

THE COURT OF APPEALS THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
DISIVION 1

RECEIVED
JAN 29 2018

MUFFIN ANDERSON

Appellate pro se

V

SUSAN LARSEN

CALE & SARA WILL

COMCAST CEN./XFINTY HOME SECURITY

Washington State
Supreme Court

95445-3

"MOTION"

RICHARD JOHNSON THE
COURT ADMINISTRATOR, TO
INTERVENE, IN 3 CIVIL COURT, TO
PROTEST THE COURT AND THE RIGHT OF
THE PEOPLE, FROM CERTAIN STAFF
MEMBERS EACH CASE NEED IT'S
ON INDIVIDUAL TIME, FOR A
PETITION FOR REVIEW, NEED MORE
TIME

To: Richard Johnson, The Court Administrator

My name is Muffin Faye Anderson, I have three cases in the court of appeal case no# 75174-3-1 Anderson v Larsen, case no#751751- 1 Anderson v Cale and Sara Will and case no# 75176-0 -1 Anderson v Comcast Cable Center / Xfinty Home Security. They derived from The Superior Court in Seattle. They are all regarding my real estate property.

Supereme cases no# Anderson - Larsen - # 93409-6

Anderson- Wills -95541-6

Anderson - Comcast Cable Cen./Ixfinty Home Sec.- # 93410-0

These cases no# were given to the cases from Supreme court for criminal cases under the preceeding of indigency which is a criminal

In the beginning of these compiaints was served in Aug. 2015. on September 1, 2015, Anderson had a debilitating brain brain stroke which affected my brain, my ability to concentrate and remember I was

Pg 1

advised not to participate in litigation for 8 months. I have pursued these cases alone, without an attorney, by with the justice of the law. While I was under the disability the trial court collectively got together and the court dismissed the cases. In according to my medical information the patient was disability from September 1, 2015 - April 2016

Filed and Appeal after the medical release April 2016.

There are certain staff member are boubling the cases with not enough time and combining them together. These certain staff has not follow the proceeding of the Appellate Court.

This staff has sent these cases to three court's at the same. The perceeding that were supposed to be done in the lower court is being done in the court appeal , an example the appellant court reaches its decision by using only the record of the proceedings in the lower court, the written brief filed by both parties to the appeal, and the partie's oral arguments given before the appellate judges. The record of

The proceeding in the lower court includes the pleadings pretrial papers, depositions and a transcript of the trial proceedings and testimony. the appellate court court bases its decision solely on the theories argued and evidence presented in the lower court. No new auguments or proof are admissible. There are no witnesses jury at the level. The appellate court does not retry the fact of the case.

This Appellant court staff has not follow court proceeding therefore it is a must in order to have a just decision.

This staff order an indigency which put the cases in a criminal procedure that went to the Supreme court and have obtain perjury. In the new opening brief that in the appellate court addressing the law of indigency, they are disappearing from the court files and my home.

This certain staff has prejudice and moving the cases in the wrong direction in a speedy way. This is an error of fact and is in keeping with defendants urging this court to punish a person because they suffer from a disability. The fact that even in the mentalty incapacitatated state I tried to do something to protect my rights is being used against me by this certain staff echoed by this court is unconscionable. The who purpose of the Americans with Disabilities act is the level the playing filed for those with disabilities.

These certain court staff has even follow Proceural Due Process with is a must in order to justify in the Supreme Court.

This certain staff denied each and every order and ruling and statues and authorities in these cases.

The Court of Appeal denied all three cases reconsideration and motion to publish.

This staff has rush these cases to the Supreme for a Petition for review without enough time and by combining and scheduling them together.

These cases should had REMAND back to the lower court's long time ago when it was rule under extraordinary circumstances by Richard Johnson the court administrator. But these court staff member's are bringing preceeding that cost money and deadlines knowing I'm in forma pauperis in the trial court and took it away, and replace it with a criminal procedure indigency, by denying a fair trial or hearing. keeping it moving forward and not giving the appellate enough time to answer by double the cases and not fair chance to correct so many error of this certain staff. These cases needs the Richard Johnson Administrator to intervene.

This certain staff demand that I file a petition for review on all 3 cases with in 6 weeks and there isn't enough time.

The risk external to a dispute from court's violations of the appearance of fairness doctrine, namely, the risk that the denial of relief will produce injustice in other cases and the risk of undermining the publics confidence in the judicial process, will favor providing relief from a judgment for "any other reason justify relief." Whenever courts are charged by statues, common law or other authority to recuse or obtain an informed waiver if circumstance suggest partiality; whether a party is entitled to relief from judgment will therefore usually turn on whether there is a risk of injustice to the parties in the particular case if relief is not granted.
Tatham vRogers(2012). 70 Wash. App. 76, 283 P. 3d 583 Judgment 343

A motion for relief from judgment for "any other reason justifying relief" applies only in situation involving extraordinary circumstance relating to irregularities which are extraneous to the action of the court or go to the question of the regularity of its proceeding. Tatham v Rogers (2012) 170 Wash. App. 76, P283 P. 3d 583. judgment 343

As it has been well illustrated that the certain staff certain members has not follow the Appellate Court rules and procedure nor demonstrated good faith in the justice of the law, which is a must.

Therefore the appellate has 3 cases for a petition for review and the review is from in 3 different courts regarding indigency is a criminal procedure, alone with perjury because these are civil cases when these cases were already in forma pauperis. I need more time

Address - medical record subpoena duces tecum

Address order of change of individual judge assignment

Address letter from Spencer Thorable - bailiff of judge P. Oishi whom has gone beyond his duties participating in the professional capacity.

Address invasion of privacy

Address privilege is to promote medical care and improved treatment, it is also consistent with the physician's ethical duty of nondisclosure

Address procedural due process

Address small claim court dismiss itself for lack of jurisdiction

Address the Appellate procedure

Address this court demand a RAP in order to denied it.

Address how are these cases in petition for review and never went to trial court.

I need more time

I have brought nothing but law to this case

Stare decisis regarding indigence

Disability act regarding the stroke

The finding of indigency- criminal procedure

My constitutional right to a jury trial

Deprived of a property right without due process of law

Both the fourteenth amendment to the United States constitution and article 1, section 3 of the Washington state constitution to a fair hearing before being deprived of my property.

The appellant has a right to a jury trial under article 1, section 21 of the Washington state constitution. On all three cases I need more time and new schedule for petition for review and the three cases are separate and time run together. Remove certain staff member will not follow justice.

New schedule for Petition for Review

Case no 75174-3 the month of February plus 3 days of March = 30 days