

FILED
Court of Appeals
Division I
State of Washington
8/30/2018 2:14 PM

FILED
SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
9/4/2018
BY SUSAN L. CARLSON
CLERK

96256-1

SUPERIOR COURT OF WASHINGTON FOR King County

Bovo, Angela))	10305248-1SEA
Plaintiff,))	Notice of Appeal to
v.))	746647
Sanderson, Zane))	
Defendant.))	

Angela Bovo, Plaintiff, seeks review by the designated appellate court of the Judgement trail ruling by Judge North, decided on 1.20.2017, which allowed Minor Child to relocated with sole custody to a parent with a criminal history of domestic violence. NO court order has been followed an the child has a right to access his home country, his mother and the privilege and rights that come with being a US citizen.

1. According to Rule 1.1 (a) the review of the trial court decision is a right of the aggrieved party. According to rule 6.1, 1.1.2 The review is under the Scope of the Supreme Court.
2. The Appellate argues that allowing the relocation to Non Hauge Country has failed to provide the child an enforceable court order and has allowed increase in domestic violence and conflict, while failing to allow the child access to both of his parents.
3. The Plaintiff request the support to the US courts to facilitate safe, cooperative parenting in the best interest of the child involved and a return to the original parenting plan.

8.30.2018

Signature,

Angela



Bovo Pro Se

FILED
Court of Appeals
Division I
State of Washington
8/30/2018 2:14 PM

A. Assignments of Error (1.1)(a) Review is within the Scope of the Supreme Court Assignments of Error, section (1.1 g) allows scope of Supreme Court Review for contract complaint made or indicated. The Order contradicts the Laws and statues in place.
No. Rule 3.3 Plaintiff is eligible for and seeks review of the Supreme Court as the aggrieved party.
No. Rule 6.1 1.1, 1.2, the review is a matter of right and the Superior Court Decision Can be reviewed.

No. 8.3 The Appellate Court Authority is effective for review and appellate has review as a matter of right.

Issues Pertaining to Assignments of Error

No. 1 - The System failed to enforce RCW 26.50.550, to prevent, avoid, or deescalate patterns of domestic violence. The plaintiffs requests that the court take all preventative and proactive action, to require court order adherence for both parties and to follow the recommendations of the professionals involved.

No. 2- The Superior Court system is acting in such ways to prioritize it's finical fees, over and above citizen rights to due process. They are doing this by not providing any way by which I can file complaints electronically.

This gives priority to the legal industry and there are not ways for pro se litigants to get the same treatment, or the federal accommodation that the court is obligated to.

B. Statement of the Case ,

Seeing how a Dissolution Case that was sent to review to the King County Bar Association DV protection case, could then go to such court abuse that Case Management and inaccessible procedural access violation the laws and statues in places which require judicial review, which authorize electronic communication, and which provide for reasonable accommodation. All of which have been requested and communicated to the Court all of which have been denied.

Despite the appellate being noted for being able, no such remedy, motion, release of records, or available support to comply with request were available.

It was argued in October of 2018 that under Rap 15.2.F, G that indigent and medically recommends accommodation must be request by litigant, and provided for reasonable by the court. This was denied. Which led the court to a previous path of court inflict abuse, where by the respondent, intentionally instigated

C. It is not fair to allow a US child, and victim of domestic violence to be deported a country which will not allow him access to his mother. This child's needs and rights to a mother should be protected by the country he comes from, as all professionals have been requesting the court to act according the benefit of the child's needs.

E. It is not ethical for the Family Court Industry to deny any participant access to electronically filed, fee waivers, working copies, motions, or other legal matter which would prevent access to due process.

F. Appendix ____ A-1
[List each separate item in the Appendix and give page where each item begins.]

Statutes
RCW 26.50.150.5,6
RCW 26.50.220
RCW.50.330
RCW. 36.28.022
RCW 9A.56.022
RCW 71.05.212

A.

Assignments of Error

Here in trial court ruling 1.20.2017, the Trial Court Ruling which allowed minor child to relocate with Defendant Sanderson to a Non Hauge Country. Plaintiff at the time of trial requested a protection order, and explained verbally to the judge the ongoing actions, threats and escalation patters of domestic violence. The judge disregarded this. He disregarded the enforceability and remote location of the relocation. Since the trial date. No court order has been followed. and continuing acts of domestic abuse have been instigated by the defendant.

Issues Pertaining to Assignments of Error

The plaintiff has been given many attempts to file this appeal, designation of clerk's papers and service.

However the ability to access the system, request required release or records, or comply with other procedural issues of the court too complex to appropriately navigate. The Court of Appeals waited on the Release of the Designation of Clerk's Papers and

B.

Statement of the Case

Plaintiff seeks trial court decision review. The Court of appeals allowed several modification and extension as to comply with Rul 9.6 and 9.2 The Designation of Clerk's Papers. However the Superior Court has refused to recognize

C.

Summary of Argument

[This is optional. For suggestions for preparing a summary of arguments see Wiener, supra, section 65.]

D.

Argument

1. The Plaintiff is a resident of the state of Washington.
2. The minor child involved is a US citizen.
3. The entire family is struggling with the patterns of domestic violence
4. State initiatives to protect the child during this time of litigation have failed, disregarded legislation in place to handle the matter otherwise, and have denied parental access and prejudice parental rights, against recommendations and what is in the best interested of the child.
5. The Superior Court had refused to provide basic and human recommendation according to the ADA act and as were medically recommended. Instead they have appointed a set judge. This judge has been recently admonished for his bias and unfair judicial behavior. This same complaint has been made by the plaintiff to the Court, Commission, and his behavior intentionally has refused to enforce the court order equally for both parties. He has also failed to follow medical recommendations for all parties involved, and the defendant whose condition falls under RCW 25.50.150.5.6.

6. The Plaintiff's request and court obligation falls under RCW 25.50.330, by which she has made request of the court and the due process to fall under the financial fee waiver recommended by RCW 38.18.022. This Statues states that family court litigation cannot cost the litigants such that they lose basic cost of living. This has been the financial circumstance of the plaintiff since the extorted debt in her name and claiming of all assets. There have also been predatory identity attack, and further acts of domestic violence out of the country.

E. Conclusion

A full review of the trial relocation 1.20.2017 is requested. Safety planning, child's rights to adequate health care, education, medical recommended interventions planed for an provided in such manner that they are enforceable and all preventative and proactive action has been taken to prevent further conflict, violence, discrimination or predatory economic behavior.

8.20.2018

Respectfully submitted,

A rectangular box containing a handwritten signature in black ink. The signature is written in a cursive style and appears to read "Angela Bovo".

Angela Bovo

Pro Se

ANGELA BOVO - FILING PRO SE

August 30, 2018 - 2:14 PM

Transmittal Information

Filed with Court: Court of Appeals Division I
Appellate Court Case Number: 76466-7
Appellate Court Case Title: In re: Angela Sanderson n/k/a Bovo, Appellant v. Zane Sanderson, Respondent
Superior Court Case Number: 10-3-05248-1

The following documents have been uploaded:

- 764667_Briefs_20180830141042D1950240_5110.pdf
This File Contains:
Briefs - Appellants
The Original File Name was Supreme Court Brief.pdf
- 764667_Other_20180830141042D1950240_1342.pdf
This File Contains:
Other - Fee Waiver
The Original File Name was EX PARTE 6.13 FILING DESIGNATION .pdf
- 764667_Petition_for_Review_20180830141042D1950240_8969.pdf
This File Contains:
Petition for Review
The Original File Name was Notice of Appeal Supreme Court 8.30.pdf

A copy of the uploaded files will be sent to:

- v@vfreitaslaw.com

Comments:

Sender Name: Angela Bovo - Email: angbovo@gmail.com
Address:
222 SW 292 ST
Federal WAY, WA, 98023
Phone: (425) 753-1966

Note: The Filing Id is 20180830141042D1950240

ANGELA BOVO - FILING PRO SE

August 30, 2018 - 2:14 PM

Transmittal Information

Filed with Court: Court of Appeals Division I
Appellate Court Case Number: 76466-7
Appellate Court Case Title: In re: Angela Sanderson n/k/a Bovo, Appellant v. Zane Sanderson, Respondent
Superior Court Case Number: 10-3-05248-1

The following documents have been uploaded:

- 764667_Briefs_20180830141042D1950240_5110.pdf
This File Contains:
Briefs - Appellants
The Original File Name was Supreme Court Brief.pdf
- 764667_Other_20180830141042D1950240_1342.pdf
This File Contains:
Other - Fee Waiver
The Original File Name was EX PARTE 6.13 FILING DESIGNATION .pdf
- 764667_Petition_for_Review_20180830141042D1950240_8969.pdf
This File Contains:
Petition for Review
The Original File Name was Notice of Appeal Supreme Court 8.30.pdf

A copy of the uploaded files will be sent to:

- v@vfreitaslaw.com

Comments:

Sender Name: Angela Bovo - Email: angbovo@gmail.com
Address:
222 SW 292 ST
Federal WAY, WA, 98023
Phone: (425) 753-1966

Note: The Filing Id is 20180830141042D1950240