RECEIVED
SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
Feb 12, 2015, 2:23 pm
BY RONALD R. CARPENTER
CLERK
E
CRF
RECEIVED BY E-MAIL

LAW OFFICE OF DEWEY W. WEDDLE
A Professional Limited Liability Company
Telephone: 360-293-3600

909 7th Street
Anacortes, WA 98221

Fax: 360-293-3700
dwweddle@msn.com

February 12, 2015

Ms. Susan L. Carlson
Supreme Court Deputy Clerk
Temple of Justice
P. O. Box 40929
Olympia WA 98504-0929

Re: Supreme Court No. 90989-0 Guardianship of Dorothy May Kertis
Dianna Parish v. Terry L. Kertis

Court of Appeals No. 70909-7-1

Dear Ms. Carlson:

Thank you for your letter dated February 6, 2015. You wrote that I had the opportunity to reply on behalf of the Respondent to the *Petition for Discretionary Review* and the *Supplement to Petition for Discretionary Review*, provided the reply did not exceed eight pages in length.

Ms. Kertis passed away leaving not much of an estate. Unfortunately, a substantial portion of her estate was consumed in legal fees responding to the endless, meritless litigation initiated by the petitioner, whose attorney is representing him *pro bono*. Beyond this letter, the estate simply cannot afford to file a detailed reply, even one as brief as eight pages. I hope it suffices to say that at the last hearing in Skagit County Superior Court (March 26, 2014) the Court made the following finding:

> "Because the motion was not brought in good faith, was filed to harass the guardian, and has needlessly increased the cost of litigation, Mr. Kertis's motion is the abusive use of litigation, as it repeats the same pattern of conduct that has already resulted in sanctions against him."

As a result of that finding, the Court ordered the petitioner to pay the respondent's attorney's fees in the amount of $3516.

It is my understanding that the Supreme Court has the entire court file. I believe that anyone reading the file will quickly conclude that the *Petition for Discretionary Review* is without merit, that it was brought in bad faith, and that it repeats the same pattern of conduct (harassment of the guardian) that has already resulted in sanctions against the petitioner.

Should the Supreme Court require a more extensive reply than this letter, certainly I will file one. But for the sake of the beneficiaries of Ms. Kertis's small estate, I hope that is not necessary.

Sincerely,

Dewey W. Weddle

Dewey W. Weddle

Cc: Client
Rick Ross
Nancy Preg