

98702-5

COURT OF APPEALS - DIVISION ONE
SUPERIOR COURT OF KING COUNTY - SEATTLE
THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF
WASHINGTON

APPELLATE CASE NO.: 19807-3-1
TRIAL COURT: 18-2-26094-7
ADMIN. REVIEW: 19-2-06331-9

JULIET S. SARIOL

(PETITIONER)

v.

PAUL G. ALLEN and
THE FAMILY FOUNDATION

(DEFENDANT)

PREPARED BY:

Juliet S. Sariol (Individuality)
977 Discovery Heights Circle NE
Issaquah, WA 98029
apt 302

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. Identity of petitioner - pg 1
- II. Decisions - pg 1
- III. Issues presented for review - pg 2
 - Assignment of Errors
- IV. Issues pertaining to Error - pg. 3-10
- V. Statement of Case - pg 10-11
- VI. Argument - pg 12-20
- VII. Conclusion - pg 20-24

Appendix

- A. Proof of Service - 2 pgs
 - B. Unpublished opinion - 5 pgs
 - C. Background of the Case 6 pgs.
(Demonstrative)
 - D. ISSUES - 3 pgs.
- (there are 2 pgs for page # 5 of Petition for Review)

COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION ONE
SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
SUPERIOR COURT OF KING COUNTY

Juliet S. Saniol
(Petitioner)

vs.

Paul G. Allen and
Family Foundation

CAUSE: 79801-3

TRIAL CT: 18-2-206947

ADMIN. REV: 19-2-06331-9

PETITION FOR DISCRETIONARY
REVIEW

I. IDENTITY OF PETITIONER

Juliet S. Saniol asks this Court to accept review of the decision or parts of the decision designated in Part B of this Motion.

II. DECISIONS

Petitioner herein, requests Discretionary review from the Appellate Court of the following:

1. Trial Court Decision entered at Court of Appeals on April 17, 2018.
2. Court of Appeals Unpublished Opinion, Affirmed Order - April 27, 2010.

pg 1 of 24

3. Denial of Motion for Reconsideration or Motion to vacate and Retain Separated issues for De Novo and Discretionary Review - entered on April 11, 2020 and on May 20, 2020.
4. Denial of Petition for Relief from Restraint Noted on January 9, 2020
5. Application for Recovery Costs
6. Retention of Restraining Order Violation Counsel
7. Application for Recall of Mandate of Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit
8. Waiver of Application-filing fee transfer by Certificate Failure to State Claim Rap 2.5 - Split authority between the Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court

III. ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

ASSIGNMENTS OF ERROR

- No 1. King County Superior Court Failure to State Claim with prejudice
- No 2. District Court failure to State Claim without prejudice
- No 3. Defendant's Motion to Dismiss with Exhibits
- No 4. Strict Reply Memoranda
- no 5. Consolidation of Cases

20824

IV. ISSUES PERTAINING TO ERROR

No. 1. King Superior Court Failure to State Claim with prejudice is a decision reviewable for discretionary because of conflicting decision with Court of Appeals. RAP 2.2. Failure to State Claim precludes Common Law Family and Community realstate, Juvenile, government misconduct and gangsters activity. It is said that Failure to State Claim cannot be litigated and does not preclude Collateral Estoppel because it cannot be resolved. To this exception under "with prejudice" of trial Court allowing opportunity on Appeal at discretionary.

At the hearing rendition "leave of Court" therein, implied interpretation under: to protect defendant under Equal Protection Clause in an incompetent Court, for the Judge to become witness of the case and avoidance for reversal for settlement under Factual Issues herein, asserts the latter presided more of the conduct of Judge because what constitutes substantive evidence was the word "any". When judge asked petitioner "do you have any other evidence?" Answered "yes your honor" and did not proceed to cross examination. Under this claim is conformed to Court of Appeals opinion to certify the case for discretionary because conduct of trial Court arrived to dismiss case as unconscientious or improper when there were other

available remedy because defendants complaints were harmless errors curative for Amendment.

"Leave of Court" was unnecessary because under petitioners first Pleadings deduced facts are known to the Court as Interlocutory matter because of the Factual issues presented. if so, why does the Court and defendant focused interrogation into something have gone past beyond Court rule procedures? Consider there, a mandate at the Ninth Circuit have already been issued declared at the Pleadings thereafter, the Order failure to state claim with prejudice is similarly confession and avoidance which is an affirmative action defense qualified for discretionary review.

Are there other available remedy at the Superior Court prior dismissal as previously stated "can not be litigated"? But what were the issues and matters already been litigated? Here, in this case against Mr. Allen and Family Foundation is the intent or emotional intent behind the transfer of the property" and the issues formerly litigated were pertained to the 1981 Defense Treaty Agreement with NATO. Issues that are distinct and separate for Discretionary Review. and Factual issues Contrasting Failure to state claim or substance versus procedure which constitute legal issues and not Judicial Procedure, as to say "Conflicts of law".

Herein, beyond conforming that "Factual Issues" is the

Circumstance behind trial Court's "heave of Court" conduct. Failure to state Claim Duration under Supplemental 15 for Interlinear cannot be distinguished with the Factual Issues. Under the Judge availability inquiry "do you have" "Any" Evidence". At that given point petitioners could have established evidence grounds burden of proof of Contract associated acts of Mr Paul G. Allen and the Family Foundation and the asserted "transfer of property". The word "Any" are known to the Court as "Substantial Evidence", and this what constitutes Factual Issues. A remedy under Reversal and Settlement could have been applied without dismissal of Case because King Trial Court is a Remedial Court. Case was at the proper jurisdiction. This is substance over procedure matters because of dying declarations affecting pecuniary and substantial interest of property. Legal issues or Conflicts of Law and additional delay impacts Constitutional Speedy Rights violation and irraparable harm, damages and injuries. What constitutes "Conflicts of Law" is finding original jurisdiction. If so, 1978 Hague Convention was the original contract agreement then trial Court's application was to transfer Case not dismissal.

50724

Factual issues under the claim asserted that, Paul G. Allen Exceeded Authority by the transfer of Property is separate and distinct issue.

Substance vs. Procedure or Conflicts of Law are applied to the other Issue where Mr. Allen was the key person for decision making about the property which have been entered into Short title legislative government Acts namely the 1981 Treaty Defense and the instrumentality utilization under legislative's as Foreign government State Instrumentality. Herein, Compulsory, permissive or Joinder Agreements necessary to establish grounds of Mr. Allen in the Corporation or perhaps Third party Summoned to Mr. Bill Gates necessary for Incorporation issues and Contract origination issues.

Herein, Emotional state of Mr. Allen prior his death to decide the transfer of property is to be investigated whether Quiet Title or his philanthropic to help the petitioner at the same time helping his own community, The Intergovernmental organization appointed to fix issues of petitioner.

No 2. Court of Appeals opinion - Please see the argument of this document for contrasting defenses under the elements factual issue and failure to State Claim issues.

no.3 Denial of Motion for Reconsideration or Document in titled motion to vacate and retain separated issues for DeNovo and Discretionary Review.

Under this issue the purpose of the copy for the Court of Appeal was to provide a copy, to inform the Court that under 12.3 Forms of decision, the claimed separate and distinct issue Breach of Contract Exceeded Authority issue is qualified under CR 5a (a) of the King Trial Court. Therein asserted that, 12.3 (a) departed Court authority was upon Termination of Review by issuance of unpublished opinion, because the issue is not part of the Interlocutory Nature of the Case and due to the Appellate's opinion that they review Failure to State Claim as De Novo. The intent was for the King County (and) to correspond under the matter. Nevertheless, the Court of Appeals treated the document as Motion for Reconsideration.

and upon phone call follow up with the Bailiff of Judge Parisien at the King County therein, responded that Trial Court have long time departed its authority under the Case despite of the Motion.

No.4 - Denial of Restraint Petition Relief notation on on January 9, 2020.

As to the standing of the Case is the mandate Specific Performance and other Execution Supplementary Pleadings under Collateral Injunction and Contempt of Court, Herein. Ask the Courts why such Interlocutory private setting under appointment of receivership restricts petitioner from seeking (K&PI) assistance for reconciliation. Herein, attests that the longevity infiltration of Conspiracy undertakes Case is traced back from the time Hereditament was administered and petitioner have been subjected in the opposition of holding a title in the Monarch. The Constitutive nature of the case was when the instrumentality received the first improvisation and entered into Treaties diplomatic purposes and the Hague Economic Environmental Eastern Countries Council. to place the instrumentality under U.N. legislative purposes when the petitioner is open for titleship under Primary Common law legislative.

Hereupon, the discovery that Washington State and the Mexican State entered the instrumentality for other purposes Federal and State, managed to Conspire at the vicinity pursuant to CFR. 47. Presentation. State Allegations or the Tribunal Court Military police said to be "Substantial" evidence against the petitioner according to the Order issued by the trial Court on the Administrative Review Stated by the Department of Labor Assistant Attorney General.

The technicality of Artificial Intelligence main Role of Mr. Allen for experimentation purposes under this case one of the methods associated to his Dream Works Production in Hollywood ownership is for enhancement and mental preparedness purposes. These are Demonstrative Evidence Admissible under Rules of Evidence. The songs lyrics under the song by Lilly Allen in titled "Fuck you" was intended for Judicial purpose and said to have contents under "ting mind." Another song which could help the Appellate to the issuance of Writ of Assistance is that under the content lyrics song intitled "I can make your hands clap." This is evident that the petitioner is and

have been abused by designing. This song was released during the time when she only have the FCC and without this Robotic Engineering. Imagine the capability of the third installation susceptible and highly manipulable to VIRTUAL GAMING designing out of the normal function if at the time fully occupied because of the open electrodes. The allegations under the said occurrences at the Four Seasons Hotel, at the Pleadings Attaints at the district Courts and the said Omission wherein, the petitioner said to fail to appear at the hearing after a year dismissal of case under RCW 10.77. This was because the State have to used away 2 vehicles she lined after homelessness, to conceal evidence experiments used w/ the vehicle and left out of the State. Co- Consequentially, at another dismissal of the Administrative Review of the Case at the King Superior Court due to non appearance. Herein, move to strike all allegations to be under the elements of Fraudulent Acts and pray to the appellate consider the Super Highway Nature of Information Technology applied under this Case more specifically that the

procedure of Game programming are being held under the manipulation of Children around the Community of the resident projects.

Therein, recent research that the case is under investigation to be associated with over 700 cases entered and submitted all around the United States.

- no. 5 Application of Recovery Cost herein, Pray for Review all the costs under review.
- no. 6 Retention of Restraining Order Violation Counsel, pray for appellate for assistance in correspondence -
- no. 7 mandate recall - Please See Argument
- no. 8 Waiver of Application fees pray for application under disputed issue Failure to State Claim effects preclusion - Transfer by Certification.

(no. 9) V. STATEMENT OF CASE

Procedural questions and issue affected the Case and pervasiveness effects under the violation of CFR 47 - Presentation Ex Parte Restricted.

therein, this regulation prohibits the use of "Casual talks" at the premise, and the Function of the Government guaranteed the resident's rights and

100824

privileges, Immunities and Powers extended out to petitioners family acquired Statutory provided under 28 USC 1610. Property is exempt from Execution under 28 USC 1611 and 28 USC 1603 guaranteed the instrumentality to own Shares.

Why does State Courts adhere to practices and illegality nature of Collusive Civil Conspiracy irrespective to the seriousness of the purposes intents of legislatures interfering Government Acts.

V. ARGUMENT

Hereupon, brought to the argument two controlling main issues which significantly impact the end result of the case. This is the inferences drawn under "leave of Court", why it could lead us to Choices of Law, the Forum Preferential for the case to be considered with discretionary review. The elements of Failure to state claim and factual issues. First, under the word "any" is the driven force element Courts have known for "Substantive evidence" the conduct of Court to not proceed for presentation which relates to "Confession and Avoidance", an affirmative defense with the Judicial Notice supplementation under adjudicative facts Court decision have arrived ~~are~~ Order Failure to State Claim with prejudice. Defense under discretionary which depends upon petitioner reasoning and substantiation. Acts of fraud, affirmative about a "material fact" brought to evidenced under Contempt. Such as facebook account outlined on the fact finding as "Supporting declarations of Tim J. Filer for motion to Dismiss". The word "any" and pleading relationship "Confession and Avoidance" are elements of Factual Issues and not Failure to State Claim.

"Leave of Court" under Failure to State Claim does not preclude Collateral Estoppel because they are cases that can not be resolved and litigated. Unless "with prejudice"

12 of 211

ARGUMENT CONTINUATION:

it allows plaintiffs to proceed with discretion. Under Family law, "leave of Court" implies necessary objection or Amendment for Interlinear CR 15. But, the goal of defendant was for Supplemental proceeding evidence to the factfinding order, a painful process which petitioner suffered from. It is said that affirmative defense could lead to concealment or destruction of evidence.

At the hearing for "Motion to dismiss" because petitioner's side is constraint to 15 minutes and was focused on the "Strict reply" real evidence to be admitted, objection defenses to strike motion to dismiss lacked persuasion. But, the gravity underlying "dying declarations" were enough to counter the controlling elements under failure to state claim, it is the Court duty to weigh substance over procedure, to that of "Conscience of Court". Legal issue vs. Judicial procedure. Could it be the Court was right not to collateral attack the jurisdiction? but failed to point the case into a right direction? Failure to state claim instead of factual issues, or could the motive be to delay by dismissal and participate into investigation because of Supplemental proceeding. Is this Constitutional violation of Amendment Sixth The Speedy Trial Clause.

ARGUMENT CONTINUATION:

These are Agreements of history to that of "Contracts". Substantive Law constituted "to find the original Contract and location" for jurisdiction determination. But, why did the appellate and trial Court fail to cite this issue, rather the appellate court on their opinion seemed to conform to Defendants' complaint under defective pleadings, when this case is obvious Historical legislative Government Act functions. Herein, Evidences are the issue to compel do to be "Substantive" for factual issues to be resolved under Reversal of the Case and Settlement. Defendant's holding under offered statement at the hearing saying "Plaintiff is an expert or we don't know what is in front of us" then later corresponded to one of petitioner's Pleadings accusing "Plaintiff does not know English" are part of interrogatory patterns excessiveness as to inconsistency rather focusing to important facts held for burden of presumption which at given point of Hearing were available upon presentment of evidences. Another issue brought upon this argument that is distinct to be separated is Mr. Allen's intent of the "transfer of the property to section 8", herein asserts would qualify under CR 59(a) Denovo.

ARGUMENT CONTINUATION:

Therein, Factual issue to narrow down is the real issue of the fact subject matter jurisdiction subsequent to, the Intellectual Property lawyer in Tacoma represented the Restraining Order violation but introduced a Public defender. Under this analysis will straightforward this case under RCW 10.77, refer to Civil Commitment and the SSA Schizophrenia justifying under the Operational legislative duty nature Code. Hence, is another substance, was the appointment of receivership necessary? the procedure mastectomy was explained on the first pleading of this case but petitioner held to inform the court that it was installed without consent. It is said one of the reasons for "Receivership" is to find the original ownership of the property but it has been proven that it is also a one way of disposal.

Conflict of interest of the property's Trusts.
A receiver is an extraordinary equitable remedy that is only justified in extreme situations, See, Aviation Supply Corp. v. RSBI Aerospace, Inc. 999 F.2d 314 (8th Cir. 1993). Factors typically warranting appointment are a valid claim by the party seeking the appointment, the probability that fraudulent conduct has occurred or will occur to frustrate the claim, imminent danger that property will be concealed,

ARGUMENT CONTINUATION

lost, or diminished in value, inadequacy of legal remedies, lack of a less drastic remedy and the likelihood that appointing the receiver will do harm than good." Aviation Supply Corp., 999 F.2d at 317.

The grounds for appointment of a receiver are set out in RCWA 7.60.020. The procedure for obtaining an appointment of a receiver is governed by local court rules. CR 66(a). In King County, for example, CR Ex Parte Department setting forth the grounds for the appointment. See, Ginsberg v. Katz, 21 Wn. App. 593, 597, 619 P.2d 995, 997 (1980)

Herein, Counterattack receivership appointment notwithstanding petitioner claimed three in all devices. The Hereditant acquired by inheritance blood family lineage a Cultural property, second is the improvisation of Integrated Circuit Chip Sensory switch human inspiration Technical Information which was entered to the 1981 Defense Treat Agreement under cooperating legislative of the Act of 1952 and the third, Robotic engineering long planned out promised by Japan to NATO to improve Crater defense capability began since 1983. But, this third device was concealed under receivership which may have redefined Execution attachments such as the mandate of the case at Ninth Circuit for enforcement of

Specific performance, R/o proceeding without prejudice in Tacoma Collateral Estoppel by Civil Injunction and subsequently without prejudice wanting to prosecute at the District Court. These attachments are all contentions and accusation arising out of the Congress held Ex Parte Status Inquiry Presentation on 2006 and in pursuant to 47 CFR Telecommunications. On the Appearances are Private Giant Information Technology Corporation including Paul G. Allen and Bill Gates, Service Carrier Corporation, Department of Natural Resources, Department of Energy, and Department of Interior. Concurrent to this Action previously mentioned RCW 7.060.020, CR 66(a) and LR Ex Parte. Coherently, evident to the dispute of finding the "thread" ownership of the Hereditament which leads us to the Interlocutory nature of the Case which could justify under the claim that Review was not terminated by RAP 12.3(a) but review is considered by Interlocutory reasons under Rap 12.3(c), now conformed to qualify under ~~RCW~~ 4.4 Certification by Court of Appeals. Herein. Ask the Court to transfer Case by Certification Rap 2.5 effects circumstances a "disputed issue" to qualify

170824

Waive of application fee payment. Rap 2.5 @ failure to state Claim with prejudice herein, disputed under factual issue Rap 2.5 (b) acceptance of benefit.

The latter, corresponds to the claim under the "intent" issue of Mr. Allen and Family Foundation under the claim "transfer of property." This claim is a separate claim under the related interlocutory jurisdictional history of the case because these are Outside Breach of Contract under emotional state intent of the decedent Mr. Allen. To reach Family and real estate Common law property Liability - under "EXCEEDED AUTHORITY".

The interlocutory subject matter jurisdiction would be held under Contract legislatures. Under this disputed issue, petitioner herein highly protested that Hereditament was a family lineage inheritance need not to be improvised to be entered under legislative Government acts ~~to~~ receive Short title rewards but rather Hereditament titleship ~~is~~ for Long titles. Under this Short title, ~~the~~ painful process to undertake, such as declaring to be an INSANE person which was documented under petitioner's dossier upon

18 of 24

arrival in the U.S. which are likely misrepresented by an Agency for the retention of observation purposes concealed under the utilization of property for legislative purposes (Hereditament) and for the ICC under Trade purpose collateral swap based entered at the Security and Exchange Commission. These are two different property ownership with the Robotic engineering, the likelihood under the Claim Confusion of Goods intermixing property was the intent or motive of the case because as declared the plan for improvisation with NATO! could be traced down in 1983. Under this issue, if this case has been litigated which resulted to failure to state claim with prejudice, this would qualify for Amendment CR 15, Interlinear and forum will be under Procedural law rather than Substantive Law. This will only make petitioner to be a Joinder and Clearly Intermixing Confusion of goods to the intent of frustrating the claim by concealment, devalue property, inadequacy of legal remedy and lack of a less drastic remedy, are evident at the location of the current residence of petitioner the Project 8 Based unit.

19 of 24

Could this be a Civil Conspiracy? yes and it is reflective - under the Attachments of the Case, Specific Performance and Execution by Supplemental Pleadings. Could this be a Collusive Action? likely it is, which it has been ruled State Courts does not handle the Federal nature Collusive Action of Cases. Can the Supreme Court Act under this Substantive Law Claim of Petitioner? yes. Pursuant to 28 USC 1257 - Review of State Court Judgment by Certiorari. "A party aggrieved by a State court ruling on an issue of Federal law may only seek review by filing a petition for a writ of Certiorari. Review by the Supreme Court is discretionary." Subjects petitioner herein, present for the Conclusion of this argument are:

- 1.) Exceeded Authority - Remedy under Rap 2.5(b) acceptance of benefit to reach Separation Contract Liability.
- 2.) Jurisdiction dispute - Review for substantive law
- 3.) Receivership Concealment of the purposes - Review by discretionary to issue writ of Assistance
- writ of mandamus and prohibition
- 4.) Mental Health Act Short title dispute - writ of Habeas Corpus

26 of 24

ARGUMENT CONTINUATION:

Legal issues or questions of law or Conflicts of law 2nd ReStatement what constitutes procedural is to find the Original Contract and location. As to Substantive Law Choice of Law Forum. Herein, Trial Court must have inspected District Court pleadings but redirected their Judicial Notice to Adjudicative of "facts instead of legislative facts. As earlier said "Confession and avoidance" is an affirmative defense that defendant would take a route under Acts of fraud, by taking or carrying out the case under a "material fact" such "false representation; made with knowledge of its untruth with intent to deceive. These elements requires necessary Continuation to justify the delay "with prejudice" for De Novo or CR 15. But, what if the delay have Obscured evidences? what are there to present to the Court? at District Court case there, a complete detailed legislative history background of the case, that would point the decision to Factual issues because pleadings and the brief were facts derivations out of Demonstrative material Evidence under legislative Function or statutory Codes. Such as Learned Treatises Citations under the Act of 1952, 1981 Treaty with NATO, US. and Petitioner's instrumentality and 1970 Hague Convention.

5) Confusion of Goods - rescission and Interjection

Hereupon, pray for the Appellate to address the matter under expeditious manner and pray for to observe issuance of writ of assistance, prohibition and mandate recall issuance of mandamus reversal at the Ninth Circuit.

Hereupon, pray for Appellate assistance to materially evidence the case for referral at the Department of State for Service process for reservation of appointment at the United Nation for obligatory purposes, under the intensiveness and pervasiveness adverse affects controlling amount in Controversy under Mental Health Act, requirement of legislative purposes for Government function, that the attachment records on the petitioner's status compromised by Civilians contains "Insanity" detrimental and problematic because of the Act of 1952 petitioner entered as a representative under "white" thread. Herein, ask and pray for the appellate necessary steps to stop the vital amount in Controversy because this a codified statutory Jurisdiction under Primary legislative for Short title addressed to the Monarch,

Her Majesty the Queen of United Kingdom.

Hereupon, pray for expungement and writ of Assistance, and pray for to qualify case under Direct Review, notwithstanding CR 35 impact of the effects under Compromised status "Insanity" recording Statute and Insanity RCWA 10.77 at the ~~Intelocutory~~ Restraint Order violation proceeding. Consequentially, her present condition at the project based constantly abused by the community of I.T. and neighborhood because of compromised pass code "easy to do" unsecured server of the said Receivership.

Hereupon, pray for Interjection writ of Assistance, and to call for the assistance of the Intellectual Property lawyer Consolidating Administrative Review at the Department of Labor Assistant General's Attention. This is to an effort of reconciling Direct Review purpose, and Interjection turning in property under disputed issue that petitioner is incompetent to the ownership of a Surface Transportation Carrier property wherein she herself a Conductor of Energy conducted various Internet Provider network in the area and all over United States. Department of licensing is in the appearance under Administrative Review Case. 2306
29

Petitioner Juliet S. Sarioi hereby, entered into,
Petition for Discretionary Review at the Supreme
Courts of the State of Washington and pray for
above mentioned Conclusions remedies declared
and stated to her knowledge that they are
true and correct under penalty of perjury under
the laws of the United States of America, be granted.

(Prepared by
Individuality)

Juliet Sarioi
Signed and dated

June 19, 2020

Juliet Sarioi
977 Discovery
Heights Circle NE
Issaquah WA 98029

240724

Proof of Service

I, Juliet Sario, declare and certify that on June 19, 2020 I serviced the delivery of the following documents via/in ground delivery
was certified ground delivery

1) Petition for Discretionary Review
at the Supreme Courts of the State of
Washington

hereby, serviced said document to the following
Entities and governments:

- 1) The Supreme Courts of the State of Washington
- 2) Court of Appeals Division One
- 3) King County Superior Court Clerk's office
for Judge Parisien and Judge Steve Rosen
- 4) King County Superior Court Judges mailroom
Judge Parisien and Judge Steve Rosen
- 5) Department of Labor Asst. Atty. General
Lindsay Jensen
- 6) Atty. Kelly Mennemair c/o
Foster and Garvey Seattle WA

RECEIVED
JUN 30 2020

Washington State
Supreme Court

That, the foregoing Statements are true and correct under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America.

That, I am at legal age able to perform execution of such Proof of Service into testament and a domicile of King County.

Hereby, entered on the 19th of June 2020.

Philip H. H. H.
Signed

postmarked on the 23rd June, 2020

RECEIVED
JUN 30 2020

BACKGROUND OF CASE:

Washington State
Supreme Court

Before the appellate Court is case of Interlocutory Order under Receivership with attachments under Execution of Property, Specific Performance, Collateral Estoppel under Injunction, Supplemental under Contempt of Court and Quiet Title arising out of a Congress Controlled Government Function pursuant to C.F.R. 47 - Presentation Ex Parte Restricted proceeding Status Inquiring handling down property and Rewards.

Before the Appellate Court is a woman who has been tackling down Racketeering and Corrupt Organization who managed to place her name under Schizophrenia, RCW 10.77, Refer to Civil Commitment that even to justify under Mental Health Act - Short Title will not compensate the damages and injury this whole ordeal of non-notification to her and her family. Petitioner herein, asks the Court for review the representative or substitution of the case.

The said Execution of Property was held under an Adjudicative Military Police Tribunal Limited Jurisdiction Court under a (Private Setting)

Historical Background began in the making of the Historic legislatures respectively the 1947 U.N. Agreements with the U.S., The 1948 Act, The Act of 1952, FSI of 1976, The 1981 Treaty (Defense) of NATO and the U.N. These legislatures have Government Function, have rewards or titleship. Short titles are for parliamentary seat, while long title is from family posthumous heritage. This said Short title during 47 C.F.R. Presentation Status Inquiring was contested by undisclosed entity, that petitioner is unsuited and underqualified so, therefore, forfeited at the Courts and Robotic Engineering was installed to fill an employment at the Police or Law Enforcement job as back up signal. But who's collecting her Trusts and Compensation this whole time? Since "short title" or "receiveship" alibis disbarment for claims are on Mental Illness?

For Demonstrative Evidence, herein a brief Historical Background to derive the origination under the Claim Family History Blood lineage and this case establishment of burden of proof to the claim asserted that case is part of the "History" of the United States of America and the Common Law, World Diplomacy.

- (1) the presence of Military Bases in the Philippines, Airforce and Naval Base.
- (2) President Franklin D. Roosevelt FDR signed the Independence of the Philippines to be established during 1938-1948 10 years under the governance assisted by the U.S. during these 10 years Phillipines was under Common wealth until 1948, Filipino's lived freely from the Spaniards.
- (3) The Act of 1948 - known as The U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act, specifies the terms that the U.S. Government can engage in Public Diplomacy, and for Cooperative International Relations.
- (4) Petitioner's father was the out of wedlock child of President Roosevelt surprisingly named after his mistress Lucy Mercer, respectively Lucilo "Rosales".

- (5) Petitioner's mother was from the Family of Mercer. as her middle name is "Mercado", Lucy Mercer was a longtime Navy officer was stationed in the Philippines.
- (6) Origination of Surnames in the Philippines is recognized by "tribes" through syllables. Such as "Ros" from "Roosevelt" in Rosales; "Mer" from "Mercer" in "Mercado". Petitioner's mother's is from "Sirisu" from the family of "Siri". ~~but~~ her name is Adoracion Sirisu, given name from the family of then famous Scientist.
- (7) Cultural Heritage of Hereditament was accustomed among the Elite blood lineages and families of Filipinos and protected by 1970 Hague Convention - the prohibition of illicit import and Export of Cultural Property and transfer of ownership. If so, why was the Hereditament improvised with ICC and transferred ownership with the NATO and the UN?
- (8) Petitioner's Uncle "Iking" was the out of wedlock child of King Edward VIII who died in 1972, 3 years after petitioner's birth year 1969.

⑨ Instrumentality was entered under the Act of 1952, where the citation of approval of Citizenship derived from was from petitioner's mother's birth place in the United States. Herein, asserted that because petitioner was entered in these legislatures as a representative and herein, claimed under these family lineages DNA predominance, the impact of the hearsay under Short-Title, Mental Health Act Receivership will be felt impacting the common shared DNA, most especially under Civil Procedure Rule or CR 35, which specifies "Blood Group". Herein, this case is qualified for Direct Review, under public interest reasons.

With Robotic Engineering her DNA may be manipulated and that if there is no appropriation made critical because of the 1969 NEPA, the Natural and Environmental Policy Act where she believes Instrumentality was also entered.

⑩ Obligatory purposes to address matter to Codified Statutory Courts of Law under "Primary legislative" of Common Law, because the said ICC improvisation was entered under Technical Information, ^{defense} purposes and not for Public Investment Trade. then why was

The Instrumentality Situated at the project based unit under Foreign Investment of Intergovernmental Organization including the Paul G. Allen and Family Foundation and the Higher Education. Project 8 Based unit is a Federal Housing Program with the Associated Acts or Government Act.

These in, problematic jurisdictions under Hague Convention 1970 for the Hereditament because this a private Convention and Hereditament prohibits transfer of ownership against technical Information Code 70 and Robotic Engineering improvisation promised project to NATO on 1983. Notwithstanding, Petitioner is claiming "Gift", immovable and movable Hereditament, that partly have hereditary statutory Shares with the Corporation.

Hereupon, Historical Background of Case for Demonstrative purposes enclosed necessary for material reference under the grounds established for asserted relevancy of the claimed issues.

ISSUES:

Herein, Contested and Protested the Cross and Counter Claimants and Third parties because of the following reasons:

- 1.) C.F.R. 47- Presentation Status Inquiry is a codified Government function with Exemptions and this includes "Casual TACKS".
- 2.) Petitioners Property is a Hereditament improvised with Integrated Circuit Chip and Robotic Engineering hidden behind "Receivership" installed on 2013, with non notification.
- 3.) Property was entered under 1981 Technical Information Treaty (Defense) and entered under Hague Convention Economic Environmental Assistance Council and property was entered under Military Procurement "Swap Based" Security and Exchange Commission for Collateral, with non notification. Property is protected under 28 USC 1611- Exemption from Execution because then the property was a government instrumentality and not a Technical Information Storage but a Hereditament or a "Conductor of Energy". Code 70 only for technical Information at the World Trade but for the Hereditament it was undeclared.

Hereditament was administered because of Cultural Blood lineage in the Family of Roosevelt's, Mercer and the Monarch King Edward VIII. History obscured by time managed to slip through beyond the knowledge of authorities by declaring only as Code 70. Hereditament is the first property already improvised with the ICC when she left in the Philippines, and third improvisation was on 2013, the Robotic Engineering Crater defense improvised Capability 1,000 miles Coverage. This project was a promised improvisation on 1983 under NATO 1981 Treaty.

4) The Mexican Government adopted the said Treaty with non notification on 1994; this means that Petitioner have Immunity, Privileges and power extended to the properties and her family.

28 U.S.C. 1605

5.) Property was entered into legislatives and by Statutory Law under FSIA of 1976, 28 USC 1605 Petitioner have been incorporated and entitled to "Shares" of the Corporation.

6) Petitioner is entitled to the Short Titles of three devises. Act of 1948 and 2012 Amendment International Broadcasting.

7) The Short Title under Mental Health Act for the Primary legislative was a non-notification which gives rights of petitioner to "sue".

8) Petitioner and her family are not Juridical, and are exempted to the forum of Choice of Law of the State of Washington RCW 62A. 5-116.

9) Hereditament was an entitlement rewards under posthumous heirarchy acquired by blood lineage from petitioners hereditary roles in the government.

10) Short title herein, Contested and protested under non-notification to be onerous.

Asks the Court for Assistance pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Service process - Time to answer - for Long Titleship.

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

JULIET S. SARIOL,)	No. 79807-3-I
)	
Appellant,)	
)	DIVISION ONE
v.)	
)	
PAUL G. ALLEN FAMILY)	UNPUBLISHED OPINION
FOUNDATION,)	
)	
Respondent.)	
<hr/>		

MANN, C.J. — Juliet Sariol appeals the trial court’s order dismissing her case with prejudice. On appeal, Sariol fails to substantively argue how the trial court erred. We affirm.

I.

On October 24, 2018, Sariol filed a “Notice of Petition to Restrain Assets” against the Paul G. Allen Family Foundation (the Foundation) in King County Superior Court. After this initial filing, Sariol filed an “Emergency Motion for Joinder and Judgment on Partial Finding” and a “Motion for Intervene and Permanent Injunction” several days later. None of these filings were styled as a complaint or served with a summons.

Citations and pin cites are based on the Westlaw online version of the cited material.

185

In her filings, Sariol alleges she was the subject of scientific experimentation without her consent by the government or military and that devices were secretly implanted in her body. Sariol contends she was the victim of stalking, harassment, vandalism, and home invasion. Sariol also discusses suffering from breast cancer and parasites. In all of these filings, the only allegation that even closely resembles an allegation against the Foundation is a reference to Paul Allen, where she alleges "The case's involvement to secret Hollywood Agenda hinting conveyance are one of the attributions of responsible projects that the late Paul Allen himself invested on to his philanthropic community engagements." Most of Sariol's filings are difficult to understand.

In response, the Foundation filed a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim. The Foundation noted that Sariol did not state an articulable claim, did not allege any specific actions against the Foundation, and disregarded procedural court rules. Sariol then filed a "Motion to Stipulate and Enter Objection on Motion to Dismiss the Case," which did not respond to the deficiencies identified in her filings by the Foundation.

The trial court heard argument on the Foundation's motion. The Foundation explained why the documents filed by Sariol did not present a claim for relief and failed to comply with CR 4, 8, and 10. Sariol responded by asking the court to accept all her filings as her "real evidence" and "testimonials." The trial court clarified that Sariol wanted the court to accept her filings as her pleadings and explained that evidence would not be taken because the hearing was on the Foundation's motion to dismiss:

We're—today is a motion to dismiss based on your pleadings, the things that you have filed. I don't know what is—what you have in front of you, what kind of documentation you have, but today would not be the day to

roll that out anew for the first time for the defendant. That's not how a motion to dismiss works.

Sariol responded that she would limit her argument to the motion to dismiss but argued there were violations of discovery rules. Sariol explained:

I had cited—I have cited the defendant in violation of Rule 26 discovery, Rule 26(b) discovery limits to pattern of interrogations or interrogatory— pattern interrogatory. Which governs in cases where a party has propounded pattern interrogatory (indiscernible) interrogatory in pursuant to LCR 33. And in cases—B, in cases where now court-approved pattern interrogatories [are] not propounded, (indiscernible) limitation of 40 pattern interrogatory.

During the hearing, Sariol never explained her claims against the Foundation. Similarly, Sariol claimed in her “Emergency Strict Reply Memoranda and Objection to Dismiss the Case with Prejudice,”

[t]he Foundation which operations of multi-disciplinary knowledge professions are integrated community from where plaintiff received treatment of her breast cancer, there is reason to believe that, trier of facts find relevance to order of Habeas Corpus from what she believe[s] is illegal detention or potential “insider trade”, Mandatory relief and Emergency Interim financial assistance of replevin and rescission of orders and law pertained to the plaintiff's case.

Again, Sariol's response to the Foundation's motion to dismiss did not address the deficiencies in her filings identified by the Foundation. The trial court dismissed her case with prejudice.

II.

We review dismissals for failure to state a claim under CR 12(6)(b) de novo. Nissen v. Pierce County, 183 Wn. App. 581, 589, 333 P.3d 557 (2014). We review dismissals for insufficient process under CR 12(b)(4) de novo. Jafar v. Webb, 177 Wn.2d 520, 526, 303 P.3d 1042 (2013).

Under notice pleading standards, a complaint need only contain a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief and a demand for judgment for relief. CR 8(a). A complaint that does not comply with CR 8(a) may be dismissed for failure to state a claim under CR 12(b)(6). Becker v. Cmty. Health Sys., Inc., 182 Wn. App. 935, 941, 332 P.3d 1085 (2014). We construe a complaint liberally so as to do substantial justice. CR 8(f). "If a complaint states facts entitling the plaintiff to some relief, it is immaterial by what name the action is called." In re Estate of Dormaier v. Columbia Basin Anesthesia, P.L.L.C., 177 Wn. App. 828, 853, 313 P.3d 431 (2013). "But a complaint should adequately alert the defendant of the claim's general nature." Dormaier, 177 Wn. App. at 853-54. "A complaint is insufficient if it does not give the defendant 'fair notice of what the claim is and the ground upon which it rests.'" Dormaier, 177 Wn. App. at 854.

A pro se litigant is bound by the same rules of procedure and substantive law as an attorney. In re Marriage of Olson, 69 Wn. App. 621, 626, 850 P.2d 527 (1993). If a party fails to support assignments of error with legal arguments, those assignments of error will not be considered on appeal. Schmidt v. Cornerstone Inv., Inc., 115 Wn.2d 148, 160, 895 P.2d 1143 (1990). Further, "[i]t is not the responsibility of this court to attempt to discern what it is appellant may have intended to assert that might somehow have merit." Port Susan Chapel of the Woods v. Port Susan Camping Club, 50 Wn. App. 176, 188, 746 P.2d 816 (1987).


Sariol has assigned error to the trial court's "[d]ismissal of case for failure to state claim with prejudice," "[d]ismissal of exhibits including plaintiff's Emergency Strict reply," and "[d]efendant's District court supplemental source for Judicial Notice request; Tim J.


Filer supplemental for 'motion to dismiss.'" In her briefing, Sariol has not explained how the trial court erred in dismissing her case or the causes of action she believes she has against the Foundation. Without a short and plain statement of her claim that shows she is entitled to relief, the Foundation does not have sufficient notice to respond to those claims and the court's dismissal was proper.

We affirm.¹



WE CONCUR:






¹ Sariol also filed a statement of additional grounds pursuant to RAP 10.10. We decline to address her arguments because statements of additional grounds are only permitted in a criminal case on direct appeal. RAP 10.10.

Juliet Sanol

977 Discovery Heights Cir. NE

#302 Issaquah wa

98029 #302



The Supreme Court of the
State of Washington

P.O. Box 40929

Olympia, Wa 98504-0929