No. 90613-1

IN THE SUPREME COURT
OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

HELEN IMMELT; JAY IMMELT; and
JUSTIN ELLWANGER,
Plaintiffs/Respondents,
vs.
ROBERT BONNEVILLE, AKA WILL
ELLWANGER, AKA WILHELM VAN
WANGER; HANNA BONNEVILLE AKA
JOHANNA ELLWANGER; SARA
NICHOLS; PATRICIA PROKOP;
EVERGREEN MANAGEMENT SERVICES
LLC, a Nevada limited liability company,
DBA APPRAISAL SERVICES; and
WASHINGTON APPRAISAL SERVICES, a
Nevada Corporation, DBA APPRAISAL
SERVICES,
Defendants/Appellants.

RESPONDENTS' ANSWER TO APPELLANTS' PETITION FOR DISCRETIONARY REVIEW

Helen Immelt
Justin Ellwanger
Jay Immelt
1815 177th Avenue NE
Snohomish, Wa. 98290
425.374.0056

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Statutes

Rules

COUNTER STATEMENT OF ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

1) Has an issue of substantial public importance been stated when appellants failed to meet their burden of providing an adequate record for review where there is a mixed question of law and fact regarding whether the particular appraisal reports at issue are "products" within the meaning of RCW 63.60.060 and appellants failed to assign error to factual findings made by the trial court following a three week bench trial pertaining to that issue and refused to provide a verbatim report of proceedings, a narrative report of proceedings or an agreed report of proceedings.

2) Has an issue of substantial public importance been stated when appellants failed to meet their burden of providing an adequate record for review where a counterclaimed for release of lis pendens, damages, attorney fees and costs, was stated and appellants were afforded the opportunity to present those counterclaim during the course of a three week bench trial but produced no evidence in support of their claim resulting in factual findings by the trial court that appellants produced no evidence to which findings, appellants failed to assign error and have additionally, refused to provide a verbatim report of proceedings, a narrative report of proceedings or an agreed report of proceedings.

COUNTER STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Following a three week bench trial, the Honorable Suzanne Barnett entered detailed findings of fact, conclusions of law and judgments in favor of plaintiffs Justin Ellwanger and Helen Immelt and against defendants Robert Bonneville aka Will Ellwanger aka Wilhelm Van Wanger and Patricia Prokop totaling approximately $289,581 for having forged plaintiffs' names to real estate appraisal reports[1] thus constituting

[1] Bonneville aka Ellwanger aka Van Wanger had been convicted of forgery and identity theft in 2009 for having forged yet another appraiser's signature to appraisal reports

the unauthorized use of their names and signatures in violation of RCW 63.60.060. (CP 10-33; 140-145, Finding of Fact 75)

The trial court found as fact that *"Bonneville and his associates (Ms. Prokop, Ms. Nichols, and Ms. Woodward) had access to Mr. Ellwanger's and Ms. Immelt's digital signatures and applied these digital signatures to hundreds of appraisal reports submitted to appraisal management companies. Plaintiffs produced evidence of numerous reports bearing Landmark-style file numbers, identifying "significant assistance" by appraiser trainees with whom Plaintiffs had no working relationship, and records of payments for those reports to Landmark or other entities controlled by Mr. Bonneville or Ms. Prokop."* (CP 10-33; Finding of Fact 42).

The trial court found as fact that defendant Prokop and several of defendant Bonneville's employees *"created reports without the knowledge of, and without any assistance or input from plaintiffs... and affixed the digital signature of one of the plaintiffs, shifting all risks associated with the reports to the licensed appraiser whose digital signature she used."* (CP 10-33; Finding of Fact 65).

The trial court further found as fact that defendant *"Prokop changed the mailing and billing remittance address for Ms. Immelt with*

---

during the same time period as here involved (2004-2007). (CP 10-33; Finding of Fact 64.)

one of the appraisal management services. She informed the management company that Ms. Immelt no longer worked with her company, Evergreen Management, and directed that all future payments be sent to Ms. Prokop's Tacoma address. This change of address assured that Ms. Prokop or her colleagues would receive payment in full for reports bearing Ms. Immelt's digital signature, but completed without Ms. Immelt's knowledge or input." (CP 10-33; Finding of Fact 66).

The trial court found that *"Mr. Bonneville affixed or directed or condoned the affixing of the digital signatures of Ms. Immelt and Mr. Ellwanger, without authorization and consent, and without payment therefore."* (CP 10-33; Finding of Fact 71.)

The trial court made a specific finding of fact (#75) that appraisal reports were ***"products"*** within the meaning of RCW 63.60.060 and entered a conclusion of law that plaintiffs had met their burden of proving that defendants had infringed their rights under RCW 63.60.050, .060. (CP 10-33; Finding of Fact 75; Conclusion of Law 6.) The Court's findings and conclusions were not entered in a vacuum. Rather they were based upon substantial testimony by all parties during the course of the three week bench trial regarding the appraisal industry in general (Findings 20-32) and the parties' practice of that profession specifically (Findings 33-82) (CP 10-33).

Defendants counterclaimed against Plaintiffs for, among other things, improper filing of the lis pendens and prayed for release of the lis pendens, damages, costs and attorney fees. (CP 10-33; Finding of Fact 16.) Plaintiffs answered defendants' counterclaim and asserted affirmative defenses. (CP 10-33; Finding of Fact 17.) Much of defendants loosely asserted claims were dismissed at the commencement of trial having been previously dismissed by the Pierce County Superior Court in *Bonneville v. Immelt*, No. 08-2-09415-0. (CP 10-33; Finding of Fact 18.)

Having asserted their wrongful lis pendens claims as counterclaims, Defendants were afforded the opportunity to try those claims and present evidence during the course of the within trial but, for reasons known only to them, chose not to do so. The Court so found in a handwritten interlineation to her Order Vacating, Discharging and Releasing the aforementioned lis pendens filings wherein the court specifically finds that *"Defendants failed to prove attorney fees or costs. "Exhibit A" to the Tall declaration was not provided to the Court and defendants presented no evidence of damages at trial."* (CP 146; 155; 123-127). Again, defendants failed to assign error to these factual findings and provided no record from the trial court of the trial testimony whatsoever.

In the Court of Appeals, Defendants did not assign error to any of the Findings of Fact and did not produce the Verbatim Report of Proceedings pursuant to RAP 9.2, a Narrative Report of Proceedings pursuant to RAP 9.3 or an Agreed Report of Proceedings pursuant to RAP 9.4.[2]

---

[2] RAP 9.2 (b) requires a party to provide a verbatim report of proceedings necessary to present the issues on review including all evidence relevant to the disputed finding if a finding is alleged to not be supported by the evidence. RAP 10.3 (a)(3) requires that a party include a reference to the record "for each factual statement" included in the statement of the case and under section (g) requires a party to include a separate assignment of error for each finding a party contends was improperly made with reference to the finding by number and that the appellate court will only review claimed error in the assignment of errors.

In the present case, appellants provided virtually no citations to the record to support their factual statements and commenced their statement of the case with a gratuitous slam of respondent Jay Immelt regarding the loss of his law license two decades previously. Appellants' counsel does not even feign any tangential relevance to the issues on appeal. Jay Immelt did not draft the complaint in this action and did not even represent himself in the trial of this matter. The statement was included solely to besmirch all appellants in the eyes of the court as if Mr. Immelt's Bar Status makes any of the parties' claims more or less legally viable. By any interpretation of the Rules of Evidence, Mr. Immelt's Bar Status is neither relevant or material to anything in the present case and the reference should be stricken from Appellant's Brief as it has nothing to do with a "fair statement of the case."

Moreover, while it is true that the trial court found that no evidence was presented in support of Mr. Immelt's claims, Mr. Immelt would say that the trial court's findings were not supported by the evidence as substantial uncontroverted evidence was presented on his behalf that defendant's violated Mr. Immelt's rights under the statute as defendants admittedly forged Mr. Immelt's name to appraisal approval applications with a variety of lenders using his education, training, and experience to obtain a volume of appraisal work that they then parceled out amongst themselves. The trial court erroneously believed that Mr. Immelt's signature had to be placed on each of these reports to constitute a violation. Mr. Immelt was not able to afford the $20,000 transcript estimate to produce a record to show that evidence and therefore did not assign error unlike Appellants who apparently feel they are entitled to a free ride.

ARGUMENT

1. No Substantial Public Interest Is Presented Where Appellant Failed to Produce A Record or Assign Error to Factual Findings That The Subject Appraisal Reports Were Products Under RCW 63.60.050 And Where Appellant's Admit Forging Individual's Names and Signatures to Those Appraisal Reports

RCW 63.60.050 provides protection to individuals for the unauthorized use of their name or signature on *"products" "entered into commerce in this state".*[3] The Court of Appeal found that the statutory term "products" was capable of simple determination as, essentially, "'something produced by physical labor or intellectual effort: the result of work or thought.' Real estate appraisal reports plainly fit under this definition." (COA Opinion at p. 8)

Respondents would contend that any analysis beyond the simple application of the foregoing dictionary definition to this case requires a review of the entirety of the record produced at trial which is not possible as Appellants have chosen not to expend their resources in an effort to enlighten this Court.

---

[3] Note that appellants do not assign error to or request construction of the statute as to whether or not the within appraisal reports are *"entered into commerce in this state."* This failure, coupled with the failure to assign error to findings of fact pertaining to the *"product"* issue together with the complete failure to provide an adequate record of the three week bench trial provide more than ample reason for this court to find that appellants failed to meet their burden of providing an adequate record and the appeal should have been dismissed on respondents' motion on the merits.

While these respondents only have access to a simple online search of cases interpreting RAP 13.4 (b)(4) through the Court's website, no such case appears. The closest respondents can come to an interpretation of what constitutes an issue of substantial public importance is found in *In Re Marriage of Horner*, 151 Wn.2d 884 (2004) dealing with this Rule in the context of a review of a moot question.

In *Horner*, the Court looked at resolution of the following questions as dispositive: (1) the public or private nature of the question presented, (2) the desirability of an authoritative determination for the future guidance of public officers, and (3) the likelihood of future recurrence of the question.

Respondents would suggest that with the felony conviction of appellant Robert Bonneville aka Will Ellwanger aka Wilhelm Van Wanger for forging other appraiser's signatures to appraisal reports and the within monetary judgment, there is little likelihood that the Courts of this State will be inundated with cases involving the forgery of appraiser's names to appraisal reports. This case would seem to be the quintessential private question between private parties and certainly not the best vehicle for this Court to expound on this particular statute.

Appellants bear the burden of providing an adequate record for review. *Sime Construction v. WPPSS*, 28 Wn. App. 10 (1980); *Story v.*

Shelter Bay Company, 52 Wn. App. 334 (1988). In *Sime*, the court held that since the appellant had failed to provide a report of proceedings, the analysis was confined to the trial court's findings which were unchallenged by appellant. The court went on to hold:

> On the basis of these unchallenged findings and without an adequate record to determine how the trial court arrived at these figures, we cannot say the trial court's decision was based upon opinion or discretion. Since WPPSS has the burden of providing an adequate record, but failed to do so, the decision must stand. (Citations omitted.)

As it was in *Story and Sime*, *supra*, so too should it be in the within case.

2. No Substantial Public Interest Is Presented Where Appellant Failed to Produce A Record or Assign Error to Factual Findings and Appellants Failed to Produce Evidence at Trial Regarding Lis Pendens Damages; Failed to Assign Error to Pertinent Findings of Fact; and, Failed to Provide an Adequate Record for Review.

Appellants counterclaimed against respondents in the underlying case for release of lis pendens and sought damages, attorney fees and costs. (CP 10-33; Finding of Fact 16.) Respondents denied those claims and asserted affirmative defenses. (CP 10-33; Finding of Fact 17.) Much of defendants loosely asserted claims were dismissed at the commencement of trial having been previously dismissed by the Pierce County Superior Court in *Bonneville v. Immelt*, No. 08-2-09415-0. (CP 10-33; Finding of Fact 18.) Trial of the matter was had before the trial

court for three weeks. During that time, appellants produced no evidence whatsoever in support of their claims. (CP 146; 155; 123-127). **Seven months after** the Court entered its Findings and Conclusions, appellants attempted to bootstrap into the case a claim for damages and attorney fees by way of self-serving and un-cross examined declarations, parts of which were not even provided to the Court.[4] (CP 58-95).

As with the previous issue, appellants assigned no error to the Court's finding of fact that appellants produced no evidence in support of their claim during trial when they had the opportunity and therefore, were not entitled to any relief other than release of the lis pendens. As with the previous issue, appellants have provided no record from which to challenge the trial court's decision. As with the previous issue, this court has no choice but to uphold the trial court's decision for lack of an

---

[4] This case is similar to the posture of the case in *Engstrom v. Goodman*, 166 Wn. App. 905 (2012) wherein a party, as here, attempted to bootstrap declarations into the record after the underlying court had already made its decision.

In *Engstrom* the court held:

> "...a motion to strike is typically not necessary to point out evidence and issues a litigant believes this court should not consider. No one at the Court of Appeals goes through the record or the briefs with a stamp or scissors to prevent the judges who are hearing the case from seeing material deemed irrelevant or prejudicial. So long as there is an opportunity (as there was here) to include argument in the party's brief, the brief is the appropriate vehicle for pointing out allegedly extraneous materials--not a separate motion to strike. See *Cameron v. Murray*, 151 Wn. App. 646, 658, 214 P.3d 150 (2009), *review denied*, 168 Wn.2d 1018 (2010)." As in *Engstrom*, this court should not consider the bootstrap declarations of Bonneville, O'Brien and Tall.

adequate record and failure to assign error to findings of fact pursuant to *Sime and Story, supra.*

Respondents would respectfully suggest that like the preceding issue, no issue of substantial public interest is presented where appellants had the opportunity to litigate an issue at trial, failed to do so, the Court entered factual findings, no assignment of error was made and no record provided the reviewing court.

3. Attorney Fees on Appeal

Should this court uphold the judgments of the underlying court, RCW 63.60.060 (5) provides that the prevailing party may recover reasonable attorney fees, expenses and court costs incurred in recovering any remedy brought under the statute. As the failure to produce an adequate record is largely based upon the conduct of appellants' counsel, it would be wholly unfair to permit appellants to avoid the imposition of a penalty that would have been visited upon respondents solely because respondents have had to act as their own counsel. Moreover, providing respondents an award for attorney fees will ensure that pro se litigants are treated on an equal footing with their more well-heeled counterparts and provide for equal protection under the law for all parties. Therefore, respondents request that the Court award respondents reasonable attorney fees, costs and expenses to be based upon supplemental affidavit.

CONCLUSION

No issue of substantial public interest is presented by a party previously convicted of forging appraiser's names to appraisal reports where that party refuses to expend funds to provide a record of a three week trial in which he is found to have committed the same acts many times over in a civil proceeding and fails to assign error or produce any evidence of damages regarding lis pendens filings.

Dated this 19th day of September, 2014.

Helen Immelt
1815 177th Avenue NE
Snohomish, Wa. 98290
Phone 425.308.1755

Justin Ellwanger
1815 177th Avenue NE
Snohomish, Wa. 98290
Phone 253.237.3222
justin.ellwanger@gmail.com

Jay Immelt
Pro Se ~~Defendant~~ Respondent
1815 177th Avenue NE
Snohomish, Wa. 98290
Phone 425.374.0056
homeappraisalservices@msn.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States and State of Washington that I am now and at all times herein mentioned, a resident of the State of Washington, over the age of eighteen years, not a party to or interested in the above-entitled action, and competent to be a witness herein.

On the date given below I caused to be served in the manner noted a copy of the following upon designated counsel:

Respondent's Answer

JOSEPH P. TALL 2611 NE 113th Street, Suite 300 Seattle, Wa. 98125-6700	[] Via U.S. Mail [] Via Fax: 206.440.0636 [] Via Hand Delivery [x] Via Email per CR 5 Agreement [] Via Pierce Co. Linx system
Helen Immelt 1815 177th Ave NE Snohomish, Wa. 98290	[] Via U.S. Mail [] Via Fax: [x] Via Hand Delivery [] Via Email
Justin Ellwanger 1815 177th Ave NE Snohomish, Wa. 98290	[] Via U.S. Mail [] Via Fax: [x] Via Hand Delivery [] Via Email
Jay Immelt 1815 177th Ave NE Snohomish, Wa. 98290	[] Via U.S. Mail [] Via Fax: [x] Via Hand Delivery [] Via Email

DATED this 19th day of November, 2014 at Snohomish, Washington.

OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK

To: hdiappraisals@netscape.net; joetalllaw@gmail.com
Subject: RE: answer to petition for discretionary review and motion for extnsion of time

Rec'd 9/19/2014

Please note that any pleading filed as an attachment to e-mail will be treated as the original. Therefore, if a filing is by e-mail attachment, it is not necessary to mail to the court the original of the document.

From: hdiappraisals@netscape.net [mailto:hdiappraisals@netscape.net]
Sent: Friday, September 19, 2014 12:23 PM
To: OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK; joetalllaw@gmail.com
Subject: answer to petition for discretionary review and motion for extnsion of time

attached please find respondents answer to petition for discretionary review and motion for extension of time.

hanna immelt