

NO. 94105-0

SUPRME COURT STATE OF WASHINGTON

LONNIE RAY TRAYLOR

Appellant

v

**MOST WORSHIPFUL PRINCE HALL GRAND LODGE F. & A.M.
WASHINGTON AND JURSDICTION and
MOST WORSHIPFUL GRAND MASTER, GREGORY D. WRAGGS, SR.**

Respondent (s)

REPLY TO ANSWER TO PETITION FOR REVIEW

Lonnie R. Traylor
PO Box 5937
Lacey, WA 98509
Phone: (253) 861-8939
traylor48@q.com

I.	TABLE OF CONTENTS	i-ii
II.	TABLE OF AUTHORIES	iii-iv
III.	INTRODCUTION	1 - 2
IV.	DISCUSSION	2 - 3
	I. The Petition should be granted because the court erred in not granting petitioner Motion for Default	2
	II. The Petition should be granted because the court erred in not all of the facts, that have cause substantial public interest.	2 - 3
	III. The Petition should be granted because the Grand Lodge took action against Petitioner without formal charges file against him.	3
	IV. The Petition should be granted because Trial Court and the Court of Appeals did not followed well established case law.	3
	V. The Petition should be granted because illustrate how Masonic problems have been determined by the courts.. . . .	4 - 5
	VI. The Petition should be granted because his briefs are not difficult to understand...	6
	VII. The Petition should be granted because not filing responses timely not sanction for filing “bogus order and withholding discovery evidence.	6 - 7
	VIII. The Petition for should be granted because Petitioner is most interested in Respondent complying with the court rules in providing discovery evidence.....	7 - 8

XI. The Petition for should be granted because Trail and
Appeal court rendered a decision on all verbal allegations
without documented proof?8

V. **CONCLUSION**9

III. TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Woolfork's Appeal, 126 Pa. St.47 (1889), (Involving a black group calling itself Masonic) it was observed by the court that "The ancient landmarks of the Masonic fraternity are unalterable.

Smith v. Smith, 2 Desaus 557 (1813; So. Car.) and in *Bayliss v. Grand Lodge of Louisiana*, 131 La 579, 59 So. 996 (1912). On the ancient landmarks are predicated the rules that govern the Masonic fraternity. Nothing can be adopted in derogatory of these landmarks."

Rheubottom v. MWP HGLWA (2003; King County) where Attorney Fowler litigated and prevailed on behalf of his client Rheubottom; Court Rulings has stated, "we don't follow our own laws."

Eugene Nairn v. Prince Hall Grand Lodge of Bahama (2014) where the Supreme Court rule in (Narin) Freemason Wins Court Fight Over Expulsion From Lodge. Justice Evans ruled that masonic jurisprudence does not and "cannot" overreach the laws of The Bahamas. "Every citizen whether he be a mason or non-mason, has the right to apply to the Supreme Court of the Bahamas for redress and that right, in no manner whatsoever, be abrogated.

(*Evans v. Brown*, 134 Md 519, 107 Atl. 535, 1919 and *M. W. Grand Lodge v. Lee*, 128 Md. 42, 96 Atl. 872, 1916)(7 C. J. S. 63) (7 C. J.S. 61, 1980).

As a general rule, a member cannot be suspended from or expelled from an association without a fair trial before an impartial tribunal and a reasonable opportunity must be given to defend the charges filed. It is established that the proceedings to discipline a member should be conducted in conformity with the rules of the association and the law of the land.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

U.S. Const. Amend 1

U.S. Const. Amend 7

U.S. Const. Amend 14

WASHINGTON STATUTES

RCW49.60 et seq.

OTHER AUTHORITIES

CR 5,

CR 26,

CR 59(a) (7-9)

RAP 12.3,

RAP 12.4 (b)

REPLY TO ANSWER TO PETITION FOR REVIEW

INTRODUCTION

Petition should be granted. Lonnie Ray Traylor, Petitioner raises procedural arguments in an attempt to convince this Court to grant Petition.

The Petitioner has not ignored RAP 13 .4(b), and this case does meet the four circumstances in RAP 13 .4(b) under which review should be granted. The decision of the Court of Appeals in this case did conflict with a decision of the Superior Court, and the unpublished decision of the Court of Appeals that Respondent incorrectly present in their answer to petition.

This case involves a group called the Most Worshipful Prince Hall Grand Lodge F & AM Washington and Jurisdiction current and past officers, who have verbally falsely accused Petitioner of theft.

No formal documented proof of charges have been filed against Petitioner for taking money for the church, organization and private citizens.

In addition, it also involves Petitioner being discriminated against by the (Grand Lodge) violating its own Laws preventing right of due process. (CP 169)

DISCUSSION

I. The Petition should be granted because the court erred in not granting petitioner Motion for Default.

On November 12, 2014, Petitioner filed his complaint in the Pierce County Superior Court against Respondent Most Worshipful Prince Hall Grand Lodge, who did not respond until after 74 days had elapsed. (CP 1)

On January 26, 2015, Petitioner filed Motion for Default in accordance with CR 55 (a) (1) (b) and Respondent did not answer Petitioner complaint until the day of the hearing on February 6, 2014, that clearly violated the timeline to respond. CR 12

It is thus accurate to say that Judge Chuschoff, permitted this violation and did not grant Appellant motion for default.

Petition should be granted.

II. The Petition should be granted because the court erred in not all of the facts, that have cause substantial public interest.

Petitioner argues that constitutionally the Superior Court and Appeals Court significantly erred in the in this case by not considering all of the facts.

The Petitioner was illegally suspended from the Masonic Lodge for un-masonic conduct, who have been verbally falsely accused of theft without any formal charges or documented proof filed against him for taking money for the church, organization and private citizens

III. The Petition should be granted because the Grand Lodge took action without having any formal charges.

The Petitioner argue, the Grand Lodge violated their internal laws and Petitioner due process, discriminating against him, when they engaged in taking disciplinary actions without presenting any formal documented proof accusing him of theft.

The questioned is, should the Grand Lodge have taken disciplinary actions against Petitioner when the allege entities themselves have never file any formal charges against him?

IV. The Petition should be granted because Trial Court and the Court of Appeals did not followed well established case law.

The Petitioner argues the Trial Court and Court of Appeals did not followed well established case law limiting court interference in fraternal organizations.

V. The Petition should be granted because illustrate how Masonic problems have been determined by the courts.

The petitioner argues, these opinions are of importance and why petition should be granted, because they illustrate how Masonic problems have been determined by the courts and they indicate how the organization in its functioning, at times, must adjust itself to comply with these decisions relating to the laws of the land.

Within the United States, there have been about four hundred Court cases which have resulted in appeals and have ended with the Issuance of a formal written opinion by the court whereby the court have ruled against the organization for violated it Laws.

In (Evans v. Brown, 134 Md 519, 107 Atl. 535, 1919 and M. W. Grand Lodge v. Lee, 128 Md. 42, 96 Atl. 872, 1916) (7 C. J. S. 63) (7 C. J.S. 61, 1980). a member cannot be suspended from or expelled from an association without a fair trial before an impartial tribunal and a reasonable opportunity must be given to defend the charges filed.

In *Universal Lodge vs. Valentine*, 134 Md. 505, 107 Atl. 531 (1919), the court held (p. 515): "Where it is shown that the proceedings instituted against a member of an association have been conducted in accordance with the prescribed rules of procedure in such cases, and that in violation of such rules, he has been given no opportunity to appear and defend himself before the tribunal which is to hear and determine the charges preferred against him, the court when called upon will not hesitate to interfere in his behalf against the invasion of such rights, if it be shown that he has exhausted the remedies furnished by the association."

The same court in *Evans vs. Brown*, 134 Md. 519 (1919), held that a court will prevent the expulsion of a Mason where charges have been filed but no sufficient opportunity was afforded the members to defend himself against such charges, especially where the Grand Lodge Constitutions do not provide for a review by the Grand Lodge.

VI. The Petition should be granted because his briefs are not difficult to understand.

Respondent Counsel states in his response that Petitioner.

“ It is impossible to make a well-organized, point-by-point refutation of the Petition because the Petition itself is so disorganized.”

Petitioner argues there has not been any difficulty in understanding his complaint or any other brief prepared and filed in the court by the Petitioner.

Petitioner argues that his complaint and all other describe the facts of the discriminative action on behalf of the Grand Lodge brought under RCW49.60 et seq.” of Petitioner is being accused of theft without document proof of any formal charges have ever been filed against him.

VII. The Petition should be granted because of Respondent not filing responses timely not being sanction for filing “bogus order” and withholding discovery evidence.

The Petitioner have formatted and presented his briefs timely and with precise explanation for the reason we’ve arrive to the Supreme Court seeking the facts and evidence of allegations made against him unlike Respondents, i.e. not responding to Complaint, Refusing or Withholding Discovery Evidence.

. This should be considered unethical and Respondent should have been Sanctioned for his conduct.

The Petitioner also believe that Respondent shows prejudice as he states in response “ Petitioner is a serial pro se litigant” and his

It appear that Respondent assertion here is that Petitioner is a Pro Se who is a filer of lawsuits suit that are frivolous.

Petition should be granted.

The Petitioner find this statement offensive and unprofessional as Respondent has mentioned in his previous briefs, things such as, and I quote “ Petitioner Harassing the Court.”

VIII. The Petition should be granted because the Trial Court and Appeal Court rendered a decision on all verbal allegations without documented proof?

Petitioner asserts the Court of Appeals II, did not give consideration to Petitioner dissatisfaction with the Grand Lodge’s disciplinary procedures used to decide his suspension and discriminated against him without having document proof of any formal charges file against him from the church, organization or private citizens.

Petitioner asserts that how can the Trial Court and Appeal Court rendered a decision on all verbal allegations without documented proof?

A claim is an assertion that someone has done something illegal or wrong, typically one made without proof.

Petitioner asserts everyone charged with a penal offense has the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law in a public trial at which he has had all the guarantees necessary for his defense. This is considered probable cause.

Finally, Petitioner respectfully ask the court to consider, how can Petitioner defend himself when he's never been served with any official charges or official proof of allege allegation of theft made against him.

XI. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Petitioner Lonnie Ray Traylor, respectfully requests this Court to grant his petition for review in this matter.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 10th day of MARCH 2017

By: _____

Lonnie R. Traylor
P.O. Box 5937
Lacey, Washington
(253) 891-8939
traylor48@q.com

SUPRME COURT STATE OF WASHINGTON

LONNIE RAY TRAYLOR

Appellant

Supreme Court

No. 94105-0

Court of Appeal

No. 48322-0-II

v

DECLARATION OF

DOCUMENT FILING AND SERVICE

**MOST WORSHIPFUL PRINCE HALL GRAND
LODGE F.A.M. WASHINGTON & JURSDICTION
and MOST WORSHIPFUL GRAND MASTER
GREGORY D. WRAGGS, SR.**

Respondents

DECLARATION OF DOCUMENT FILING AND SERVICE

I LONNIE RAY TRAYLOR DECLARE THAT ON THE **10TH DAY OF MARCH 2017**, I CAUSED THE ORIGINAL REPLY TO ANSWER TO **REPLY TO ANSWER TO PETITION FOR REVIEW** TO BE FILED IN THE COURT OF APPEALS II AND SUPREME COURT AND A TRUE COPY OF THE SAME TO BE SERVED ON THE FOLLOWING IN THE MANNER INDICATED BELOW:

JAMES C. FOWLER, WSBA # 15560

1201 PACIFIC AVE STE 1900
TACOMA, WA 98402

U.S. MAIL

HAND DELIVERED

AGREED E-SERVICE

VIA COA PORTAL

SIGNED IN TACOMA, WASHINGTON THIS 10TH DAY OF MARCH 2017