FILED
SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
8/6/2021 4:02 PM
BY ERIN L. LENNON
CLERK

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

COLUMBUS PARK,	)	No. 99670-9
	)	
Respondent,	)	
	)	**EMERGENCY MOTION FOR**
v.	)	**THIRD-PARTY STANDING**
	)	
PATRICIA CROGHAN,	)	
Petitioner.	)	
	)	

I. IDENTITY OF MOVING PARTY

Petitioner Patricia Croghan moves the court for standing for third parties with claims in this matter, as designated in the below statement of relief sought. Said third parties are unable to represent their claims herein as they have no standing in this court. Petitioner respectfully asks this Court to grant the relief requested in Section II, Statement of Relief Sought.

II. STATEMENT OF RELIEF SOUGHT

This motion seeks standing in this case for third-party victims whom were the first to be victimized by Respondent Columbus Park's manager, Carrie Lerud. Petitioner Croghan attempted to defend and protect these voiceless residents of Columbus Park, and for her efforts, Croghan was in turn victimized by manager Lerud by the eviction of Croghan from her home in Columbus Park. These third-party victims were the *catalyst* for this lawsuit, and without Lerud's primary assault upon them, this

lawsuit would not have come into existence. The facts of the case demand that these third-party victims be given standing herein, for it is upon their injuries and deaths that Croghan's defenses depend.

Lerud's *direct* actions upon certain of these third-party victims created widespread *indirect harm* to others of these third-party victims, which together comprise **all the kingdoms of Nature, including human.** These third-party victims for which Croghan serves herein as Representative, **comprise the entire evolutionary chain of Life itself.**

To grant standing in this lawsuit to these third-party victims *individually* would be impractical, inefficient, and inaccurate, because the identification and numbers of wildlife, ecosystems and human families affected will increase every year as toxic lead from many pounds of hunters' gunshot continues to leach into the Columbus Park ecosystems, and visitors and residents continue to catch and consume lead-contaminated fish from the Columbus Park piers. It is therefore fitting, appropriate, and life-affirming for this Court to grant standing in this lawsuit for Nature, **in all of its forms,** of which humanity is an integral subset.

Croghan also moves this Court to rule that **Nature's standing in Washington courts is retroactive.** Rare wilderness and shoreline areas in Washington have been compromised by private developers, the cities, the government, foreign interests, and the military, such that the state is almost unrecognizable as compared with its former beauty just twenty years ago. Thanks to lobbyists and their private industry clients, the Legislature has "eased" environmental restrictions to the point where revenue and

"economic development" are seemingly all that matter. Due to huge logging contract awards, the health of the forests has declined to such a condition that they are dying.

By granting retroactive standing for Nature, perhaps the few remaining natural areas that have been recently quietly "earmarked" for offshore, shoreline and inland mining and/or industrial development have a chance at reversal. Retroactive standing for Nature would mean that, despite permits granted, construction commenced or even finished, those invasive mining projects may be found to endanger Nature and therefore, **the health and safety of Washington citizens.** When Nature has been poisoned, shortly thereafter, humans will suffer the same. *Never again should citizens learn their water or lands are toxic from the sheer numbers of people who have been diagnosed with cancer, as was the case in the Hanford leaks of radioactive waste into soil and ground water.*

Finally, Croghan moves this Court for a nullification, a complete revocation, of the above five (5) unconstitutional "doctrines" that bar the ability of U.S. citizens to govern and defend themselves and the nation, per the Constitution's directives and the Framer's dearest intent for the country.

III. FACTS RELEVANT TO MOTION

This case was first dismissed as without merit and retaliatory per RCW 59.18.240 and RCW 59.18.250, but due to the backstage interference of opposing counsel and Washington lobbyist to the Legislature, Chester Baldwin, was set for trial under questionable judicial procedures. Predictably, the trial was staged for certain defeat for Croghan. Upon appeal, the trial court's unethical tactics were upheld, with the Appeals Court failing to address the valid issues brought forth for consideration by

Croghan. As stated in the *Petition for Review*, Croghan refuses to even discuss the shoddy work product of the Appeals Court, as there was no true analysis conducted of the facts, and there was clear and open bias in Respondent's favor.

Due to the irregular fashion in which this case has been fumbled and deliberately mishandled, there has been no opportunity for Petitioner to even broach this motion for the third-party victims. This review by the Supreme Court is the first opportunity Croghan has had to present her full case without active resistance to presenting the truth of what actually transpired. Thus, this motion had to be presented on an **emergency basis** at the Supreme Court level, for Croghan's claims and legal defenses cannot be adequately reviewed by this Court without the inclusion of the third-party victims whom she was trying to protect.

IV. GROUNDS FOR RELIEF AND ARGUMENT

As explained in Croghan's *Brief in Support of Emergency Motion for Third-Party Standing,* Croghan foresaw that her motion for standing for the third-party victims would be blocked by court "doctrines" that dated back two centuries, with the foundation for them laid by the first Supreme Court, beginning with its "cases AND controversies" doctrine, and its "standing" doctrine. Croghan realized these doctrines interfere with not only a fair review of this case, but with the fair review of ***all*** litigants' cases. These doctrines bar the exercise of intelligent, original thought by the Court in determining rulings. These doctrines restrict, circumscribe and literally *dictate the findings and the remedies for a citizens' lawsuit*, while arrogantly presuming to *supercede the written laws.*

In the literature on these doctrines, Croghan found a voluminous body of legal challenges that exposed the inequity and unconstitutionality of these doctrines. Croghan realized that not only did these doctrines block her motion for third-party standing for her co-victims, these doctrines were the mechanism which robbed all citizens of their constitutional right to access to the courts without restriction.

To wit, there are five (5) blockades to citizens' constitutional right to self-governance, every single one them a mere *doctrine* of the court which has illegally been *elevated above the written laws* as passed by the legislatures. These blockades to citizens receiving a fair hearing or trial are: 1) "cases or controversies" doctrine (in violation of Article III language stating the judiciary shall hear cases AND controversies; 2) the "standing" doctrine, based wholly upon a judges' discretion; 3) case precedent as law; 4) hierarchical case precedent; and 5) the stripping of citizens' private right of prosecution.

Croghan moves this Court for a nullification, a complete revocation, of the above five (5) doctrines that bar the ability of U.S. citizens to govern themselves and the nation, per the Constitution's directives and the Framer's dearest intent for the country.

Each of these doctrines exerts unconstitutional interference, alteration, restriction and control over the outcome of a case. Being subjected to the "case precedent" doctrine in one's private lawsuit, is to be tried by a crowd -- a literal mob of dead people from the last two centuries whose values are not ours. Croghan refutes the legality of these "ghosts" of the Past from having any bearing upon her case.

The Court is directed to Sections III - IV in the accompanying *Brief in Support of Emergency Third-Party Standing* for discussion of the issues and arguments regarding

the unconstitutionality of these doctrines. Based upon evidence derived from the National Archives, and upon the discussion in the above-referenced *Brief,* Croghan asserts that **there is no constitutional basis for denial of standing for Croghan's third party co-victims.** In this matter, Croghan's injuries arose as a direct consequence of the act of defending the rights of others whom were not able to assert their rights. Croghan's injury claim and her defenses rest upon the injuries suffered first by the voiceless third parties. All third-party victims herein are protected under RCW 59.18.240 because Lerud's actions caused harm to their personal health and safety. Therefore, the injured parties must be allowed to come forward to present their own case, with Croghan as Representative for Nature and the citizens of the State of Washington. Justice is served by the addition of these voiceless victims to this lawsuit.

To limit this case to monetary remedies requested by the landlord, or even the landlord's retaliatory and revengeful eviction, is to ignore the priceless irreplaceable loss of life, loss of entire gene sets of Nature, and loss of a thriving ecosystem which afforded a protected species a rare location to birth its young. The graceful Canadian geese, like all biological life and humans, have a biological need and therefore a RIGHT to defecate -- it is a part of Life. Their mass execution based upon this "inconvenience" to manager Lerud, was an insult to all life everywhere. Such arrogance on the part of Manager Lerud should not go without redress.

Croghan discovered in her research the reason why the Court has historically sat silent on the sidelines, while the nation boiled over with irresolvable controversies. The first Supreme Court had created self-limiting "doctrines" that inadvertently, **as a direct**

consequence of those doctrines, paralyzed the Court's ability to independently act to defend the citizens or the nation.

Article III of the Constitution could not be more clear: the Framers never intended that the Court sit on the sidelines during a national controversy, hands folded primly like a girl at a dance waiting to be approached. The Court is mandated by Article III to forge equitable resolutions to national controversies which are setting the citizens against one another, such that the national peace, safety, health, and well-being of the nation are upset and imbalanced. The wise Framers knew that if the Court, an objective party -- could take national controversies and "nip them in the bud" *before* they festered into warring factions or caused civil war, the nation could survive the future challenges the Framers knew were inevitable.

The Court does not now, nor has it ever needed a pertinent case regarding a national controversy to land in its lap, in order to grant it "permission" to perform its constitutionally-mandated duty of resolving national controversies. It is also inappropriate and without basis in the Constitution, that the Court insist that a "controversy" fit neatly inside the parameters of a "case", in order for the Court to take up the matter, for the reasons stated below.

Trying "cases" cannot be compared to resolving "controversies". Controversies require an **open forum,** a place for many members or interested parties to safely and objectively air the issues, examine the evidence, and if applicable, the verifiable science, before deciding upon a benevolent resolution that is as equitable as possible for the entire nation.

The judicial courtroom is not the appropriate forum for controversies, where discussions and brainstorming can occur *to bring people together from disparate values and beliefs.* Courtrooms are set up as an adversarial "movie set", where the parties square off into opposite sides of the courtroom, with seats for the audience to view the "duel". The judge oversees from a lofty balcony in his/her intimidating black robe of superiority and austerity. Further, "cases and controversies" cannot be treated the same because their substance and outcomes are different.

A "case" has facts that can be quantified, lawful/unlawful actions, a conclusion. A "controversy" is not quantifiable -- it cannot be neatly distilled into a digital format of zeroes and ones, yes/no, lawful/unlawful -- because, like it or not -- controversies involve *people's emotions and their values,* which are, unfortunately, "messy". Resolution of opposing values and beliefs involves **compromise and creative thinking -- it is a mediation process, not a judicial process.**

Handling a controversy via the judicial process will always provide inequitable and inferior results, and the fury between the parties will likely march into the Future unresolved, because the human factors at the root of the controversy were ignored. **Controversies must be resolved to an amicable settlement so that there is a satisfactory end to the issue, and people can put away their weapons and go home.**

A perfect case on point: the raging controversy rocking the nation now, regarding the false "science" behind the corona virus, the forced mask-wearing, and forced COVID[1] vaccinations, even of children and infants. To date, there is NO scientific proof of laboratory isolation of the alleged "virus". Ethical physicians and

[1] "COVID" is an acronym for "Certificate of Vaccination ID"

scientists have examined the vaccines under scanning electron microscopes and found them to contain: 1) highly toxic chemicals; 2) graphene oxide nanoparticles (tiny pieces of ragged metal) that rip up body tissues; 3) "spike" proteins that travel throughout the body and brain cannibalizing human antibodies so that they attack the human host (exactly like the previously "engineered" auto-immune diseases like AIDS); and 4) "nano" electronic receivers and transmitters and nanocomputers which are "tuned" to the frequency of 5G. Recently it was discovered that via the dark web, vaccinated people are able to view their own biological data and location being uploaded real-time to the internet, which is an integral component of Bill Gates' U.S. Patent No. 60606.

Esteemed physicians with solid backgrounds have gone on record to state that the estimated longevity of vaccinated folks will be approximately two years[2]. All of this Orwellian nightmare is in violation of the citizens' constitutional right to Life and their own bodies, their right to defend themselves from harm, and the U.S. Military Tribunal's Nuremberg Code[3] of limits for governments, physicians and researchers for medical experimentation on human subjects.

I beseech this Court to take up the reins you were endowed with in Article III as protectors and defenders of *We, the People*, to regain control over this wild runaway "Trojan" horse which is carrying all the frightened Americans in the buggy behind it.

---

[2] Croghan sincerely apologizes that at this writing there is no time to obtain the references for these facts that I cite. These facts were derived from physician-published personal videos that were posted to the internet. However, Google, Facebook, Apple and Youtube have censored and taken them down within hours of the physicians' posting their info to the internet. Many physicians have moved their videos to a site, Brighteon.com

[3] The U.S. Military Tribunal case, *United States v Karl Brandt, et al,* (1949), includes what is now called the "Nuremberg Code", a 10-point statement delimiting permissible medical experimentation on human subjects. Please refer to the Appendix herein for the complete text.

To stop this out-of-control horse in its tracks is rightful, purposeful, and reasonable, so that it does not do more harm. This is the obvious action that responsible people would take. **This Court, constitutionally-empowered by Article III, has full latitude to immediately order a stop to all these criminal activities harming the health of the people of the State of Washington.** Please, do step forward and assume your rightful place as defenders of the citizens of Washington.

And if there are cries of outrage from the compromised politicians and those who are profiting from the sales of the vaccines, let them rage. The Court is assuming the responsibilities the Framers <u>expected you to fulfill</u> - to avert civil war, to avert foreign war, and in this case, **to avert attempted genocide of the people of this state. By stepping forth boldly on the constitutional empowerment of Article III, this Court will blaze a trail for the state Supreme Courts of the nation.** The U.S. Supreme Court has disqualified itself to act because it violated the first premise of Article III, which requires that only *"upon good behavior",* may the Court assume its powers. Chief Justice Roberts has fallen into disrepute for his entanglement with Jeffrey Epstein, documented travel to Epstein Island with published photographs of Roberts swimming in the waters with Bill Clinton outside the Epstein compound, and investigations into the questionable adoption of two children that was arranged by Jeffrey Epstein.

In the vacuum of responsible power then, finding that the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States has not demonstrated "good behavior", please take it upon yourselves to step into the void of leadership. It is long past the point at which the Court should have stepped up to the plate -- the issue has been boiling over for a very long time, and

the stench is unbearable. Their wickedness is so well-developed that unnecessary deaths will occur on an unprecedented level if this "game" is not immediately halted. Enough people have died now from this experimental vaccine that reasonable minds must step forward to protect the American people.

As of August, 2021, over 65,000 Americans have died within three (3) days of receiving the vaccine. This data was reported by the VAERS COVID reporting system, which is data reported to the CDC and FDA on "adverse events" after the vaccine. This is only a *fraction of the deaths*, as of course not every facility or physician sends their death reports to this public data base. I refer you to a VAERS report shown in the Appendix herein (See item (B)) from July, 2021 where almost 10,000 deaths were reported three days after receipt of the vaccine.

This Court cannot but have observed and noted that *the country is in a state of panic over this controversy* -- should not the deaths and the nationwide panic be a "sign" for the Court to ACT? Since the Court has never developed any **protocols for initiating consideration of a national controversy -- what about now?**

President Washington and his Cabinet had to "wing it" on their own in the face of the Supreme Court's refusal to assist with the maritime controversies in U.S. ports. With Thomas Jefferson as scribe, the Cabinet used their collective skill sets to forge their own "Rules of Neutrality" that would become the rules of engagement at U.S. ports. Likewise, the state Supreme Courts today are faced with complex and even life-threatening controversies that must be resolved immediately. Simultaneously there is a complete vacuum of responsible power in the U.S. Supreme Court as well as the Executive and Legislative branches. **Like President Washington and his Cabinet, the state Supreme Courts must similarly "wing it" and step outside their comfort zone to forge a new path forward to protect the rights and interests of the citizens and the country.**

I beg the court that it not shrink from this once in a lifetime opportunity to create a positive change for humanity, for the Earth and ALL her inhabitants, great and small. Why not now, and why not by yourselves -- this very court of esteemed justices? Why not here in Washington, one of the last refuges of the natural world? Do step forward onto the stage, it is your moment. It is your honor and privilege to set the scales that are the symbol of your profession -- back to equity. To bring down the gavel arighting the injustice towards Nature. Your authority? It is LIFE itself, the supreme authority, that grants this court the permission to make this ruling. Nature's creatures and the citizens of this state have a RIGHT to life -- they have a RIGHT to exist in health and in peace, and to defend themselves against those who would harm them.

V. CONCLUSION

Corporations and ocean vessels are granted standing in courts as individual entities. Corporations are only a legal concept and ocean vessels are inanimate objects, both fiduciary entities. The irony is that every form of monetary exchange, every contract, has at its very roots, its foundation -- Nature, as there is not one business product that does not draw from the products of the natural world. Everything we see, sit upon, sleep upon, drive in, fly in, and travel to distant galaxies in is made directly from the elements of Nature.

This standing for Nature in the courts is THE key to addressing global warming, or "climate change", or more accurately, the assault on humanity from dark actors using sophisticated weapons fashioned from Nature, which are being used right now to create drought, earthquakes, floods, and mental and emotional chaos amongst the citizens of

the world. The state of emergency that the entire Earth is experiencing now is due to the singular fact that Nature has not been granted standing in the courts.

Croghan moves the Court to grant standing to all of Nature in the generic sense, because this allows inclusion for the parties that were *directly harmed* by Lerud, as well as those who were *indirectly harmed* as a consequence of Lerud's actions, and those *harmed in the future* by the continuous leaching of toxic lead into ecosystems and the Black Lake stocked fish which are caught and consumed by the public.

It is in the interests of the citizens of the State of Washington that this motion be granted by this Court. When the rights of Nature to thrive are protected, the health and safety of the citizens are likewise protected, for the biological needs of Nature and humanity are identical and symbiotic. By granting this motion, standing for Nature in the courts may be applied broadly in future Washington lawsuits seeking to protect water, soil, air, a species, or any element of Nature, including microscopic, biological life. As part of this ruling, the Court should take care that there is wording to prevent future actors from inserting "conditions" or clauses that create legal loopholes making it difficult to prove harm or liability, such that those not of good faith may continue to exert harm upon Nature, or the health and safety of the citizens of Washington.

This Court is asked to consider whether the diluted environmental protection laws have proven sufficient to protect Nature in the arena of the courts, and to decide that in order to enable interventions to prevent further environmental decline, it is fitting, it is expedient, it is a matter of emergency, to grant Nature in the broadest sense, standing in the courts.

Croghan also moves this Court for a nullification, a complete revocation, of the above five (5) doctrines that bar the ability of U.S. citizens to govern themselves and the nation, per the Constitution's directives and the Framer's dearest intent for the country. This motion for: a) standing for all of Nature; and b) the revocation of the Court's doctrinal blockades to true self-governance by the citizens, puts the needed legal tools into the hands of those that have the expertise needed to bring balance back to the Earth's ecosystems as well as secure the health, safety and well-being of the citizens. There is no speedier remedy to begin a worldwide shift in consciousness and collective efforts to reverse the effects of our common negligence to Nature, than these crucial rulings. At last, a court will have taken wise, rational steps towards intelligent action, breaking the centuries-long paralysis of the Courts in the performance of their duty to protect and defend the citizens and the nation.

Upon this enlightened ruling by this Court, Washington citizens will be empowered to advance the cause of Nature and to rescue themselves from the danger they find themselves in from enemies foreign and domestic.

Croghan reminds this Court that every member is "in the boat" with the citizens -- you and your families are equally at risk at the hands of those who would force a deadly vaccine upon you. And if you have been already vaccinated, take heart, for coming soon are "med beds" that will reverse and deprogram the microchips and flush out the toxins from your body. They have been around for many years, but only the elite have had the use of them.

Croghan wishes this Court *Godspeed* in its deliberation, and may God look after you all, as you bravely take up the slack in the reins of this runaway horse. May

you unflinchingly reject any attempts to politically influence your decisions herein, **remaining steadfast in the right use of your will,** and guide this state and this nation to the **"right use of us".**

DATED this 6th day of August, 2021.

Patricia Croghan [Electronic signature]
PATRICIA CROGHAN, Petitioner *pro se*
P.O. Box 6451, Olympia, WA 98507
(360) 878-6181
croghanp19@gmail.com

APPENDIX

A) *Nuremberg Code*, published by U.S. Government Printing Office
SEE: https://www.marshall.edu/ori/nuremberg-code-directives-for-human-experimentation/

–"Permissible Medical Experiments." Trials of War Criminals before the Nuremberg Military Tribunals under Control Council Law No. 10. Nuremberg, October 1946 – April 1949, Washington. U.S. Government Printing Office (n.d.), vol. 2., pp. 181-182.

1. The voluntary consent of the human subject is absolutely essential. This means that the person involved should have legal capacity to give consent; should be situated as to be able to exercise free power of choice, without the intervention of any element of force, fraud, deceit, duress, over-reaching, or other ulterior form of constraint or coercion, and should have sufficient knowledge and comprehension of the elements of the subject matter involved as to enable him to make an understanding and enlightened decision. This latter element requires that before the acceptance of an affirmative decision by the experimental subject there should be made known to him the nature, duration, and purpose of the experiment; the method and means by which it is to be conducted; all inconveniences and hazards reasonably to be expected; and the effects upon his health or person which may possibly come from his participation in the experiment. The duty and responsibility for ascertaining the quality of the consent rests upon each individual who initiates, directs or engages in the experiment. It is a personal duty and responsibility which may not be delegated to another with impunity.
2. The experiment should be such as to yield fruitful results for the good of society, unprocurable by other methods or means of study, and not random and unnecessary in nature.
3. The experiment should be so designed and based on the results of animal experimentation and a knowledge of the natural history of the disease or other problem under study that the anticipated results will justify the performance of the experiment.
4. The experiment should be so conducted as to avoid all unnecessary physical and mental suffering and injury.
5. No experiment should be conducted where there is an a priori reason to believe that death or disabling injury will occur; except, perhaps, in those experiments where the experimental physicians also serve as subjects.
6. The degree of risk to be taken should never exceed that determined by the humanitarian importance of the problem to be solved by the experiment.
7. Proper preparations should be made and adequate facilities provided to protect the experimental subject against even remote possibilities of injury disability or death.

8. The experiment should be conducted only by scientifically qualified persons. The highest degree of skill and care should be required through all stages of the experiment of those who conduct or engage in the experiment.
9. During the course of the experiment the human subject should be at liberty to bring the experiment to an end if he has reached the physical or mental state where continuation of the experiment seems to him to be impossible.
10. During the course of the experiment the scientist in charge must be prepared to terminate the experiment at any stage, if he has probable cause to believe, in the exercise of the good faith, superior skill and careful judgment required by him that a continuation of the experiment is likely to result in injury, disability, or death to the experimental subject.

B. VAERS COVID Reporting System - July 11, 2021
See: https://rightsfreedoms.wordpress.com/2021/07/22/the-truth-about-vaccines-that-the-cdc-doesnt-want-you-to-know/

Let's take a look at the OFFICIAL PRIMARY DATA SOURCE that is used by the CDC and FDA to monitor adverse events caused by the vaccines. It is known as VAERS: vaccine adverse event reporting system.

Reported Deaths post COVID Vaccine: Total 9,048



Do you see anything "unusual" in 2021?

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Patricia Croghan, hereby certify that I caused a copy of the foregoing document to be served on all parties or their counsel of record, as follows:

VIA SUPREME COURT E-FILE PORTAL:

Daniel E. Pizaro, WSBA #47937
Thomas L. Dickson, WSBA #11802
1200 East D Street
Tacoma, WA 98421
(253) 721-1000
daniel@pizarrolegal.com
dpizarro@dicksonlegal.com
tdickson@dicksonlegal.com
jrichards@dicksonlegal.com
klampman@dicksonlegal.com

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct.

DATED this 6th day of August, 2021.

Patricia Croghan [Electronic signature]
PATRICIA CROGHAN

PATRICIA CROGHAN - FILING PRO SE

August 06, 2021 - 4:02 PM

Transmittal Information

Filed with Court:	Supreme Court
Appellate Court Case Number:	99670-9
Appellate Court Case Title:	Columbus Park v. Patricia Croghan
Superior Court Case Number:	18-2-06365-2

The following documents have been uploaded:

- 996709_Motion_20210806155818SC319669_9160.pdf
  This File Contains:
  Motion 1 - Other
  The Original File Name was PETITIONERS EMERGENCY MOTION FOR THIRD-PARTY STANDING.pdf

A copy of the uploaded files will be sent to:

- daniel@pizarrolegal.com
- dpizarro@dicksonlegal.com
- jrichards@dicksonlegal.com
- klampman@dicksonlegal.com
- tdickson@dicksonlegal.com

Comments:

EMERGENCY MOTION FOR THIRD-PARTY STANDING

Sender Name: Patricia Croghan - Email: croghanp19@gmail.com
Address:
P.O. Box 6451
Olympia, WA, 98507
Phone: (360) 878-6181

Note: The Filing Id is 20210806155818SC319669