RECEIVED
SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
May 16, 2014, 8:02 am
BY RONALD R. CARPENTER
CLERK

1		May 16, 2014, 8:02 am BY RONALD R. CARPENTI
2		CLERK
3		E CDF
4		RECEIVED BY E-MAIL
5		
7	WASHINGTON STATE SUPREME COURT	
8	JOHN WORTHINGTON,	CASE NO. 90037-0
9	Appellant,	COA NO. 43689-2-II
10	v.	MOTION TO STRIKE KITSAP
11	WEST NET.	COUNTY PROSECUTOR'S RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR
12	,	REVIEW
13	Respondents,	
14		
15	I. Identify of Moving Party	
16	Appellant John Worthington respectfully asks for the relief designated in	
17	Part 2.	
18	TI CALL LED ILEG 14	
19	II. Statement of Relief Sought	
20	Worthington respectfully requests the Washington State Supreme Court to	
21	strike the Kitsap County Prosecutor's office	WestNET response to Worthington's
22	petition for review.	
23	The Kitsap County prosecutor's office	ce has stepped forward in this case
24	to represent WestNET, without any express	authority from affiliate jurisdictions to
25	,	-

ORIGINAL

 $_{26}$ represent WestNET, and without an official entity to represent.

Worthington respectfully asks the Washington State Supreme Court to strike the "WestNET" response to Worthington's petition for review by Ione George and Russel Hauge until such time as they can show they were appointed by WestNET affiliate jurisdictions to officially represent WestNET, and until an entity is created by the affiliate jurisdictions.

III. Facts relevant To Motion

Since the start of this public records lawsuit, the Kitsap County

Prosecutor's office has filed responses, replies, and appeals briefs for WestNET in
this public records case. However, nowhere in the WestNET interlocal agreement
is there any designation for the Kitsap County Prosecutor to function as the civil
attorney for WestNET for public records cases. Worthington is only asking the
court to examine the WestNET interlocal agreement, to see where it is the other
affiliate jurisdictions have all agreed to have the Kitsap County Prosecutor's office
represent WestNET in civil matters.

IV. Grounds for Relief and Argument

Since the WestNET interlocal agreement contained language that stated WestNET was not subject to suit, it only makes sense that the interlocal agreement failed to consider appointing representation in civil matters. Currently, the only language in the agreement is for the Kitsap County Prosecutor to have criminal seizure forfeiture authority. That means the Kitsap County Prosecutor's office has taken a hypothetical authority.

¹ CP 125-135

A. The Kitsap County Prosecutors office is not an employee of WestNET.

The Kitsap County Prosecutor's office is an independent contractor as shown below:

c. Each contributing agency shall act as an independent contractor and not as employee of the Task Force or of another party to this agreement. As such, each party shall not have the authority to bind other parties nor control employees of other' parties contractors or other entities.

As shown above the Kitsap County Prosecutor is not a WestNET employee and can only act independently and cannot bind the other affiliate jurisdictions to any legal representations on their behalf.

B. The WestNET interlocal agreement is the only binding agreement between affiliate jurisdictions.

The WestNET interlocal agreement is the only binding agreement that can appoint a civil attorney that can represent and bind all the affiliate jurisdictions as shown below:

SECTION 9. INTEGRATION. This agreement contains all the terms and conditions agreed upon by the patties, except necessary operational a efforts between the law enforcement agencies of the respective jurisdictions in furtherance hereof. No other understanding, *oral* or *otherwise*, regarding the subject matter of this agreement shall be deemed to exist or to bind cures of the parties.

As shown above, The WestNET interlocal agreement is the only binding agreement that can appoint a civil attorney that can represent and bind all the affiliate jurisdictions.

C. The Kitsap County Prosecutor was appointed the task to prosecute drug felonies and represent Kitsap County and the State in real and personal property forfeitures and drug nuisance abatement proceedings, not civil PRA matters.

Kitsap County as stepped beyond the boundaries of the language of the WestNET interlocal agreement, which was only intended to address criminal matters and not civil matters. This is confirmed by the language of Section 3, general duties of the parties' part e as shown below:

As shown above the only language in the interlocal agreement outlining the general duties of all the parties, contains no language that officially appoints the Kitsap County Prosecutor's Office as the civil attorney for WestNET.

D. Worthington did not raise this issue at trial because he thought WestNET was a drug enforcement agency.

Worthington did not raise this issue at trial because he thought WestNET was a drug enforcement agency as shown below:

d. "Drug Task Force" means a <u>drug enforcement agency created</u> by this agreement.

However, despite the clear intentions of the WestNET affiliate Jurisdictions to create a drug enforcement agency, the trial court and the appeals court ruled

WestNET was not an agency.

Since WestNET is not an agency subject to suit, there is no reasonable reason for a civil attorney to represent such an entity, until that entity can be created. WestNET is a ghost. The Kitsap County Prosecutor's office cannot represent a ghost.

Without an official entity to appoint a civil attorney to, and with the Kitsap County Prosecutor's office only appointed to handle criminal felonies and represent Kitsap County and the State in real and personal property forfeitures and drug nuisance abatement proceedings, the briefing in this case is void for the lack of authority to legally represent a non-entity.

The Kitsap County Prosecutor's office cannot act as a civil attorney for WestNET. The WestNET affiliate jurisdictions should have appointed private counsel in this case or designated the proper civil representative for WestNET in the WestNET Interlocal agreement. Since they did neither, the Kitsap County Prosecutor's briefs should be stricken.

The general rule is that issues not raised in the trial court may not be raised for the first time on appeal. See RAP 2.5(a); State v. Moen, 129 Wash.2d 535, 543, 919 P.2d 69 (1996). By its own terms, however, the rule is discretionary rather than absolute. See RAP 2.5(a) (an "appellate court may refuse to review any claim of error which was not raised in the trial court") (emphasis added); Obert v.

I	I
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

24

25

26

Environmental Research & Dev. Corp., 112 Wash.2d 323, 333, 771 P.2d 340 (1989) ("rule precluding consideration of issues not previously raised operates only at the discretion of this court"). Accord Bennett v. Hardy, 113 Wash.2d 912, 918, 784 P.2d 1258 (1990). Thus, the rule never operates as an absolute bar to review.

The trial court and Appellate Court Panel has already used the WestNET Interlocal Agreement in making its rulings. Worthington is only asking the Supreme Court to reconsider the WestNET Interlocal Agreement, which have already been brought onto the record, were before the trial court, and preserved on appeal in Worthington's opening brief.

III. CONCLUSION

Worthington respectfully requests the Washington State Supreme Court strike the response to the Petition for Review by Kitsap County Prosecutor's office, because there has been no legal and binding agreement to support them as a legal representative for the affiliate jurisdictions of WestNET in civil matters, and because an entity has to be created in order for them to be able to represent it. The response to the Petition for Review is a hypothetical response. Respectfully submitted this 15¹ day of May 2014.

John Worthington Pro Se /Appellant

4500 SE 2ND PL.

Renton WA.98059

ı		
1	Declaration of Service	
2	I declare that on the date and time indicated below, I caused to be served	
3	Via email and U.S. Mail, a copy of the documents and pleadings listed below upon	
4	the attorney of record for the defendants herein listed and indicated below.	
5		
6	1. APPELLANT'S MOTION TO STRIKE	
7	IONE GEORGE WEST NET	
8	614 Division Street MS-35A	
	Port Orchard, WA 98366	
9	PAM LOGINSKY	
10	WAPA	
11	206 10 TH AVENUE SE Olympia, WA. 98501	
12		
13	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the	
14	foregoing is True and correct.	
15	Executed on this 51H day of May, 2014.	
16 17	BY M Worth	
18	John Worthington Pro Se /Appellant	
	4500 SE 2 ND PL. Renton WA.98059	
19 20	Renton W71.70037	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		

OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK

From:

OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK Friday, May 16, 2014 8:02 AM

Sent: To:

'john worthington'

Subject:

RE: MOTION TO STRIKE KITSAP COUNTY PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE RESPONSE

Rec'd 5-16-14

Please note that any pleading filed as an attachment to e-mail will be treated as the original. Therefore, if a filing is by e-mail attachment, it is not necessary to mail to the court the original of the document.

From: john worthington [mailto:worthingtonjw2u@hotmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, May 15, 2014 9:11 PM To: OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK

Subject: MOTION TO STRIKE KITSAP COUNTY PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE RESPONSE

Hello,

Please file this with the court.

Thank you

John Worthington