

Replaces petition previously
filed on 7-24-20. See Deputy
Clerk's 8-7-20 letter.
Supreme Court Clerk's Office

FILED
SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
8/5/2020
BY SUSAN L. CARLSON
CLERK

FILED
COURT OF APPEALS DIV I
STATE OF WASHINGTON
2020 AUG -3 AM 11:27

PETITIONER'S PETITION FOR REVIEW

[Rule 6.2 Review of Trial Court Decision] Rule 13.4 (Miscellaneous
Review of Decision Terminating Review), Rule 13.5 (Review of Court of Appeals
Interlocutory Decision) Rule 15.2 (Determination of Indigency and Rights of
Indigent party) Rule 17.3 Contents of Motion).

No. [Appellate Court] # 79882-1-I

Supreme Court No. # 98789-2

[SUPREME COURT OR COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION ONE]
OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

NORMAN GOITCHER, SR.,

petitioner

vs.

ARMCO TRANSMISSION CORP., et al.

Respondents.

CORRECTED

PETITION FOR REVIEW

A. IDENTITY OF PETITIONER

Petitioner Norman Goitcher, Sr.
ask this Court to accept review
of the decision, designated in part
of the decision, designated in part

Norman Goitcher, Sr. #634076

Norman Goitcher, Sr. Petitioner
MSU-Campus Unit # CC2-11
Coyote Ridge Corrections Center
P.O. Box 764

- A

Connell, WA #99326

A. IDENTITY OF PETITIONER:

Norman Gaches, Sr, herein an Inmate Temporarily housed at the Coyote Ridge Correctional Facility Camp, located in Connell, WA and at all times relevant in this Complaint. / Petitioner ask that this Court disregard its prior patten for review to except this newly corrected petition for review.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents

A. IDENTITY OF PETITIONER ABOVE ----- 1.

B. COURT OF APPEALS DECISION ----- 2.

C. ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW ----- 2, 3, 4.

D. CITATION TO COURT OF APPEALS DECISION ----- 5

E. STATEMENT OF THE CASE ----- 5, 6, 7.

F. ARGUMENT WHY REVIEW SHOULD BE ACCEPTED ----- 7, 8, 9.

G. CONCLUSION ----- 9, 10.

H. APPENDIX ----- 10,

PETITION FOR REVIEW

Norman Gaches, Sr #631076
 Norman Gaches, Sr, Petitioner
 MSU-Campus-Unit # CC2-16
 Coyote Ridge Corrections Center
 P.O. Box 269
 Connell, WA # 99326

B. DECISION;

1.) PETITIONER'S seeks Review of the Appellate Courts Order to Dismiss, Decided on March 13, 2020 in its Commissioner's prior Decision where petitioner filed a Waiver on Stay on March 1st, 2020, pending filing a Notice and a Motion for Rescissionary Review sent down to the Appellate Court from the Supreme Court as a proper petition for review, can't find the records of what the Supreme Court sent back down to the Court of Appeals. Ref to prior EE. 13 And prior Motion for Indigency E.C. Court Records petitioner believe it was a Motion to Modify Commissioner's ruling.

2.) Ref to the September 23, 2019 Motion for Reconsideration, which seeks Reconsideration of the Court's Decision on his Motion for Public Expenditure under Court no. # 97448-9 Supreme Court.

a). Ref to the Trial Courts prior Order of Dismissal under 12(b)(6) And the Appellate Courts prior Motion Petition's as Appendix A. III Ad EE. 13(4).

3. Then on 06/24/2020 An Order Denying Goodness Motion to Modify And Dismissal Goodness Appeal was entered, because the Clerk's papers have not been filed as directed by the Commissioner when still ignores why Goodness cannot afford to pay for any Clerk's papers nor have Mr. Goodness even been told how much it would cost to obtain requested Clerk's papers to at least show how much it will cost, when will then give Goodness a chance to see if he can come up with what it will cost? Mr. Goodness was given 30-days to file this petition for review.

PETITION FOR REVIEW

Thomas J. Walker #634926
Appellate Court Clerk
MSU-Courts Unit - 2nd Fl
Coryell Plaza - Lansing, MI 48906
Tel: 517-487-7879
Fax: 517-487-9736

C. ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW!

1. Whether Mr. Gotchers CR 60(b)(3) and (9) motion was timely pursuant to CR 59(b) as well as providing his Nuclear Direct phone call evidence at the trial court decision to claim Gotchers plaintiffs were untimely sent pursuant to CR 59(b)? [Assignment of Error 2]

A). During the course of Gotchers litigation Judge: Roger Rossell provided Mr. Gotcher with a January 24th, 2019 letter to show or present to Gotchers Counselor among other supervisory staff.

B). Staff Members received the Courts letter to then call the Court asking personal questions as to Gotcher why his claim and what the phone conference call was about, then telling the Court its staff will not set up any conference calls for Mr. Gotcher which do not relate to any active criminal case under its policies.

C). Did D.O.C. Staff's Silence, Chilled and Intentional with Gotchers claims to possibly settling his case? And did Judge Rossell violate Gotchers 1st Amendment Free Speech Rights to present his claims with his evidence over phone communication or by way of mail? Was CR 59(b) violated? [Assignment of Error 2]

2. Whether the Court Commissioner Ignored or overlooked Nuclear Evidence Mr. Gotcher provided showing he is indigent, falls under its poverty law and cannot afford Clerk's papers? [Assignment of Error 3]

PETITION FOR REVIEW

Norman Gotcher #634076
Norman Gotcher, Petitioner
MSU-Campus West! CC2-14
Coyote Ridge Corrections Center
P.O. Box 719
Connell WA 99736

a). Mr. Gotcher have continuously shown with his D.V.C. PLRA prison account, and motion to proceed in forma pauperis to be indigent and cannot afford to obtain Clerk's papers.

b). In Reference to this a D.V.C. Contract Attorney, Jason Covey sent the Court a personal letter confirming Gotcher has no money and is doing his best to pursue his case while in a prison environment still ignored by the Courts.

c). Both Judge Roger Rogoff and Appellate Court Commissioner has confirmed Mr. Gotcher is indigent, falls under its poverty laws and cannot afford to pay filing fees of his Civil Trial claim or of his appeal. How is it not shown or proven Mr. Gotcher cannot afford to then pay for Clerk's papers for his review?

d). Are RAP Rules 15.2(a), 15.2(d)(2) and 15.2(c)(2) partly being indigent false rules or laws of the Courts? At this time due to the Covid-19 Virus or Epidemic all Institutional Law Libraries, Schools and most Gyms are shut down and closed therefore Prisoner cannot provide supply cards or redundancy. The Washington Court Rule Book was provided by an inmate luckily for Mr. Gotcher.

3. Whether the Court of Appeals showed what portions of the Records shall be reproduced at public expense and whether Mr. Gotcher was provided by the Trial Court or Appellate Court what portions of the Records he must pay for and exactly how much he'll have to pay and for what Records the Court is requesting to review at public expense [assignment of ERROR 4.]"

PETITION FOR REVIEW

- 3

Norman Gotcher #634076
Norman Gotcher, Prisoner
MSE-Campus West: C12-16
Coyote Ridge Correctional Center
P.O. Box 789
Connell, WA #99326

4. Whether the Appellate Court Commissioner and its panel has Refused and knowingly Ignored Rap Rule 15.2(a), Rap 15.2(d)(2) and Rap 15.2(c)(2) for an Indigent Party? [Assignment of Error 5.]

a). While Mr. Catcher have Diligently Tried to present Direct Rap Rules of the Law to Confirm his indigent status, Including to Show his PLRA missed Account Showing He has no money or any means to obtain Clerk's papers How are such foreseeable Facts then constantly ~~being~~ Ignored? [Assignment of Error 6.]

5. Whether the Confiscation of Mr. Catcher Vehicle by Defendants Violated Mr. Catcher Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States and Under Article 1, Section 7 of the Constitution of the State of Washington once Defendants made promise to Secure and then Deliver Catcher Vehicle and personal effects for the \$ 125.00 Dollar Towing Fee, But instead Breached its Verbal Contract Agreement? [Assignment of Error 7.]

6. Whether the Court of Appeals Finds an issue with Mr. Catcher's pleadings as well as the Rap Rules being correctly presented? Are these foreseeable Rap Rules from the laws intended to be that of falsehood or of fabrication of these Rules? [Assignment of Error 8.]

DEFERRED FOR REVIEW.

William J. [Signature] #631076
Abner [Signature] Sr. petitioner
MSE-Camas-Unit CC2-16
4 Coppe Ridge Corrections Center
P.O. Box 789
Connell, WA #99326

D. [CITATION TO COURT OF APPEALS DECISION]!

1. ON February 11, 2020, Commissioner Masako Kanazawa, Entered a Notation Ruling Giving Petitioner Norman Catcher, One last Extension of the Time to File the Clerk's Papers, Including Payment for the Record, until March 13, 2020. If Catcher Fails to File Clerk's Papers by March 13, 2020, this Case will be Dismissed without Further Notice of this Court. Ref^d to Notations March 25, 2020 Opposition.
2. ON June 24, 2020, The Appellate Court Considered Catcher's Motion Under RAP 17.7 to Determine Catcher's Motion should be Denied, and because the Clerk's Papers have not been Filed as Directed by the Commissioner, the Appeal is Dismissed. Ref^d to Court of Appeals prior Records.

E. [STATEMENT OF THE CASE]!

1. Catcher's Original Complaint Claiming Fraud, Conversion, Theft and Loss of Personal Property was heard by Superior Court Judge, Roger Rosoff!

PETITION FOR REVIEW

Norman Catcher #634076
Norman Catcher, Petitioner
MSC-Campus Unit, CC2-14
Coyote Ridge Corrections Center
P.O. Box 789
Connell, WA #99326

Under Case No. # 18-2-06128-8 SEA, Dated: 05/28/2019, with a Trial Date of March 4th, 2019, But Dismissed on March 15th, 2019 without Reviewing Mr. Catchers CR 60(b)(3) and (9) Motion for Reconsideration for a New Trial to Material Evidence Supporting All Claims Denied by Judge: Roger Rosoff. It is an Error by the Trial Court.

2. All motions were caused by D.O.C. Coyote Ridge Staff's whom refused setting up Mr. Catchers Court Ordered Telephonic phone hearing for March 15th, 2019 at 9:00 am by stating Catchers Case did not relate to any Criminal Case, so Judge Rosoff decided to dismiss Catchers Case due to D.O.C. Staff Employee's Incompetence; which forced Mr. Catcher to file Notice of Appeal, where both the Appellate Court and State Supreme Court are constantly ^{to} force Mr. Catcher to commit an Act to some how pay for Clerk's papers before his case could move forward and violate Mr. Catchers Due process and Civil Rights not to be Deprived of Life, Liberty and Due process of Law in connection with the Constitution of the United States.

3. Both the Washington State Supreme Court and Court of Appeals are constantly ~~outright~~ ignoring its own Set of Washington Court Rules pursuant to

PREPARED FOR REVIEW

Norman Catcher #1634076
Norman Catcher, Sr. Petitioner
MSU-Carnegie Unit: CC2-1L
Coyote Ridge Corrections Center
P.O. Box 769
Connell, WA #99326

RAP 15.2(c), 15.2(d)(2) And RAP 15.2(c)(2) A Party Indigent. And Why Don't These Washington Court Rules Apply To Mr. Gatchers Situation?

F. [ARGUMENT]:

1. If Court Commissioner Mary S. Noel 'Granted' Petitioner TO File Service of his Appeal by Waiving the Cost of Filing his Appeal in His May 31ST 2020 Court Order, And if the Trial Court in its 5/28/19 Order of Indigency Waived Petitioner's Filing Fees For both his Trial Court and For the Appellate Court to Determine What Portions of the Clerk's Records "Shall" be Reproduced at Public Expense Pursuant to RAP Rule 15.2(d)(2).

a). And if under RAP 15.2(c), an Order of Indigency Shall Resignate the 'Items of Expense Which are to be paid with public funds' the State Supreme Court has ignored

b) Which includes 'Items of Expense to be paid by Appellant or the Demandant Mr. Gatchers, must Contribute towards the Expense for Review, Ignored by both the State Supreme Court and Appellate Court';

2). Is this not a Conflict in Law and Fact by both Courts in Conflict with the Above Cited RAP Rules to state petitioner has not satisfied the Requirements for Expenditure of Public Funds Relatively to his Appeal? Ref. to Appendix IV Supreme Court Order in the Appellate Court Records.

PETITION FOR REVIEW

William Whitcomb #634976
Norman Gatchers, Petitioner
MSU-Campus Unit, CC2-1C
Coyote Ridge Connections Center
P.O. Box 789
Connell WA 99326

— 7

3. If both the Trial Court Granted Mr. Catcher's Order of Indigency to have parts of the Records Reproduced at Public Expense Towards Appellate Court Review Pursuant to the Trial Courts Statute's RAP Rule of 15.2(d)(2) Verbatim, and then the Appellate Court Waived Mr. Catcher's Appellate Court Filing Fees, then how is it not acknowledged Mr. Catcher is not responsible or able to pay for Clerk's papers, especially 100% percent for Clerk's papers and his Appeal?

4. If Court Commissioner Mary S. Neel Waived Catcher's Appeal Filing Fees under RAP Rule 15.2(a) and if RAP Rule 15.2(c)(2) both enforce an Order of Indigency which the Trial Court shall designate the items of Expense which are to be paid with Public Funds and if Petitioner is only Required to pay for or Towards Expense for Review, then why are the Courts Burdening Mr. Catcher to somehow come up with whatever it may cost to obtain Clerk's papers, and why haven't the Courts provided what Clerk's papers are needed for Appellate Review, and if how much Catcher would be Requested to come up with?

5. Petitioner have not been informed by either of the Courts as to what Clerk's papers are need for the Appellate Court or if how much petitioner must contribute towards the Expense must be paid personally by Petitioner?

a). This is a Question of Law and Fact. Did the Trial Court Determine in its Findings the portion of the Records Necessary for Review and if the Amount if Any, Mr. Catcher

PREPARED FOR REVIEW

— 8

Norman Catcher #634276
Norman Catcher, Petitioner
Main Campus Unit 1002-16
Coyote Ridge Corrections Center
P.O. Box 769
Creston, IA 50521

Is. abled or Was abled TO CONTRIBUTE Towards the Expense for Review?

b). Did the Trial Court Findings Conclude With its Order to the Clerk of the Trial Court to promptly Transmit to the Supreme Court without Charge to the Moving party, the Findings of Indigency, the Affidavit in Support or in Opposition to the Motion and the Findings of Indigency?

16. Why have the Courts Ignored foreseeable Facts of which Petitioner is the Not a Question of Law and Fact Under the Constitution of the State of Washington or of the United States which Also involves an issue of Substantial Public Interest? Are these RAP Rules misplaced or Invalid to be Ignored by the Courts Within its Law Books printed for the Courts? Remaining questions to be Answered Truthfully. a). Are these Above RAP Rules Not a Correct Finding of the Law?

G. [CONCLUSION]:

Appellate and Petitioner, believe to have more than presented Supporting Facts Confirming the Washington Court Rules Written by State Courts to implement what it is to be true Findings conforming to such Washington Court Rules and Therefore Request the Appellate Court Uphold these Above RAP Rules and provide

DEFERRED FOR REVIEW

Norman D. H. #134076
Norman D. H., Petitioner
MSU-Camas-Wash! CC2-11
Coyote Ridge Correctional Center
P.O. Box 269
Connell, WA # 99326

Those Necessary Clerk's Papers for Review at Public Expense pursuant to RAP 15.2(a), RAP 15.2(d)(2) and RAP 15.2(c)(2) or provide An Answer As to Why these Washington Court Rules Do not Apply to Mr. Gatchers Financial Situation or at least Advise Petitioner How Much will those Clerk's Papers Cost? and What papers are Needed by the Appellate Court for Review?

Either Way petitioner Seeks Reconsideration to move forward with his Appeal and that other prior claims be Granted absent Defendant's prior Opposition.

Petitioner believe that these Claims are presented to the best of his knowledge and that I am over the age of eighteen and stand Competent herein to testify to the truth.

Executed at Connell, WA on this 28th day of July, 2020.

PETITION FOR REVIEW

Norman Gatchers #634076
Norman Gatchers, petitioner
MSU-Camas Unit CC2-11
— 10 Coyote Ridge Connections Center
P.O. Box 769
Connell WA #99326

PETITIONER'S PETITION FOR REVIEW

H. [APPENDIX];

1. Appellant/petitioner attaches RAP Rule 15.2(c)(2). See Wash Ct Rules.
2. Ref' to prior Ex. B and prior motion for Indigency as Ex. A. See Appellate Court Records.
3. Ref' to Trial Court prior Order of Dismissal and Appellate Court prior notation Rulings as Appendix A. III, and Ex. B-4.
4. Ref' to RAP Rules 15.2(d)(2), Trial Court Order of Indigency as to the Appellate Court Records.
5. Ref' to RAP Rule 15.2(c) Appellants Reply to Defendants Opposition. See, Appellate Court Records.

SWORN TO BEFORE ME THIS 28th day of July, 2020.

PETITION FOR REVIEW

William D. [Signature] #634026
Wash State Corrections, Petitioner
MSU-Campus Unit #CC2-16
Coyote Ridge Correctional Center
P.O. Box 769
Connell, WA 99326

- B

Pursuant to BR 3.1

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Appellant/Petitioner, Mr. Norman Cochran, Sr., do hereby
do declare that I served the following (New Petition for Review
Along with the Appendix List) sent to the following addresser below!

The Court of Appeals
Division One
One Union Square
600 University Street
Seattle, Washington #98101-4170

CC: Nat's Atty: Nathaniel Justin Kee Smith
Sohub Lars, PS
1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 2000
Seattle, Washington #98101-2570

Executed at Cornell WA, on the 28th day of July
2020.

PROOF OF SERVICE

- C

Norman Cochran, Sr. #134076
Norman Cochran, Sr. Petitioner
MSU-Campus Unit #E02-16
Coyote Ridge Corrections Center
P.O. Box 769

LEAF MAIL 11

LEAF MAIL 11

THE WASHINGTON STATE COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION ONE
One Union Square
600 University Street
Seattle, Washington #98101-4170

LEGAL MAIL

Mr. Norman Gotcher, Sr. #634026
MSU-Campus-Unit # CC2-1C
Coyote Ridge Corrections Center
P.O. Box 269
Connell, WA #99326

US POSTAGE \$01.40⁹
Mailed From 99326
07/29/2020
031A 0005181466

