

FILED
SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
5/19/2021 11:06 AM
BY SUSAN L. CARLSON
CLERK

NO. 99752-7

**THE SUPREME COURT
OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON**

In the Matter of the Sanction Order Against Attorney Robert W. Critchlow

ANSWER TO PETITION

DIANNA J. EVANS,
WSBA #45702
Former Guardian ad Litem for Mary
Jewel Green and beneficiary of
Sanction Award
Law Office of Richard Perednia, Inc.
28 W. Indiana Ave., Suite E
Spokane, WA 99205
(509) 624-1369

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW 3

II. STATEMENT OF THE CASE..... 4

III. LAW AND ARGUMENT 4, 5

 A. The Supreme Court of the State of Washington should not grant discretionary review.

 B. Additional responses to Issues Raised by Petitioner are reserved unless a response from the court is requested or the matter is accepted for review.

V. CONCLUSION..... 6

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Rules

RAP 13.4(b) 4

Statutes

RCW 11.88 et seq 5

RCW 11.92 et al 5

I. ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

- A. Should the Supreme Court of the State of Washington grant discretionary review?**

- B. Responses to the remainder of the arguments of Robert W. Critchlow are reserved pending a decision by the Supreme Court on acceptance of this case for review.**

I. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This case involves the entry of CR 11 sanctions Order against Attorney Robert W. Critchlow, personally, in Spokane Superior Court. Mr. Critchlow appealed to the Court of Appeals, Division III, which affirmed the ruling of the trial court as to the fees of Dianna J. Evans, former Guardian ad Litem, and Levi Liljenquist, former attorney for Mary Jewel Green. He now seeks discretionary review.

II. LAW AND ARGUMENT

A. **The Supreme Court of the State of Washington should not grant discretionary review.**

“A petition for review will be accepted by the Supreme Court only:

(1) If the decision of the Court of Appeals is in conflict with a decision of the Supreme Court; or (2) If the decision of the Court of Appeals is in conflict with a published decision of the Court of Appeals; or (3) If a significant question of law under the Constitution of the State of Washington or United States is involved; or (4) If the petition involves an issue of substantial public interest that should be determined by the Supreme Court.” RAP 13.4(b).

Here, Petitioner’s argument on his purported basis for review fall far short of any of the above parameters needed to compel this court to grant review. There is no conflict in the Court of Appeals decision and any

decision previously made by the Supreme Court or any Court of Appeals for any Division, there is no conflict with any published opinion, there is no questions of law, nor is there any public interest at stake. The law, as it relates to Guardianship petitions initiated in the State of Washington pursuant to RCW 11.88 et seq and 11.92 et al is well established, and the court found zero abnormalities in the guardianship proceeding that was initiated under RCW 11.88. The only issue is Mr. Critchlow's gross persistent and possibly intentional misunderstanding of the law. Therefore, this case should be declined for discretionary review.

B. Responses to the remainder of the arguments of Robert W. Critchlow are reserved pending a decision by the Supreme Court on acceptance of this case for review.

Response Reserved.

III. CONCLUSION

The trial court properly granted my request for legal fees and properly assessed them against Robert W. Critchlow, personally, as a sanction. The Court of Appeals Division III properly reviewed the matter and terminated review. The issues raised by Appellant herein are additional attempts to review the same issues and none of his contentions are supported by the record or the law. This court should deny review.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 19 day of May 2021.



DIANNA J. EVANS, WSBA #45702
Former Guardian ad Litem for Mary Jewel
Green and beneficiary of Sanction Award
Law Office of Richard Perednia PS, Inc.
28 W. Indiana Ave., Suite E
Spokane, WA 99205
(509) 509-624-1369

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, DIANNA J. EVANS, hereby certify that I served Robert W. Critchlow, via USPS regular mail, at the address indicated below, a true and correct copy of this Answer to Petition for Discretionary Review by the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, on file herein:


Robert W. Critchlow
208 East Rockwell Ave
Spokane, WA 99207

Dawn Vidoni
Assistant Attorney General
1116 W Riverside Ste 100
Spokane, WA 99201

Levi Liljenquist
425 E Midway Rd
Colbert, WA 99005-9379

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct.

DATED this 19 day of May 2021, at Spokane, Washington.



DIANNA J. EVANS, WSBA #45702

LAW OFFICE OF RICHARD W. PEREDNIA

May 19, 2021 - 11:06 AM

Transmittal Information

Filed with Court: Supreme Court
Appellate Court Case Number: 99752-7
Appellate Court Case Title: In the Matter of the Sanction Order Against Attorney Robert W. Critchlow
Superior Court Case Number: 19-4-00298-2

The following documents have been uploaded:

- 997527_Answer_Reply_20210519105844SC333317_5102.pdf
This File Contains:
Answer/Reply - Answer to Motion for Discretionary Review
The Original File Name was Answer.pdf

A copy of the uploaded files will be sent to:

- DawnT.Vidoni@atg.wa.gov
- Marcie.Bergman@atg.wa.gov
- critchie747@comcast.net
- lilj0029@gmail.com

Comments:

Sender Name: Dianna Evans - Email: dianna@legalrwp.com
Address:
28 W INDIANA AVE STE E
SPOKANE, WA, 99205-4751
Phone: 509-624-1369

Note: The Filing Id is 20210519105844SC333317