGTON (STATE) is established to protect and maintain individual rights, Article 1, Section 1. The State is in breach of its constitutionally mandated duty.
3. Defendant Kevin Hull is being sued individually and in any official capacity as Kitsap county superior court judge. Defendant Hull has, is, and will continue to exercise his powers in an unjust, unlawful and unauthorized manner unless he is held to the law.

- 1 4. Defendant Jesse Young, Washington state representative, is being sued individually and in
2 any official capacity. Defendant Young has the duty and power to remedy Kevin Hull's
3 'unauthorized and invalid' conduct but refuses to do so.
- 4 5. Defendant Michelle Caldier, Washington state representative, is being sued individually and
5 in any official capacity. Defendant Caldier has the duty and power to remedy Kevin Hull's
6 'unauthorized and invalid' conduct but refuses to do so.
- 7 6. Defendant Jan Angel, Washington state senator, is being sued individually and in any official
8 capacity. Defendant Angel has the duty and power to remedy Kevin Hull's 'unauthorized
9 and invalid' conduct but refuses to do so.
- 10 7. Defendant jane and john does are yet to be named defendants who are being sued
11 individually and in any official capacity, defendants jane and john does have violated their
12 primary obligation prescribed by article 1, sec 1 to Scheidler's detriment and are liable per
13 RCW 9A.08.020; 42 USC 1985 among other laws and doctrines.

14 **III. GRIEVANT**

- 15 8. Grievant William Scheidler (hereinafter referred to as "Scheidler, or grievant") is a
16 resident of Kitsap County. When Scheidler discovered the Kitsap County Assessor was
17 defrauding retired/disabled citizens, he reported the fraud to legislators, the attorney
18 general, and to the department of revenue. [APPENDIX 1](#). Rather than correct this fraud
19 upon Scheidler and the retired/disabled, the Washington State Bar Associates who occupy
20 government offices in the legislature, in the attorney general's office and at the department
21 of revenue, as well as Bar Associates who are Kitsap County's prosecutors all retaliated
22 against Scheidler so as to destroy him and render him powerless so this fraud and those
23 who devised, implement and protect this fraud (the named defendants) would continue.
- 24 9. Scheidler is entitled to the guarantees enumerated in Washington State's constitution and
25 laws that defendants are to uphold, particularly article 1 sec 1 – to protect individual rights;
26 *not destroy individuals who report government corruption.*

27 **IV. FACTS**

28 **A. HISTORY OF EVENTS TO ESTABLISH THE CONTEXT BY WHICH DEFENDANTS CONDUCT MUST BE MEASURED.**

- 1 10. At the vortex of this case is a fraud being perpetrated upon retired/disabled individuals of
2 Kitsap County by the Kitsap County Assessor, James Avery under the protection of Bar
3 Associates who hold government decision making offices.
- 4 11. The mechanism for the fraud, which originates at the Department of Revenue in consultation
5 with the Washington State Attorney General, is by the Kitsap County Assessor distributing
6 false instructions to applicants who apply for the property tax exemption granted by
7 Washington's constitution Article 7, Sec 10. The "application", [APPENDIX 3](#), is irrefutable
8 evidence of the Assessor's fraud by misstating RCW 84.36.383(5) (page 3 of APPENDIX
9 3) that then results in a false determination of income, which is a qualifying criterion. In this
10 way, by this fraud, the Article 7 Sec 10 exemption is artificially denied to those who would
11 qualify absent the fraud.
- 12 12. All Defendants are aware of this fraud upon citizens and have done nothing! By doing
13 nothing Defendants have betrayed their fiduciary duty and aid and abet in this fraud.
14 Defendant Jan Angel even provided further evidence that the Department of Revenue with
15 the aid of the Attorney General, possibly assistant attorney generals Zachary Mosner and
16 Cam Comfort, are likely the fraud's architects or chief deceivers. [APPENDIX 4](#) is a true
17 copy of a document Defendant Angel provided Scheidler that clearly alters RCW
18 84.36.383(5), the statute being misquoted and misused to defraud citizens.
- 19 13. Because these government officials refused to uphold the law, Scheidler was forced to
20 become a victim of this fraud and was forced to sign documents, under duress. [APPENDIX](#)
21 [5](#). Being forced to sign fraudulent documents under duress is a Class C Felony.
- 22 14. In early 1998, Scott Ellerby, an attorney with the firm Mills Meyers Swartling, WSBA#
23 16277, agreed with Scheidler that the Kitsap County Assessor was lying to county residents
24 for the purpose of defrauding retired/disabled citizens of their constitutional rights.
- 25 15. Ellerby took Scheidler's case. Ellerby was on Scheidler's case for about 7 months and had
26 charged Scheidler legal fees over \$2000 to prepare for a 'formal administrative hearing'
27 before the Board of Tax Appeals for the purpose of addressing this fraud. Scheidler paid
28 Ellerby's fees in full and on time.
16. On or about November 1998, a date that was three days before the formal administrative
hearing before the Board of Tax Appeals for which Ellerby was paid to prepare and to attend,

1 Ellerby notified Scheidler through the mail and over the wires claiming he had to
2 immediately withdraw his representation because the Kitsap County prosecutor, Cassandra
3 Noble, raised a conflict of interest claim that demanded his withdrawal.

- 4 17. Note: RCW 2.48.210 mandates Ellerby protect Scheidler and RCW 2.48.230 mandates
5 Ellerby carryout Scheidler’s wishes to address the fraud. Ellerby is under no legal obligation
6 to the Assessor or the County Prosecutor. However the rules established by the courts
7 provide a loop-hole for lawyers to disregard the obligations imposed under RCW 2.48.210
8 and RCW 2.48.230. In this way a lawyer can be ‘extorted’ from unpopular cases by
9 prosecutors such as the Kitsap County prosecutor. Extortion is a State and Federal offense.
- 10 18. The Legislature is willfully negligent in allowing the courts to establish rules that render
11 statutes and constitutional obligations irrelevant and are used as “extortion tools”.
- 12 19. [APPENDIX 2](#), EX 2 is a true copy of a letter Ellerby sent to Kitsap's prosecutor asking they
13 waive this conflict. [APPENDIX 2](#), EX 3. is true copy of an e-communication Ellerby sent
14 to Scheidler stating he would be “forced to withdraw” if the county doesn’t waive the
15 conflict.
- 16 20. On the eve of the formal administrative hearing, Ellerby withdrew from Scheidler’s case and
17 filed a Notice of Withdrawal with the Board of Tax Appeals citing the prosecutor’s demand
18 he withdrawal due to conflict. [APPENDIX 2](#), EX 1, is a true copy of this Notice of
19 Withdrawal.
- 20 21. In 2008, Scheidler learned that Ellerby never had a conflict of interest and that his entire
21 excuse to withdraw on the very night of the hearing was a complete fabrication between
22 Ellerby and Kitsap County prosecuting attorney, Cassandra Noble. This is a fraud upon
23 Scheidler and the Board of Tax Appeals. This is evidenced by [APPENDIX 2](#), EX 7, which
24 is an email sent to Scheidler by the president of Ellerby's firm, Larry Mills, stating no such
25 conflict required Ellerby’s withdrawal.
- 26 22. Scheidler, upon learning of being defrauded by Ellerby and the County Prosecutor
27 demanded a refund of fees paid to Ellerby. Ellerby refused and DENIED there was ever a
28 “conflict” requiring his withdrawal despite submitting his Notice of Withdrawal that cited
“conflict of interest” as reason for his withdrawal.

- 1 23. Ellerby filed sworn affidavits stating he “withdrew at Grievant’s (Scheidler’s) request.”
2 [APPENDIX 2](#), EX’s 4, 5, 6. This false swearing and is a gross misdemeanor; and made for
3 the purpose to steal Scheidler’s property ~\$2000 and achieve unlawful sanctions in excess
4 of \$120,000 – theft and racketeering are Class B and C Felonies.
- 5 24. In 2008, Scheidler filed a Washington State Bar complaint against Ellerby for lying to him
6 and conspiring with the County prosecutor demanding Ellerby withdraw from Scheidler’s
7 case due to a conflict of interest, which Larry Mills claimed was a complete lie.
- 8 25. The Washington State Bar assigned Scheidler’s grievance against Ellerby to assistant
9 attorney general Zachary Mosner (the same assistant attorney general who links to the
10 assessor/DOR’s fraud) who dismissed Scheidler’s grievance. The Washington State Bar
11 issued a letter of dismissal with the caveat that “upon a judicial finding of impropriety” the
12 grievance would be reopened. [APPENDIX 2](#), EX 11.
- 13 26. Scheidler sued Ellerby in 2008 to obtain a ‘judicial finding of impropriety,’ as the Bar’s
14 precondition to reopening the grievance stated. Scheidler additionally sued for damages –
15 his return of the fees paid to Ellerby and consequential damages for being denied the honest
16 services of his lawyer and forced to become a victim of the assessor’s fraud upon
17 retired/disabled citizens. This is Kitsap Superior Court case # 09-2-00660-3 and is
18 incorporated as evidence of proof that lawyers and judges, all being Bar Associates, violate
19 laws, codes and rules without consequence. This case is further proof the **Legislature is**
20 **NEGLIGENT** in their oversight of the blatant violations of the law, codes and rules
21 committed by judges and lawyers that causes tremendous harm to individuals and the denial
22 of due process fairness.
- 23 27. A JURY TRIAL was DEMANDED to weight the facts (including the facts noted in the
24 attached appendixes to this grievance), declarations and admissions that make up the factual
25 elements of the Ellerby case.
- 26 28. Judge Russell Hartman, who is a Washington State Bar Associate, was assigned the case.
- 27 29. After 3 years of motions, unlawful discovery of medical records that are “privileged from
28 discovery” under RCW 5.30.060(9) – which is a violation of Scheidler’s protected privacy,
Judge Russell Hartman dismissed the case without allowing for a jury and imposed a penalty
on Scheidler in the amount of \$120,000 plus interest, payable to Ellerby for bringing suit

1 against Ellerby, as the WSBA delegated to Scheidler in the disciplinary action against
2 Ellerby.

3 30. Judge Hartman, in his order of dismissal, his imposition of the \$120,000 sanction, never
4 addressed the evidence – the assessor’s fraud, the emails, notice of withdrawal, the affidavits
5 that prove Ellerby made up two stories – one to withdraw from Scheidler’s case, the other
6 to avoid refunding fees unjustly collected. Hartman ignored the perjury in submitting a false
7 “notice of withdrawal”. By law, for a judge to dismiss a case each and every piece of
8 evidence must be viewed in Scheidler’s favor. But here, the evidence was ignored that
9 proved criminal conduct by Hartman’s Bar colleagues – Ellerby, Downer, Noble, Mills, etc.

10 31. The **Legislature is NEGLIGENT** in their oversight of judges who disregard the laws that
11 apply and in the way they rule to protect and to enrich their fellow colleagues of the judicial
12 branch.

13 32. Scheidler appealed to Division 2, Court of Appeals (COA). The COA ruled, in an
14 unpublished opinion, the attorney fee award, the \$120,000 sanction, was "manifestly
15 unreasonable" and was reversed in full and remanded. The COA-II improperly upheld the
16 'summary judgment dismissal'. The COA did not address **APPENDIXES 2-7**, which are
17 material FACTS from which the complaint was instituted and SPECIFICALLY, as the law
18 demands, FOR A JURY.

19 *RCW 4.44.090 Questions of fact for jury.*

20 *All questions of fact other than those mentioned in RCW 4.44.080, **shall be** decided by the*
21 *jury, and **all evidence thereon addressed to them.***

22 33. Nor did the Appellate court address the denial of a jury trial when a jury trial was demanded.

23 34. The **Legislature is NEGLIGENT** in failing to oversee the judicial branch and their corrupt
24 conduct in denying a litigants constitutional right to a jury, Article 1, section 21.

25 35. Scheidler sought Supreme Court review of the COA-II unpublished opinion based upon a
26 conflict in law, the "substantial public interest" in attorney misconduct, a false record
27 perpetrated by the COA upon which their 'unpublished opinion' was based, and a host of
28 other instances of defense counsel and COA misconduct including the blind-eye to the
evidence and the common law established by the Supreme Court in *DISCIPLINE OF DANN*
136 Wn.2d 67, 69, Aug. 1998, which states,

1 "Attorney and Client - Discipline - Dishonesty, Fraud, Deceit, or Misrepresentation -
2 Unintended Results. In order to maintain public confidence in legal institutions and to
3 enhance respect for the law generally, RPC 8.4(c) - which defines professional misconduct
4 by a lawyer as conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation - is
administered in a manner *that holds attorneys accountable for the results of their conduct,
even unintended results.*"

5 36. Scheidler's entire case is a consequence of "dishonest lawyers – Scott Ellerby, Cassandra
6 Noble, etc", yet Scheidler is being punished when, according to the law of *DANN*, the
7 "LAWYERS" are responsible for the consequences of their dishonesty.

8 37. The Supreme Court refused to accept Scheidler's review pleading because it exceeded page
9 limits. Scheidler objected on the grounds that the length of his pleading was due to the large
10 number of violations by defendant, judges and the Court of Appeals. These violations
11 consisted of perjured facts, misapplication of law, ethical violations, and other due process
12 violations, which required extra pages to list them all. Plus, according to the Supreme Courts
13 own rules on appeal, all of these "errors" noted by Scheidler require reference to the record,
14 which exceeded 2000 pages, and citation to the authorities relied upon. Said another way,
15 to truncate any part of Scheidler's pleading so as to meet page length would cheat Scheidler
16 of presenting all the grievances against Ellerby and all the misconduct committed by judges
17 and the Court of Appeals. Nevertheless, the Supreme Court denied Scheidler's objection
18 and refused to take the appeal. Scheidler's substantive rights were violated under the use of
the courts' self-established rules.

19 38. The **Legislature is NEGLIGENT** in their check of the judicial branch's misuse of court
rules to deny substantive rights.

20 39. On March 23, 2013, the case against Ellerby was remanded back to Superior Court

21 **B. Facts pertaining to Defendant Kevin Hull**

22 40. Judge Russell Hartman retired while the case was in appeal and was not called back to
23 preside over the remanded case.

24 41. On January 9, 2015, Judge Kevin Hull was assigned the remanded case. Under law, RCW
25 2.28.030(2) a judge who WAS NOT PRESENT AND SITTING as a member of the court
26 at the hearing of a matter submitted for its decision is DISQUALIFIED from hearing the
27 matter.

1 42. Judge Hull, by law, cannot fulfill the COA’s mandate because Judge Hull never was “present
2 and sitting” for the matter remanded.. The entire case was heard and judged by Russell
3 Hartman, who was reversed for his abuse of discretion, who then retired. In such a case
4 where the sitting judge, Russell Hartman, is no longer ‘sitting’, Judge Hull’s ONLY legal
5 avenue was to grant a NEW TRIAL.

6 43. Scheidler immediately filed motions under CR 59 and 60 for relief from judgment and NEW
7 TRIAL based upon 'fraud upon the court', misconduct of defense counsel, the ‘abuse of
8 discretion by Judge Hartman, the misconduct of Joel Penoyar, who authored the COA
9 'unpublished decision', the delegated “finding of impropriety” to Scheidler by the
10 Washington State Bar, which “EXEMPTS” Scheidler from sanctions, etc. (refer to filings in
11 case # 09-2-00660-3, offered as proof)

12 44. A NEW TRIAL is not only required by law, RCW 2.28.030(2) supra, as Judge Hull never
13 was “present and sitting” at any time on the case, but a New Trial is warranted based upon
14 the accumulation doctrine established by the Supreme Court in *STATE v. MARKS* 71 Wn.2d
15 295, 301 (1967) .

16 "New Trial - Grounds - Accumulated Error. A new trial may be required for an
17 accumulation of errors even though no one of them, standing alone, would be of
18 sufficient gravity to constitute grounds for reversal."

19 45. Judge Hull refused to disqualify and refused to grant a new trial, denied every motion - never
20 addressed the evidence and re-awarded Ellerby approximately \$120,000, which is an amount
21 the COA already ruled as “manifestly unreasonable” – and in fact is unlawful as Scheidler
22 was delegated, by the Bar, to obtain a “judicial finding of impropriety”. (ref Exhibit F)

23 46. Note: RCW 2.28.030 is routinely violated by judges. Defendants Young, Caldier and Angel
24 are fully aware of judges violating RCW 2.28.030 and do nothing!

25 47. Defendant Hull is in violation of RCW 2.28.030(2) and Rule 2.11, having made the
26 following unlawful decisions: to deny Scheidler's motions to vacate judgment due to
27 misconduct of opposing counsel and for a new trial; to deny the return of Scheidler's funds
28 (appeal bond) held by the clerk in the amount of \$170,000 plus accrued interest, which the
COA ruled was an abuse of discretion; to rule Ellerby didn't invade Scheidler's protected
privacy or breach any court rules during the litigation, and to award Attorney Ellerby
\$88,409.40 plus a year of interest @12%,

- 1 48. Defendant Hull's orders are without jurisdiction, are void, and are violations of Scheidler's
2 due process rights to an impartial, disinterested, decision maker.
- 3 49. Judge Hull has a vested interest in this action because the very 'essence' of the case hinges
4 in a lawyers (whether judicial or quasi-judicial) statutory allegiance to "truth and honor".
5 Clearly Judge Hull, using the prestige of his office, can make self-serving rulings that erode
6 the legislatures intent in mandating attorneys adhere to the highest standards of "Truth and
7 Honor" as embodied in RCW 2.48.210. Said another way, lawyers, as judge are inherently
8 motivated by their own self-interest in defining the moral values imposed upon them (i.e.,
9 what is meant by "truth and honor") than fulfilling the legislature's intent embodied in the
10 law so as to protect society from a corrupt judicial system.
- 11 50. Judge Hull is bound by law, specifically RCW 4.04.010 which states in unambiguous terms,
12 "The common law shall be the rule of decision in all courts". Hull's only choice of law,
13 which Scheidler noted time and again -- is the common law case *DISCIPLINE OF DANN*
14 136 Wn.2d 67, 69, Aug. 1998, supra, in which the "LAWYER" is responsible for the
15 consequences of his lies!
- 16 51. Judge Hull has blatantly ignored this statutory mandate to abide by the Supreme Courts
17 ruling in DANN which he is legally required to obey by the express language of RCW
18 4.04.010. Clearly Hull, in making his false claim that he must follow the COA's
19 "unpublished order," does so to "protect" and "enrich" his fellow lawyers -- Scott M. Ellerby,
20 WSBA# 16277; Jeffrey P. Downer, WSBA# 12625; Russell Hartman (ret.) WSBA# 7104;
21 Larry Mills, WSBA# 6129; Gauri S. Locker, WSBA# 39022; Allyson J. Ferguson, WSBA
22 #31246; Joel Penoyar, WSBA# 6407; J. Anderson, WSBA(unknown); and Jill Johanson
23 WSBA# 15649 -- from conduct that would otherwise be unlawful!
- 24 52. In other words, Kevin Hull creates a "LIE" claiming he is bound, untruthfully, by an
25 "unpublished opinion" in abrogation of the legislatures mandate that the 'common law' shall
26 be the rule of decisions in all courts. Hull does so to save himself for his unlawful orders
27 when he should have disqualified himself, per RCW 2.28.030(2) and Rule 2.11 supra. Kevin
28 Hull creates a "LIE" claiming he is bound by an "unpublished opinion" in abrogation of the
legislatures mandate that it is the "common law" that is the rule of decision. Judge Hull
commits these abuses simply to save his colleagues from violating my due process rights.

1 This simple "lie" claiming he must abide by an 'unpublished opinion', which is itself an
2 unlawful opinion is to save his fellow lawyers but also force the matter to appeal and
3 necessitate a separate cause of action for "fraud upon the court".

4 V. GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

5 C. Washington State's Negligence to Supervise the Washington State Bar Association 6 and its members in government offices. (Bar)

- 7 53. The underlying issue concerns the 'policies, practices, customs, claimed powers and
8 schemes' [Bar schemes] used by Washington State Bar associates who hold government
9 decision-making offices in the judicial, legislative, executive branches, sit on administrative
10 boards, legislative committees, ethics boards such as the ethics boards who will review this
11 case, and who fully occupy offices as prosecutors and city attorneys, among other decision-
12 making roles.
- 13 54. The Washington State Bar doesn't need to overthrow Washington's government, they
14 essential ARE Washington's government.
- 15 55. The Bar, by its own admission is to ["serve the members of the Bar"](#). The Bar's members
16 include for-profit private businesses as well as those members holding government decision-
17 making offices.
- 18 56. The Bar's 'schemes' in the way it "serves its members" have no independent oversight to
19 protect citizens from Bar Associates who choose to misuse their claimed powers under their
20 claimed rules which they establish, interpret and apply, unlawfully, to others.
- 21 57. RCW Title 2 does NOT authorize the Bar to "serve its members". Rather RCW Title 2,
22 chapter 48 mandates the Bar ["uphold the constitution of WA, and the US"](#)! Thus the
23 application of rules established and adopted by Bar associates that impact citizens is
24 unlawful and unconstitutional. This self-regulating power often results in the denial of due
25 process, and deprives EVERY litigant of a fair forum to challenge these abuses as all judicial
26 officials are Bar Associates who use their government office to protect their colleagues and
27 Bar schemes.
- 28 58. Non-bar citizens are excluded from voting on Bar issues, approving their by-laws, or in
holding executive Bar offices.

1 59. Evidence of the Bar’s privileged and independent status is amply illustrated in the blatantly
2 arrogant statement made 3/21/ 2014, by visiting Judge, Keith Harper, WSBA #10742, who
3 said from the bench, in effect,

4 **... (you have to) go to the moon or Mars for a fair venue to address your dissatisfaction**
5 **with the judicial branch... (See EXHIBIT _____, affidavit of Bruce Gambill re case #**
6 **14-2-00042-3. Also a .wav recording of this statement is offered as proof)**

7 **D. Empirical Evidence the Bar retaliates against those who report government**
8 **corruption.**

9 60. Attorney [Doug Schafer](#) reported a corrupt Pierce County Superior Court judge, Grant
10 Anderson. The Bar, including its members on the Washington Supreme Court, employing
11 dishonest schemes, reprimanded Mr. Schafer by suspending his law license. Judge Grant
12 Anderson was removed thereafter and vindicated Mr. Schafer’s allegations

13 61. Attorney [Bob Grundstein](#) criticized an Ohio judge for corruption, and the WA Bar retaliated,
14 using fabricated evidence and fraud, to disbar Grundstein. Mr. Grundstein, who lives and
15 practices law in Vermont , appealed his WA State disbarment to the Vermont Supreme
16 Court. That Court reversed his disbarment, which is a total rebuke of WA’s Bar policies.

17 62. Attorney [Anne Block](#), while a licensed lawyer, chose journalism and writes about
18 Washington State corruption. The Bar, in retaliation to Anne’s investigative reporting, is
19 recommending Anne’s disbarment to the Washington State Supreme Court.

20 63. Attorney John Scannell, in honoring the law, [RCW 2.48.210](#), refused to turn over to the Bar
21 his attorney-client communications. The Bar sought disbarment and Washington Supreme
22 Court, in retaliation for Scannell “honoring the law”, disbarred Scannell. Scannell appealed
23 to the US 9th Circuit, which ruled in Scannell’s favor and has granted Scannell the right to
24 practice law before the US 9th Circuit Court of Appeals. The 9th Circuits refusal to impose
25 reciprocal disbarment is authoritative testimony the Washington State Bar engages in
26 retaliation and harassment.

27 **E. Anecdotal evidence the policies and practices of Bar Associates are corrupt.**

28 64. US Federal Appeals Court Judge for the 7th Circuit, [Richard Posner](#), writes, “Moral
inbreeding may be as dangerous as biological inbreeding.”

- 1 65. There is no more compelling affirmation of Judge Posner’s hypothesis that self-regulation
2 is a moral threat to the very fabric of our society than a US 9th Circuit ruling in which the
3 Court states, “Allegations of conspiracy between judge and prosecutor to predetermine the
4 outcome of a judicial proceeding are insufficient to overcome those immunities.” [Ashelman
v Pope](#)
- 5 66. This holding, on its face, that judges and prosecutors have “immunity” – even when they
6 conspire to predetermine the outcome of a case, is repugnant to any civilized society. Such
7 an immoral holding is clearly evident in the Schafer case, the Grundstein case, the Block
8 case, the Scannell case, and now the Scheidler case.
- 9 67. Even more egregious, under the US Constitution’s 11 amendment right, the States establish
10 its own laws. Washington’s Constitution unambiguously prohibits “immunities”; nor shall
11 the “unauthorized or invalid acts of any official” be legalized!
- 12 68. [Dr Richard Cordero, J.D.](#), offers statistical evidence showing that 99% of grievances against
13 judges are dismissed sua sponte. A statistic that flies in the face of a [Gallup Poll](#) which
14 measures “honesty and ethics” in professions and ranks lawyers, such as Kevin Hull, right
15 down there with politicians, such as Young, Caldier and Angel, in the bottom quantile which
16 they share with “labor unions (the Bar), car salesmen and lobbyists (also the Bar). This
17 “statistical disconnect” between dismissals of grievances and reality clearly implicates Judge
18 Posner’s hypothesis of “moral inbreeding”.
- 19 69. [Caroline Douglas, J.D.](#), in a treatise, writes “of judicial and bar corruption, explains why it
20 happened, and details for anyone involved in litigation how to spot it. Her many "sneaky
21 judge tricks" outlined in the book will give litigators a road map for holding the courts
22 accountable. Any legislator who has anything to do with court issues in any state will
23 understand far more about how the state bar associations, together with the judiciary, have
24 corrupted the branch of government that is supposed to be protecting our rights.”
AMAZON.COM
- 25 70. The Washington State Legislature has neglected to either monitor, investigate, or establish
26 a specifically avenue to address citizens’ complaints concerning the Bar’s ‘schemes. Said
27 another way, a Bar associate are always the decision maker, fact finder, and jury, concerning
28 Bar ‘schemes’ DESPITE constitutional provisions to the contrary. For example – the

1 “Ellerby case, #09-2-00660-3. Ellerby is a lawyer who lied to Scheidler. The Bar’s scheme
2 was to delegate back to Scheidler the prerequisite task of obtaining a “judicial finding of
3 impropriety” for the grievance to go forward. To obtain this “judicial finding” Scheidler had
4 to argue before a Bar lawyer serving as judge, Kevin Hull. Hull, as judge, in violation of
5 constitutional, statutory and common law authorities, sanctioned Scheidler \$120,000 for
6 seeking a “judicial finding of impropriety” as Scheidler was delegated by the Bar.

7 71. Clearly this is a Bar scheme to shift lawyer discipline to a Bar judge who can use his office
8 to retaliate against Scheidler for bringing a Bar complaint against an associate of the Bar.
9 This is one mechanism by which the Bar “serves its members” by depriving Scheidler of his
10 property, his constitutional, statutory and common law rights without recourse.

11 72. The Bar’s ‘schemes’, as in the Ellerby case, are clearly intended to unlawfully prolong
12 litigation, 3-years as in the Ellerby case, in violation of Article 1, Sec 10 and RCW 2.04.190
13 through unnecessary and uncheck tactics so as to drive up costs for citizens, or cover-up
14 crimes, contrary to Article 2, Section 28(12), so as to defraud citizens of their rights, property
15 and liberty for the benefit of Bar Associates, as a review of the Ellerby case will clearly
16 show – the \$120,000 sanction Hull imposed upon Scheidler was ordered to be paid to
17 Ellerby! It is a bald-faced fraud to enrich Bar Associates!

18 73. Defendant Washington State was established by Washington’s Constitution. Under the
19 constitution all political power is in the people and the *governments* of Washington obtain
20 their “*just powers*” from the “*consent of the people*” and are established to “*protect and*
21 *maintain individual rights*”, Article 1, Section 1.

22 74. Hull’s \$120,000 sanction imposed upon Scheidler was NOT by the “*consent of the people*”,
23 nor was it “*just*”, nor was it lawful. Rather Kevin Hull determined for himself the laws that
24 applied to judges, such as the disqualification statute RCW 2.28.030. And Hull determined
25 for himself if Scheidler has the protection of the other statutes and common laws instituted
26 for Scheidler’s protection.

27 75. This “privilege” in which judges and Bar associates determine for themselves the laws that
28 apply to judges and Bar associates is a “PRIVILEGE” no citizen has. This Violates
Washington’s Constitution Article 1, Sections 8, 12 and 28, which PROHIBITS
PRIVILEGES.

1 76. It is only by the legislatures authority granted by Article 4, section 9 or Article 5, “we the
2 people” keep control over the governments we established. For the legislature to relinquish,
3 abandon or refuse to act, in spite of its duty and powers by which to exercise their duty, the
4 Legislature forfeits the very notion of "we the people" and forfeits “by the consent of the
5 people”, and forfeits ‘individual protections’ and forfeits all notions of “just powers”. The
6 Legislatures abandonment of these principles explains why we, the people, are nothing but
7 pockets to pick by and through the Bar’s schemes.

8 77. Washington State Governments have abridged their “just powers” and refused either
9 intentionally or negligently to protect individual rights as the facts, below and offered as
10 proof, will show.

11 78. The government officials noted herein have acted ultra vires, beyond their “just powers” in
12 breach of their fiduciary duty and have caused injury, either intentionally or by willful
13 neglect to Scheidler, an “individual” whose rights governments are established to protect
14 and maintain.

15 79. Of particular note is the prohibition placed upon the Washington State legislature from
16 “legalizing the unauthorized or invalid act by any official”. Article 2, Sec 28. When the
17 legislature and the Bar Associates who hold official offices turn a blind-eye to “unauthorized
18 or invalid acts by government officials”, the legislature and these decision-making officials
19 have effectively “legalized unauthorized or invalid acts” which the Washington Constitution
20 strictly prohibits. Scheidler has been injured as a consequence.

21 **F. Defendant Kevin Hull and the Ellerby case in part.**

22 80. Defendant Kevin Hull, a Bar associate, is an elected judicial official who owes Scheidler a
23 fiduciary duty as explicitly expressed by Article 1, Section 1, “to protect and maintain
24 individual (Scheidler’s) rights”. Defendant Hull has acted ultra vires, maliciously, without
25 authority contrary to article 4, sec 28 and RCW title 2 by violating the following statutory
26 and common law mandates:

- 27 a. article 1, sec 1 acting contrary to protecting Scheidler’s rights;
28 b. article 1, sec 3 in depriving Scheidler of his property without due process of law;
c. article 1, sec 4 depriving Scheidler of his right of petition;

1 d. article 1, sec 14 by imposing a \$120,000 sanction when Scheidler is immune from sanctions
2 under RCW 4.24.500 to RCW 4.24.510, which states,

3 “A person who communicates a complaint or information to any branch or agency of federal,
4 state, or local government... is immune from civil liability for claims based upon the
5 communication to the agency or organization regarding any matter reasonably of concern to
6 that agency or organization.”

7 Scheidler’s entire action was instituted based on his Bar grievance, which the Bar then
8 delegated back to Scheidler for a “judicial finding of impropriety”. Scheidler, by law, is
9 immune because he reported the conduct to the proper regulating agency.

10 e. Article 1, Section 21, depriving Scheidler of his constitutional jury trial;

11 f. Article 1, Sec’s 8, 12, and 28 of Washington’s Constitution that ‘prohibits privileges and
12 immunities’ not afforded every citizen. Defendant Hull, in determining for himself the laws
13 that apply to him and his Bar associates is a “privilege” no citizen has and therefore violates
14 these constitutional provisions. Said another way ... judge Hull claims a "privilege" in
15 deciding his own compliance with the laws that apply to judges, which is both a "privilege
16 and immunity" Hull claims for himself and his colleagues.

17 g. RCW 4.44.090, depriving a jury from deciding the facts – i.e., Ellerby’s lies, Penoyar’s lies,
18 Russell Hartman’s lies, Jeffrey Downer’s lies, etc.

19 h. RCW 4.04.010, depriving a jury from deciding the “conditions of society” and the proper
20 roles of our institutions – i.e., governments’ “just powers” as provided by our constitution.

21 i. RCW 4.04.010 acting contrary to the court of appeals mandate by re-imposing a \$120,000
22 sanction upon Scheidler when the COA reversed judge Hartman’s \$120,000 sanction on
23 Scheidler as ‘manifestly unreasonable’ and an abuse of discretion;

24 j. RCW 2.48.210 mandates all Bar associates uphold the highest means of “truth and honor”
25 and “never seek to mislead a judge or jury by any false statement of fact or law”. The entire
26 Ellerby case concerns “truth and honor” and “seeking to mislead”. Such a case demands a
27 jury decide what is true an what is deceitful – a jury was denied by Bar associates serving
28 as judges in order to cover up violations of RCW 2.48.210, the violation of which constitutes
a gross misdemeanor under RCW 42.20.080, RCW 9A.80, among other criminal statutes.

k. RCW 2.28.030 for refusing to disqualify as judge as Hull never was “present or sitting” as
a member of the court upon which he rendered his unjust orders;

- 1 1. RCW 2.04.190 mandating cases be determined on the merits – Judge Hull ignored all the
2 evidence to justify his unjust ruling;
- 3 m. RCW 4.04.010 by ignoring the common law established by the Washington State Supreme
4 court in *DISCIPLINE OF DANN* 136 Wn.2d 67, 69, Aug. 1998. This common law provides
5 Scheidler **immunity** from Hull’s retaliation (i.e., the \$120,000 sanction) as Scheidler’s
6 lawyer, Scott Ellerby, **is liable** for the consequence of his actions.
- 7 81. Defendant Hull’s \$120,000 sanction imposed upon Scheidler and awarded to Ellerby, in
8 violation of the constitutional and statutes noted above are unauthorized, unlawful, and
9 invalid and violates Scheidler’s rights and directly resulted in Scheidler’s injuries and denial
10 of due process..

11 **G. Defendants Jesse Young, Michelle Caldier and Jan Angel**

- 12 82. Defendants Jesse Young, Michelle Caldier and Jan Angel are Washington state elected
13 representatives and senator of the 26th District, respectively, who owe Scheidler a fiduciary
14 duty as explicitly expressed by article 1, section 1, “to protect and maintain individual
15 (Scheidler’s) rights” as they are lawfully mandated by RCW 29A.24.031(5).
- 16 83. Defendants Young, Caldier and Angel knowing of the facts through emails, phone calls,
17 face-to-face meetings and copies of grievances and evidence delivered to Young, Caldier
18 and Angel on CD’s, concerning Judge Hull and his role in the Ellerby case, and that the
19 Ellerby case is a consequence of Bar associates covering-up a fraud upon retired/disabled
20 citizens should know from the facts provided to them by Scheidler that Washington State
21 Bar Associates have commandeered the judicial branch, occupy legislative offices,
22 executive office, sit on government boards and committees and hold other decision making
23 office so as to steal from citizens, cover-up crimes and deny due process rights as the Ellerby
24 case shows.
- 25 84. Defendants Young, Caldier and Angel knowing the facts and the wide ranging decision-
26 making control Bar Associates exert over Washington State Citizens should know citizens
27 are powerless against the Washington State Bar and its Associates who use their government
28 offices to enrich themselves, their colleagues and friends.
85. Defendants Young, Caldier and Angel and Washington State, knowing the facts that there
is no “impartial forum” that is totally free from the Bar’s influence should have a heighten

1 level of concern of the dangers in such broad and unchecked power Bar Associates wield over
2 Washington citizens.

3 86. The sad fact is Defendants Young, Calder and Angel and Washington State have violated
4 their primary obligations prescribed by Article 1, Sec 1 by unilaterally refusing to address
5 the unchecked power of the Bar and its oppressive 'policies, practices, customs, claimed
6 powers and schemes' inflicted upon citizens of the 26th District, particularly Scheidler.

7 87. The sad fact is Defendants Young, Calder and Angel and Washington State have violated
8 their primary obligations prescribed by Article 1, Sec 1, and particularly Article 2, Section
9 28(12), by unilaterally refusing to address the unlawful conduct of defendant Kevin Hull –
10 a Bar Associate, and the harm Hull's conduct has on Scheidler. Defendants Young, Calder
11 and Angel's blind-eye to Hull's "unauthorized or invalid acts" effectively "legalizes" what
12 Article 2, Sec 28(12) strictly prohibits.

13 88. Scheidler has supplied irrefutable evidence from his personal experience and personal
14 knowledge of the facts and listed the specific wrongdoing by Judge Hull which he conveyed
15 to Young, Calder and Angel.

16 89. The Washington State Supreme Court has held, citing *Estey*, 104 Wn.2d at 605, *In re*
17 *Debruyne*, 112 Wn.2d 924 (Wash. 1989),

18 We have held that "[m]isfeasance means the improper doing of an act an officer might
19 lawfully do; or, in other words, it is the performance of a duty in an improper manner."
20 (Citation omitted.) *Berge v. Gorton*, 88 Wn.2d 756, 760, 567 P.2d 187 (1977). Malfeasance
21 has been defined as: "Evil doing; ill conduct; the commission of some act which is positively
22 unlawful; the doing of an act which is wholly wrongful and unlawful; the doing of an act
23 which the person ought not to do at all; the doing of what one ought not to do; the
24 performance of some act which ought not to be done; the unjust performance of some act
25 which the party had no right, or which he had contracted not, to do.'(Citation omitted.) *Berge*,
26 at 761, quoting *State v. Miller*, 32 Wn.2d 149, 152, 201 P.2d 136 (1948).

27 90. Defendants Young, Calder and Angel willfully and maliciously ignored Scheidler's pleas
28 for protection against the unauthorized and invalid acts by Kevin Hull, despite a legislator's
fiduciary obligation and legislative power provided by Article 4, Sec 9, and Article 5 that
are intended to "protect" Scheidler's rights as mandated by Article 1, Sec 1

91. Defendant Young began ignoring and returning Scheidler's emails as "SPAM" after
promising Scheidler, in Young's 2014 campaign, to address judicial corruption.

- 1 92. Scheidler even prepared a [DRAFT resolution](#), per Article 4, Sec 9 that was ignored by
2 defendants Young, Caldier and Angel. See email letter, [APPENDIX 7](#)
3 93. Defendants Young, Caldier and Angel, by failing to act in accordance with their duty and
4 powers are liable to Scheidler under the principles of culpability that is further described by
5 RCW 9A.08.020.

6 **VI. WA STATE COURTS ARE BAR FUNCTIONS – RCW 2.48, WHICH**
7 **CREATED THE WASHINGTON STATE BAR, IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL**
8 **ON ITS FACE AND IN PRACTICE.**

- 9 94. WA State Bar Associates (a.k.a, Supreme and Superior court judges, by virtue of Article 4
10 Sec 17) make court rules, interpret the rules they make, strategize through other associations
11 in how to ‘abuse the rules’ – such as through the Association of Superior Court Judges, rules
12 committee, disciplinary board, etc., -- protect themselves by having Bar associates sitting as
13 decision-makers – judges, hearing officials, legislators, governor, and administrative
14 officials, and this is unconstitutional.
15 95. The Washington State Bar, a state agency per RCW 2.48, engages in closed elections where
16 only Bar Associates can vote for and hold executive offices of the Bar. Citizen control or
17 oversight is prevented and Bar Associates run the agency for their own power and wealth.
18 This clearly poses a grave danger to society in having a state agency operate outside citizen
19 control and have its members occupy judicial, legislative, executive, administrative offices
20 and sit on government boards and committes. and this alone mandates legislative attention
21 and investigation of the Bar.
22 96. The Washington State Bar’s discipline system is also “in house” and has been criticized by
23 the American Bar Association’s Clark Commission,

24 **H. Frauds devised by the Bar – the “judicial finding of impropriety” scheme to defraud.**

- 25 97. The Bar’s monopoly power – plenary power -- allows Bar Associates to engage in criminal
26 profiteering schemes without being accountable to anyone.
27 98. In addition to the Bar’s members being in key government offices to cover-up frauds like
28 the Assessor’s fraud at the vortex of this case, the Bar has created its own fraud – the
“judicial finding of impropriety” the Bar’s discipline committee assigns to the grievant. This

1 fraud is designed to shift lawyer discipline to the grievant who then is forced to spend years of
2 his/her life seeking this “judicial finding of impropriety” that will never end in a finding.
3 Rather the judge, as Judge Hull’s conduct proves, dismiss the complaint without ever
4 addressing the evidence and punish the grievant, Scheidler in this case, by imposing
5 thousands of dollars as sanctions.

- 6 99. The Washington State **Legislature is NEGLIGENT** in their duty to address such despicable
7 schemes that costs citizens and the grievant such a high cost.

8 VII. SCHEME OF EUPHAMISMS

- 9 100. Bar associates have established their unique substantive law that replaces legislative and
10 constitutional mandates. For example judges “abuse their discretion,” or “it was error” or
11 determine that they are the “reasonable person” or “reverse and remand”... This scheme of
12 “euphemisms” replaces the substantive laws that use words like “gross incompetence,
13 negligence, fraud, prejudice, deceit, perjury, unlawful, unjust, breach of trust, denial of due
14 process ...” – which are all terms that apply to others and define tortious or criminal conduct
per RCW 42.20, which states,

15 “Every officer or other person mentioned in RCW 42.20.070, who shall willfully disobey
16 any provision of law regulating his or her official conduct in cases other than those
specified in said section, **shall be guilty of a gross misdemeanor.**”

- 17 101. By relabeling unauthorized or invalid conduct as merely an “abuse of discretion” these
18 government officials escape accountability for their “tortious” or “UNLAWFUL” conduct!

- 19 102. Said another way ... judges not only decide their own compliance with the laws that apply
20 to judges, they also grant themselves immunity to escape accountability. These “privileges
21 and immunities” judges claim for themselves and their colleagues violates our constitution

- 22 103. There are no ‘impartial remedies’ in WA State to challenge the Bar’s use of euphemisms to
23 supplant substantive law as such claims would be against the entity that establishes these
24 procedures, applies, interprets, and decides its own power and conduct through the
25 procedures and the euphemisms it devises to hide their criminal conduct. Said another way
26 “lawyers decide lawyer conduct” and decide to what extent citizens are the lawyer’s play-
27 toys.
28

1 104. It is a fact the judicial/lawyer “regulating agencies” are a sham – a fraud upon the people as
2 99% of all grievances are dismissed sua sponte. No other “regulating entity” has a statistical
3 dismissal rate to equal the Bar’s. The consequence is WA State’s judicial system is also a
4 fraud upon the people and a mechanism by which citizens are fleeced of their life, liberty,
5 property, without consequence or a fair avenue of redress.

6 105. The **Washington State Legislature is NEGLIGENT** in their duty to address such
7 despicable schemes that costs citizens and the grievant such a high cost.

8 **VIII. THE COMMON LAW “IMMUNITY” IS A FRAUD PERPETRATED**
9 **UPON SOCIETY BY WASHINGTON’S SUPREME COURT**

10 106. Immunities and privileges that judges grant themselves and their colleagues ARE
11 PROHIBITED by Washington’s constitution, Article 1, sections 8, 12, and 28. In
12 Washington State, “public officials” are either guilty or not guilty in how they perform their
13 official duties. See Article 5; See Article 2 Section 28(12), which PROHIBITS legalizing
14 unauthorized or invalid acts by any official; and RCW 42.20 supra. These “immunities”
15 bestowed by the Supreme Court clearly prove the judicial branch is corrupt in disregarding
16 Washington’s Constitution. The legislature is complicit in this corruption. The motive is
17 simple – a legislator is granted “immunity” and citizens have NO State Avenue to challenge
18 a government that behaves UNCONSTITUTIONALLY.

19 107. The **Washington State Legislature is NEGLIGENT** in their duty to address such
20 despicable schemes that costs citizens and the grievant such a high cost.

21 **IX. ADDITIONAL OFFERS OF PROOF:**

22 108. The evidence supporting Grievant Scheidler’s allegations that the WA State Bar is the
23 facilitator for all the ‘corrupt tactics and procedural chicanery, fraud and deceit, resulting in
24 a dysfunctional court system’ include the following matters involving Scheidler directly.
25 These official proceedings are incorporated by reference as EVIDENCE of the Bar’s
26 “custom and practices” that fosters RICO activity, in breach of their fiduciary duty, *to*
27 ***permit “LYING, PERJURY, SUBORNATION of PERJURY” without consequence***

28 109. Kitsap County Superior Court case numbers: defendants include Avery and WA State Bar
Associates Scott Ellerby WSBA #16277, Felice Congalton, WSBA #6412, J. Reiko Callner

1 WSBA#16546 and Stephen Holman WSBA #8451, all decision makers include WA State
2 Bar Associates serving as judge [J. Russell Hartman, WSBA #7104, Kevin Hull, WSBA
3 #23994 (acting without authority –See RCW 2.28.030(2) Must disqualify “When he or she
4 was not present and sitting as a member of the court at the hearing of a matter submitted for
5 its decision”), Keith Harper WSBA #10724, Jennifer Forbes WSBA #26043 and past
6 president of the Kitsap County Bar Association, Frank Cuthbertson, WSBA #23418. The
7 allegations were that these lawyers violated law obstructed justice, engaged in fraud upon
8 the court, fraud in the court (perjury), their fiduciary duty and caused actual harm; all cases
9 demanded a jury, all cases were dismissed on CR 12 or CR 56 motions, and CR 11 Sanctions
10 were imposed upon Scheidler --- totaling about \$248,000 payable to Ellerby (over \$120,000
11 of these sanctions were by Kevin Hull who NEVER sat on the case – yet granted Ellerby’s
12 motion for this amount!!!).

08-2-02882-0; 09-2-00660-3; 12-2-02161-1; 14-2-00042-3; 15-2-0342-1

13 110. Court of Appeals II case numbers: The Court, through its clerk David Ponzoha, refused to
14 file pleadings (In an appeal from Judge Hull’s sanction award of \$120K when he was never
15 present for ANY matter for which he imposed sanctions). Then Ponzoha dismissed the
16 appeal for not filing a pleading – Ponzoha created the very situation he then ruled upon to
17 SAVE Judge Hull and to insure Ellerby was provided money out of Scheidler’s pocket. All
18 defendants in those appeals are Bar associates and Defendant Avery... all decision makers
19 are Bar Associates Joel Penoyar WSBA#6407, Ernetta Skerlak WSBA #14128 among
20 others... One appeal and an interlocutory appeal reached an opinion and resolved in the Bar
21 associates favor, but reversed \$132,000 of the \$248,000 CR 11 Sanctions that were payable
22 to Scott Ellerby. The appeal of Hull’s award was never heard due to the Clerk obstructing
23 the appeal by not filing an opening brief and then dismissed the appeal for not filing a brief
24 - #454351 387816, 397498, 425912, 454351

25 111. WA Supreme Court case numbers: The Supreme Court through its clerk Susan Carlson,
26 WSBA #12165 refused to take all of these petitions against WA State Bar Associates on
27 “procedural claims – page length” or in the claim the court lack “jurisdiction over the party
28 – a lawyer” (the Court claims ‘plenary powers’) and despite paying a fee for Supreme Court
Review. And despite the Courts own rule that “a clerks ruling on procedural grounds”

1 requires 'de novo review'. RAP 1.2 states a case will not be determined based in compliance
2 or non-compliance with procedures. #'s 848149, 848971, 857164, 876592, 879672, 902887,
3 914702

4 **X. OTHERS INVOLVED BUT NOT YET NAMED DEFENDANTS**

5 112. Jeffrey P. Downer, Wsba# 12625; Russell Hartman (Ret.) Wsba# 7104; Larry Mills,
6 Wsba# 6129; Gauri S. Locker, Wsba# 39022; Allyson J. Ferguson, Wsba #31246; Joel
7 Penoyar, Wsba# 6407; J. Alexander, Wsba(Wsba # Unknown); And Jill Johanson Wsba#
8 15649, Jennifer Forbes Wsba #26043; Keith Harper Wsba #10742; David Jurca WSBA
9 #2015, Jeffrey Stier WSBA #6911, Scott Ellerby WSBA #16277, Cassandra Noble WSBA
10 #12390, J. Reiko Callner, WSBA #16546, Bruce Lemon, WSBA #9326, Ronald Schaps,
11 WSBA#2203, Elizebeth Turner, WSBA#24165, Cathrine Clark, WSBA# 21231, Melody
12 Retallak, WSBA # 40871, Jeffrey Downer, WSBA#12625, Joel Penoyar, WSBA #6407, Jill
13 Johanson, WSBA #15649, Gauri Locker, WSBA#39022, Keith Harper, WSBA #10742,
14 Jennifer Forbes, WSBA #26043, Frank Cuthbertson, WSBA #23418, Ernetta Skerlak
15 WSBA #14128, Eric Miller, WSBA#41040, Cam Comfort, WSBA# 15188, Zachary
16 Mosner WSBA# 9566, Alan Miles WSBA #26961, Ione George, WSBA# 18236, Dionne
17 Maren Padilla-Huddleston WSBA # 38356, Sally Briggs Leighton, WSBA#12156, Alexis
18 Foster, WSBA#37032, Mary M. Tennyson WSBA #11197, Washington State Bar
19 Association, Washington's Attorney General, and The Kitsap Sun, which betrays the public
20 trust by underreporting or printing half-truths intended to deceive or cover-up government
21 misconduct, who may be named defendants at a future time.

21 **XI. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

22 Wherefore the grievant prays

23 Award Grievant damages against each defendant as proper under the circumstances

24 I, the undersigned, attest that the foregoing information is true to the best of my knowledge
25 and offered in the public interest and for the public good.

26 Signed this August 30, 2016,



William Scheidler
Grievant.
1515 Lidstrom Place E
Port Orchard, WA 98366
360-769-8531
billScheidler@outlook.com

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28