67805-1

67805-1

REC'D
MAY 22 2012
King County Prosecutor
Appellate Unit

IN THE WASHINGTON COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION ONE

SCOTT CARROLL BOLTON APPELLANT V. STATE OF WASHINGTON RESPONDENT	NO. 67805-1-1 COURT CLERKS ACTION AMENDED INFORMATION

(I) Declare, That (I) SCOTT CARROLL BOLTON being The APPELLANT, UNder pro-se, parallel with Representing COUNSEL JENNifer J. SWeigert, DO Request COURT CLERKS ACTION IN AMENDED INFORMATION DUE TO PERJURY COMMITTED by The KING COUNTY

1 OF 2

Superior Court, State of Washington; witnesses and'd subornation by procurring perjury by The State of Washington: King County Superior Court Judicial Officers - That being Judges; Prosecutors and The Representing Counsel During pre-trial proceeding and during trial.

Scott C. Bolton
SCOTT BOLTON
APPEALANT

DONE THIS 30th DAY OF April 2012, AT Forks, WASHINGTON, AT The Olympic corrections center.

Chattel paper - R.E.W. 2010

* Brief *

April 30th, 2012

Honorable: Judges Panel

Appealant: Scott Bolton

Rep. Counsel: Jennifer J. Sweigert

Case No. 67805-1-I

In Re: Perjury and Subornation of Perjury.

On Jan. 25th, 2011 Seattle police officers:

1. Vincent Feurnsein
2. Bruce Larsen

committed Subornation of Perjury by Affirming perjured statements in a certificate of

Probable Cause Report
2011-Z8504 / 11-1-00341-4 Se
JAN. 25th, 2011

Committed by Officers
1. Jeremy Reed AND
2. Michael JONES

AS WELL AS

SUBORNATION OF PERJURY
by procuring
perjured STATEMENTS AS
Such by Judicial
Officers:

1. Judge Theresa B. Doyle
2. prosecutor Erin Becker
3. Judge RONALD Kessler
4. prosecutor Hedi Jacobsen
WATTS.

AS WELL AS:

SUBORNATION OF PERJURY
BY PROCURING PERJURED
STATEMENTS OF:
JUDICIAL OFFICERS:

1. Judge Michael HAYDEN
2. Prosecutor Hedi JACOBSEN WATTS
3. Rep. COUNSEL Cherilyn Church

COMMITTED DURING:

TRIAL PROCEEDINGS
JULY 12TH - 14TH, 2011 AND
SENTANCING JULY 20TH, 12

STATEMENTS MADE BY
STATES WITNESSES:
MICHAEL JONES
Jeremy Reed

DURING TRIAL AND IN
A PROBABLE CAUSE
REPORT WERE PERJURED

And discredited by statements made by a officer Feurnstein during trial and in a in-dash-car-camera video during Jan. 24th, 2011.

Seth C. Bor

Nielsen Broman & Koch (I).
Law Office

April 13th, 2012

SCOTT CARROLL BOLTON #971543
c/o Olympic Corr. Center
11235 Hoh mainline
Forks, Wash. #98331

RE: STATE V. BOLTON # 67805-1-I

TO: ATTORNEY AT LAW,
JENNIFER J. SWEIGERT

From: DEFENDANT - ACTING
PARALLEL by PRO. SE
STATUS - IN EXECUTION -
UNDER: R.C.W. 2010
PROSECUTION;
11.1.00341.4.SEA;
AS REPRESENTED by

ATTORNEY AT LAW

* JENNIFER J. SWEIGERT *

1 OF 8)

IN RE: UNCONSTITUTIONAL, AND being illegal AGAINST WASHINGTON LAW, CONSTITUTION, AND Securities ACT,

UNder:

VIOLATION 1. perjury committed by The STATES WITNESSES - Phoenix Security Officer's AND Seattle police,

(A) *Mr. Reed & Mr. Jones*.
(B) *Mr. Feurnstien · Mr. Speers*.

VIOLATION* 2. procurrment of Subornation of perjury committed by The STATE:

(A). Acting IN Judicial capasity: Hedi Jacobsen - WATTS.

(B). Acting IN Judicial capasity:

Judge michael Hayden.

VIOLATION* 3. misrepresentation - under; negligence; against the law as by procurring subornation of perjury and in violation of R.p.c. 2011, *cherilyn church*

VIOLATION* 4. All of the jury / jurors were victims of burglary; when asked by Judge Hayden befor trial proceeding were to begin. July 12th - 13th 2011

VIOLATION* 5. Erin Becker - prosecutor and prosecuting office and amy ~~meling~~; meckling;

STATE THAT : Agreed
TO EXTEND my
Speedy TRIAL Right's,

NOT TRUE

(NOTE)
All of the documents
of Exhibit are
Fraudulent, UNder
discovery by
The prosecutor's
Office.

~~CONTEMPT OF COURT~~
AND JUSTICE

(A) NONE of The
documents are
signed by me
AND The dates &
documents Number's
DO-NOT- MATCH.

VIOLATION* 6. The Third degree Theft That WAS Amended / Attached TO The burglary charge (#2) WAS:

UNCONSTITUTIONAL & illegal UNDER: Due process: AS well AS double Jeopardy.

(1.) Charge #2 - Theft °3, WAS Never charged UNder A booking Number.

(A) AISO The Seattle municipal court dismissed This charge befor it WAS Amended TO The burglary.

VIOLATION* 7. EVIDENCE OF A 2006 ADMONISHMENT BY PHOENIX SECURITY/ SAFEWAY LOSS AND PREVENTION WAS NOT IN EFFECT;

(A) THE DOCUMENT WAS NOT SIGNED. THE PRESENTED DOCUMENT IN OPEN TRIAL HAD NO SIGNATURE BY ME.

VIOLATION* 8. MS. CHERILYN CHURCH; - ASSOCIATED COUNSEL - FOR THE ACCUSED; ATTORNEY AT LAW WAS NOT SUPPOSED TO REPRESENT ME IN TRIAL.

(A) (I) SCOTT BATON FILED SEVERAL GRIEVANCES BY THE

WASHINGTON BAR ASS. - per.
Felice P. CONGALTON

RE: WSBA Filed: 11.01015
by SCOTT BOLTON
Cherilyn church

RE: WSBA Filed: 11.01689
Hedi JACOBSEN - WATTS
by SCOTT BOLTON
IN: MISCONDUCT-RPC. 2010.

ALSO:

(B) I Requested That
cherilyN church
be dismissed From
my CASE #2 TIMES
befor Judge Kessler
AND Judge Doyle.

VIOLATION:* (9) The AMENDED Charge
Of BURGLARY IS
UNCONSTITUTIONAL
UNDER: PREVAILING
FEDERAL LAW:

.7 OF 8)

(A) That burglary must be defined as:

"Breaking-and-Entering"

(B) Also unconstitutional by Ex. post. facto

Federal Law (U.S.)

municipal by laws and ordinances.

Defendant:

[signature]

Thank you
God Bless...

* Brief Summary *

April 13th, 201[illegible]

Defendant: Scott Bolton

Attorney at Law:
Jennifer J. Sweigert

State Judicial Officer's:

1. Hedi Jacobsen-Watts
Prosecutor;

2. Michael Hayden
Judge;

3. Cherilyn Church,
Counsel;

State Witnesses:
(Phoenix Security Officer's:)

(A). Michael Jones
(B). Jeremy Reed

As well as Other
Judicial Officers Through

10-7

Knowledge of:
perjured STATEMENTS;

(A). Judge: RONALD Kessler

(B). Theresa B. Doyle - Judge;

(C) prosecutor: ERIN Becker
Apr. 1 20th, MAY 24th, JUNE 3rd; JUNE 13th,
2011,

IN RE:

UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND
ILLEGAL VIOLATIONS by STATES
WITNESSES AND JUDICIAL
OFFICERS AND SEATTLE LAW
ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS;

Judges & prosecutor's &
Office;

UNder: VIOLATION'S of:

1. KNOWledge - perjury
Rules of professional
conduct.

Exhibit (1)

WASHINGTON COURT RULE'S

PROCEDURES PRIOR TO ARREST AND OTHER PROCEEDINGS

Rule 2.1 - COMPLAINT
(B)·(5) PAGE'S *602 - * * 604

CERTIFICATE - UNDER PENALTIE'S OF PERJURY;

PER. R.C.W. - R.C.W - 9A.72.085
* PROBABLE CAUSE REPORT *
* 2011-28504 / * 11-1-00341-4-SEA

(7) PROSECUTION UNDER:
R.C.W. 9.94A.440

"COMPLAINING WITNESS IS AWARE OF NECESSITY OF COURT

(1 OF 3)

Appearance or Appearances For himself or herself And witnesses of possible liability for false arrest And the "consequences of perjury;"

"(I) The undersigned complainant understand That the following are some but not all of the consequences of my signing a criminal complaint.:"

(1) The defendant my be arrested and placed in custody;

(2) The arrest if proved false may result in a lawsuit against me;

(3) if I have sworn falsely I may be charged / prosecuted

For perjury.

The STATE OF WASHINGTON)
COUNTY OF KING)
)

NO. 11-1-00341-
4-SEA

AFFIDAVIT OF COMPLAINING
WITNESS.

DEFENDANT:
SCOTT C. BOLTON

Following is A True
STATEMENT.

Scott C. Bolton

(3 OF 3)

EXHIBIT (A)

EXHIBIT (A) · IN Reference with Document (I) · parallel with VIOLATION (I):
"perjury committed by STATES WITNESSES;
(i) Jeremy Reed and (ii) michael JONES.

.... During Trial proceedings; July 12th - 14th, 2011; AND SENTANCING July 26th, 2011.

Befor: Judge · michael Hayden; prosecutor · Hedi JACOBSEN-WATTS; counsel · cherilyn church and · Defendant · Scott C. BOLTON;

CAUSE # 11·1·00341·4·SEA
2011·28504

Testimony during Trial proceed·ings July 13th, 2011

Phoenix Security Officers:

Jeremy Reed AND michael JONES.

IN RE:

perjured STATEMENTS AND TESTIMONY During TRIAL AND IN The probable CAUSE CERTIFICATE;

(A) probable CAUSE · 2011 · 28504 JAN. 24TH, 2011.

(B) perjured STATEMENTS · during TRIAL July 13TH, 2011; 11-1-00341-4 SEA.

(According)

1. OBSTRUCTION of COURT AND JUSTICE by R.C.W. AND U.S.C.A. 2010;

2. PENAL code · 241.4; U.S.C.A §§. 1621; §§. 1623, "FALSE STATEMENTS AND AFFIRMATION"; PURSUANT WITH WASH. ST. ARTICAL 1. §§. 6,

(2011)

3. R.C.W. 9.81.110
MISTATEMENTS; AS PERJURY;

4. 2011.28504 / 11.1.00341.4.SEA
Accord. R.C.W. 9A.72.085
UNSWORN STATEMENTS;

5. R.C.W. Abuse of process 2010;

6. R.C.W. Culpability 2010;
"Negligence"

7. R.C.W. 5.28.060
"Affirmation equivalant to
oath;
S.P.D. probable cause;
STATEMENTS;
2011.28504 / 11.1.00341.4.SEA.

8. R.C.W. 9A.72.040
"False swearing"

9. R.C.W. 21.20.400 penalties
For violation's of Wash. St.
Securities Act;

10. 10. WASHINGTON PRACTICE (STATE) VOL. 11, WPIC 10.02;

PRINCIPLES OF LIABILITY; "KNOWLEDGE" - "KNOWINGLY"

"ACTING KNOWINGLY WITH KNOWLEDGE ESTABLISHED ACTING WITH "INTENTION";

PARALLEL WITH:

R.C.W. 9.A. 08.010 (1) - (b)
R.C.W. 9A. 08.010 (2)

"The Supreme Court Holds" THAT INTENT IS AN ELEMENT;

"DEFENDANT IS ENTITLED TO HAVE W.P.I.C. §§ 10.01 GIVEN".

STATE VS. ALLEN; 101 WN. 2d 355, 678 P. 2d 798 (1984)

ANNA (ADELE)

W. P. I. C. 10.01 INTENT
STATE VS. Leech;
114 WN. 2d. 700, 790 P. 2d
160. (1990)
Specifically approves ss 10.02

11. R.C.W. 2.48.180
"UNLAWFUL PRACTICE"

12. R.C.W. "UNPROFESSIONAL CONDUCT"
18.130.180.

13. OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE
(18) SS. 1501 - U.S.C.A,
PENAL CODE - 242.1

14. *Discovery*
TO UNCOVER THAT WHICH IS
HIDDEN;

PURSUANT WITH:

U.C.C. SS. 1-201(25)
KNOWledge RATHER THAN
TO KNOW;

15. WPIC SS 118.15;
"WRITTEN STATEMENTS AS
MADE UNDER OATH."

16. WPIC SS 118.22
PERJURY,

NESSMAN VS. STUMPTER;
27 WN. APP. 18, 615 P. 2d 522
(1980);

(PURSUANT)

TRIAL PROCEEDING'S JULY 13th, 2011,
TRANSCRIP'S;

"The STATE"

PAGE #23

LINE'S - #21 - #22

"The STATE WILL CALL
Jeremy Reed",

(CONTINUED TO PAGE #29)

PAGE # 29
LINE # 17

(Q). "The STATE"

"AT which POINT did you
See The defendANT"?

(A). "Jeremy Reed"

page - #29

Line's - #23 - #25

And so he came off
The Haba Asisle, coming
around The back here,
Which is Where (we)
Trailed him, And he,

(continued to page #30)

page - #30

Line's - #1 - #2 " "

"came up to The Front
From The produce And
Then came out The door's,"

{ which discredits by
{ conflicting statements by
{ contradiction. }

Thorall (8 of 17)

(Same page - #30)

Page - #30
Lines - #11 - #15

(A). "Jeremy Reed"

"So, as Mr. Bolton was moving along the back, I was moving along the front parallel with him and so he came around the corner, I left my cart somewhere around here and kept walking and stood over here."

Page - #30
Lines - #17 - #20 "Mr. Reed"

"So, once he committed to coming forward this way, I stepped outside, and which he grabbed the bags out of the cart, and then he exited the store."

{which discredits STATEMENTS made by michael JONES.}

{STATEMENT'S by michael JONES (PAGE-# 47)}

PAGE-# 47

LINE'S-# 5-# 6

(Q). "The STATE" "WHAT did you do AFTER you SAW him WALK OUT OF The STORE".

(A). "michael JONES"

PAGE-# 47- LINE'S-# 7-# 14

Well, While I WAS WATCHING him LOAD The BAGS I called my PARTNER Jeremy Reed who WAS UPSTAIRS PROCESSING The

LAST PART OF ANOTHER SHOPLIFT AND I HAD HIM GO DOWNSTAIRS, AND WAIT OUTSIDE FOR HIM.

SO, AS SOON AS he HIT right OUTSIDE The door, my PARTNER STOPPED him AND brought him BACK INSIDE, AND THATS when I WALKED over AND we both ESCORTED him UP."

(END)

"Key Wording"
{STATEMENTS made By Jeremy Reed.}

PAGE - #29
LINES - #25

"which is where we trailed him".

(AND)

~~Rough~~ (11 OF 12)

STATEMENTS by michael JONES

PAGE - # 47
LINES - # 8 - # 10

(A) "Jeremy Reed who WAS upstairs."

(B) "I had him go downstairs AND WAIT."

(END)

EXHIBIT (A) (Z)

perjury commited by The STATES WITNesses Jeremy Reed AND Michael JONES.

July 13th, 2012,

* DIRECT EXAMINATION by *
The STATE,

PAGE #23

LINES - #21 - #23 "The STATE"

"The STATE will call
Jeremy Reed".

(CONTINUED TO PAGE #29)

PAGE - #29

LINE - #17

(Q).
"AT which POINT did you
See The defendANT."

(CONTINUED TO PAGE # 30)

PAGE - #30

LINES - #11 - #15

(A). "SO, AS Mr. BOLTON WAS MOVING ALONG THE BACK, I WAS MOVING ALONG FRONT PARALLEL WITH HIM, AND SO he CAME AROUND THE CORNER, I LEFT MY CART SOMEWHERE AROUND here AND KEPT WALKING".

(CONTINUED)

PAGE #30
LINES - #17 - #20

"SO ONCE he COMMITTED TO COMING FORWARD THIS WAY, I STEPPED OUTSIDE, AND WHICH he GRABBED THE BAGS OUT OF THE CART, AND THEN he EXITED THE STORE."

(WHICH DISCREDITS STATEMENT'S) (MADE BY MICHAEL JONE'S.)

> OF 9)

(CONTINUED TO PAGE #43)

PAGE - #43
LINES - #19 - #20

"The STATE"

"The STATE CALLS Michael JONES."

(CONTINUED TO PAGE #47)

PAGE - #47

LINES - #5 - #6

(Q). (Key words)

"WHAT did you do AFTER you SAW him WALK OUT OF The STORE."

✦ UNTRUE ✦

(A). "Mike JONES"

LINES - #7 - #14

"Well, while I was watching him load the bags I called my partner Jeremy Reed who was upstairs processing the last part of another shoplifter, and I had him go downstairs and wait outside for him. So as soon as he hit right outside the door, my partner stopped him and brought him back inside, and thats when I walked over and we both escorted him up."

(which discredits Jeremy Reed's statements

* Jeremy Reed *

page - # 29

LINE - # 17

5-0)

(Q). "AT which point did you see the defendant."

(CONTINUED TO page #30)

page #30

LINES #17 - #20

"So, once he committed coming foreward this way I stepped outside, and which he grabbed the bag's out of the cart, and then he exited the store."

(which discredits michael) (JONES STATEMENT'S)

(Q). "The STATE"

page #45

LINES #13 - #14

(cont'd)

"And how did you come in contact with him on that date."

(CONTINUED TO PAGE # 46)

PAGE - # 46

LINE - # 25

(A). "Michael Jones"

"Yes, He picked them up out of the shopping,

(CONTINUED PAGE # 47)

PAGE - # 47

LINES - # 1 - # 2

"cart and then walked out the store at the produce side doors."

7 (=9)

(CONTINUED TO PAGE # 47)

PAGE - # 47

LINE'S - #5 - #6

(Q). "The STATE"

"What did you do after you saw him walk out the store"

(CONTINUED TO PAGE # 47)

PAGE - # 47

LINE'S - #7 - #14

Well, while I was watching him load the bag's I called my partner Jeremy Reed who was upstairs processing the last part of another shoptift,

AND I had him, go
downstair's and wait
outside for him,
so as soon as he
hit right outside the
door my partner stopped
him and brought him
back inside, and that's
when I walked over
and we both escorted
him up."

(Stop)

9 ~=9)

EXHIBIT (A) (3)

perjury commited by
The STATE'S WITNESSES
Jeremy Reed AND
Michael JONES;

July 13th, 2011;

(NOTE)
Please refer perjury VIOLATION'S
IN The DOCUMENT:
(I)
Nielse, Broman & Koch
Law office
page's -# 1 Through #8

(A). page -#2 VIOLATION (1)

(A)(1)
The Seattle police dept.
probable cause Report;
2011-285044 / 11.1.00341.4.Se

STATE'S: IN LINE -#5

"Suspect Then EXITed The STORE"

1 of 11

(NOTE)

UNTRUTH AND is discredited AS PERJURY DUE TO STATEMENT'S made by S.P.D. Officer FEURSTEIN ON JAN. 24TH, 2011 ON Video OF AN IN-DASH-police-CAR Video, @ 7:45 - 8:15 p.m. AT SAFEWAY TO THE NORTHEAST PRECINT; AS WELL AS STATEMENTS made IN his TESTIMONY IN OPEN COURT TRIAL proceedings JULY 13TH, 2011

AS WELL AS CONFLICTING LIE'S DONE IN COURT UNDER OATH by STATE'S WITNESSES!

MR. REED AND MR. JONES AS WELL AS Judge: MICHAEL HAYDEN JULY 26TH, 2011 AND JULY 12TH, 2011.

7-11

TRANSCRIPTS July 13th, 2011;

CROSS-EXAMINATION by
A CHERUN CHURCH;

(PAGE *40)

~~PAGE~~ - *40

LINES - *18 - *20

(Q). "CHERUN CHURCH"

"MR. REED. SO MR. REED.
YOU CONTACTED MR. BOLTON
OUTSIDE THE STORE."

(A). "MR. REED"
"YES"

{ WHICH CONFLICTS by
CONTRADICTION OF LIES. }

2 of 11

{Prior STATEMENTS made by Mr. Reed AND Mr. JONES.}

(CONTINUED TO PAGE * 29)

PAGE * 29

LINES - * 17 AND * 25

(Q). "The STATE"

"AT which POINT did you See The defendANT."

(A). "Jeremy Reed"

{"which CONFLICTS WITH STATEMENTS made by Mr. JONES."}

(CONTINUED TO PAGE * 47)

(PAGE - * 47)

(LINES - * 1 - * 2)

(michael JONES)

"AND Then WALKED OUT The STORE AT The produce SIDEDOORS."

. . .

{ which CONFLICTS WITH STATEMENTS made by mr. JONES ON SAME PAGE AS WELL AS STATEMENTS made by Jeremy Reed ON PAGE # 29 }

. . .

(CONTINUING TO PAGE # 47)

(Q). "The STATE"

~~PAGE~~ # 47

LINES - #5 - #6

"WHAT did you do AFTER YOU SAW him WALK OUT The STORE."

5 of 11

(A). "Michael JONES"

page - # 47

LINES - # 7 - # 9

"Well, I called my partner Jeremy Reed who was upstairs processing the last of another shoplift."

{"conflicting statements which discredits mr. JONES statement as well as prior statements made by mr. Reed."}

• • •

(CONTINUED TO page # 30)

page - # 30 and page # 29

page # 29 - LINE - # 25 and,

page - # 30 - LINES - # 1 - # 2

(page # 29)

LINE - # 25 - *Jeremy Reed*

6 OF 11

" came up to the front from the produce and then came out the doors."

(continuing to page #30)

page #30

Lines #11-#12 *Jeremy Reed*

"I was moving along the front parallel with him."

(page #30)

Lines #17-#18 "Jeremy Reed"

"Once he committed to coming forward this way, I stepped outside, and then he exited the store."

{ discredits STATEMENTS made prior by Mr. Reed AND STATEMENTS made by Mr. JONES: }

(PAGE # 47)

(PAGE # 47)

LINES - #1-#2 *michael JONES*

"AND Then WALKED OUT The STORE AT The produce SIDE doors."

(PAGE - # 47) - LINES - #5 - #6

(Q). "The STATE"

"WHAT did YOU do AFTER YOU SAW him WALK OUT The STORE."

(PAGE # 47)

LINES - #7 - #9 - *michael JONES*

" I called my PARTNER Jeremy Reed who WAS UPSTAIRS processing The LAST PART of A Shoplift."

{CONFLICTING AND CONTRADICTING STATEMENTS by STATES WITNESSES.}

(Page #47)

LINES - #9 - #10

"AND, I had him go downSTAIRS AND WAIT OUTSIDE FOR him."

{"which discredits STATEMENTS made prior AND previous by STATES WITNESSES Jeremy Reed AND Michael JONES.}

(Page #47)

LINES - #15 - #16

"The STATE"

(Q). "Where did you CONTACT Jeremy AND The defendANT?"

(A). "Mr. JONES"

LINE - # 17

PAGE - # 47

"Right Outside The door."

(Q). "The STATE"
"AND WHAT happened AFTER you got back INSIDE"?

(A). "michael JONES"

"we STARTED processing our paperwork".

{ discrediting AND conflicting STATEMENTS by STATES WITNESS }

* CONTINUED *

(MR. JONES)

(PAGE # 49 AND # 50)

PAGE # 49

LINES - # 24 - # 25 "CHERILYN CHURCH

(Q). "MR. JONES, WAS IT YOU OR MR. REED THAT ASKED MR. BOLTON TO COME BACK INSIDE"

(A) "MR. JONES"

PAGE - # 50

LINE - # 2 "MR. REED"

* END *

EXHIBIT (B)
refers TO:

DOCUMENT:

NIELSE, BROMAN AND KOCH; *LAW OFFICE* (I)

PAGE - # 8 - VIOLATION # 2

PROCUREMENT OF SUBORNATION OF PERJURY

"ACTING IN JUDICIAL CAPASITY"

JUDGE:
MICHAEL HAYDEN
JULY 12TH, 2011 AND
JULY 26TH, 2011;

AGAINST: JUDICIAL CODE OF CONDUCT - CANON LAW RULES AND WASHINGTON SECURITY ACT PENALITIES AS WELL AS FEDERAL AND STATE LAW.

(1 OF 17)

EXHIBIT (B)

TRIAL proceedings
July 12th, 13th, 14th & 26th, 2011;

CAUSE NO.# 11-1-00341-4-SEA/
S.P.D.# 2011-Z8504

TESTIMONY IN COURT proceedings
TRANSCRIPTS:
July 26th, 2011;

PLAINTIFF:
(A) The STATE- Hedi JACOBSEN-
WATTS
(B) The COURT- TRIBUNAL-
Judge Michael HAYDEN

(B) Rep. COUNSEL:
CHERILYN CHURCH;

EXHIBIT (B)(Z)

TRIAL PROCEEDINGS AND SENTANCING:

Befor:
Judge Michael Hayden;
COMMITING AND procuring
perjury.

AS presented July 26th AND
July 12th 2011.

* Transcript citing *
as by
Verbatim Report of
Court proceedings:

July 26th, 2011;

PAGE - # 2
LINES - # 20 - # 21

"mrs church"

"cherilyn church ON behalf
of mr. BOLTON":

(CONTINUING TO PAGE # 3)

PAGE: # 3
LINE - # 1
"The court"

"WHAT OTHER MATTERS"

PAGE - # 3
LINES - # 2 - # 4
"mrs. church"

"His other legal matters"

PAGE - #3
LINES - #5 - #10

"The Defendant"

I have administered some stuff to Ronald Kessler, Ms. Theresa B. Doyle;

"Then I have Filed complaints".

PAGE - #3
LINES - #14 - #16

"The Court"

"Does everything that you have in the way of legal matter pertaining to this case."

PAGE - #3
LINES - #23 - #24

"The court"

"But pertaining to his incarceration"

PAGE - #3
LINES - #25

"Mrs. Church"

"NOT pertaining to his"

(CONTINUING TO PAGE - #4)

PAGE - #4
LINES - #1 - #2

incarceration for this case, but pertaining.

PAGE - #4
LINES - #11 - #16

"The Defendant"

"Im in the process and
im trying to get the
State's witnesses
prosecuted for perjury".

"The court"

"For perjury"

"The Defendant"

"Yes, Sir, perjury and
violations of the
Washington Securities Act."

PAGE - #4
LINES - #19 - #20

"The Defendant"

*"I have the Documents here, if you'd like to go over them".

Page: # 4
Lines: # 21-# 22

"The court"

"I don't need to go over them".

"I know what's in them or generally whats in them".

(continued to page # 5)

Page: # 5
Lines: # 1-# 8

"The Defendant"

"I would like to know, did you - have you acknowledged the perjury

STATEMENTS THAT WERE MADE IN THE TRIAL PROCEEDING'S:

"THE COURT"

"SIR, I DIDN'T HEAR ANY PERJURY IN THE TRIAL PROCEEDING".

"THE DEFENDANT"

"AND YOUR NOT AWARE OF ANY".

"THE COURT"

"IM NOT AWARE OF ANY".

(END)

Exhibit (B)(3)

Trial proceedings;
July 12th, 2011

Verbatim Report of
proceedings;

Befor Judge:
Michael Hayden

Perjured STATEMENT AS
well AS procurement
of SubornATION of
perJury.

PAGE - # 4
LINES - # 20 - # 22

MS. CHURCH

"MR. BATON HAS HIS OWN MOTION THAT HE WOULD LIKE TO ADDRESS THE COURT WITH."

PAGE - # 5
LINES - # 17 - # 20

"DEFENDANT"

"I HAVE QUITE A FEW DOCUMENTS AND EVIDENCE PERTAINING TO PERJURY THAT'S BEEN COMMITTED BY SEATTLE POLICE OFFICERS FEURNSTEIN AND LARSON AND THAT OF PHOENIX SECURITY OFFICERS, WITNESSES."

PAGE - #5
LINES - #21 - #24

"The court"

"I don't know what the information is, sir. But if they've committed -- if witnesses have committed and been convicted of perjury, then certainly they can be impeached on that."

PAGE - #7
LINES - #24 - #25

"The court"

"All right. So you are asserting that the two security officer's have made untrue.

(CONTINUED TO PAGE - #8)

PAGE - # 8
LINES - # # 1

STATEMENT'S THAT BECAME THE BASIS OF YOUR ARREST.

PAGE - # 8
LINES - # 5 - # 7

"DEFENDANT"

BECAUSE I STARTED ADMINISTERING IT IN OPEN COURT BEFOR THERESA B. DOYLE AND RONALD KESSLER

"THE COURT"

"ADMINISTERING WHAT"

"THE DEFENDANT"

"PERJURY"

"The court"
You don't start administering perjury.
If perjury is commited, It's commited and it's prosecuted by the prosecuting office.

"The Defendant"

"Ive asked for it to be prosecuted several times".

"I have motions here that ive motioned the court to do --- I have plenty of cross-- complaints by ---

"The court"

So, Its your assertion that the two security

Officers have lied to the police about your involvement in this case?

"The Defendant"

"It is, Sir!

Page - #9 - Lines - #1 - #2

"The Court"

Well, that's an issue to be brought up at the trial to show that they're not telling the truth.

"The Defendant"

Page - #9
Lines - #9 - #12

Okay, but I've presented several times beter Judge Ronald Kessler and Judge Theresa B. Doyle

TO dismiss This case due TO perJury, which I have plenty of Evidence of:

"The court"

page # 9
LINES - #18 - #20

"If witnesses take the stand and lie under oath, then that could constitute a perJury charge.

"The Defendant"

page - #10
LINES - #8 - #17

is that the court, the Judicial staff being in the prosecutorial power and the Judicial staff are under and

Obligated duty Through A CONTRACT work duty has power TO PROTECT AND Secure That PERJURY has been committed Through FRAUDULENT AND deceptive ACTS.

"IT IS A WASTE OF Everybody's TIME here, including The officer's, TO proceed WITH This matter. This --- This discredits The probable CAUSE THAT STARTED This whole CASE IN The FIRST place, IT'S Abuse OF process.

(END)

EXHIBIT (B) (4)

UNCONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATIONS OF LAW;

Judge michael HAYDEN IS IN VIOLATION OF CANON LAW. Rules OF Judicial CONDUCT, 2011,

(A) FAILURE by CANON LAW TO Regulate with The PROSECUTION UNDER: Rules of professional CONDUCT, 2010 FAILURE TO Regulate court process AND procedure; DUE TO failure TO make Discovery TO disclose perjured STATEMENTS made IN The probable cause - S.P.D. Report # 2011-Z8504 / 11-100341-4-SEA

* Brady VS. MARYLAND *

* FAILURE TO make discovery *

"The Supreme court Held THAT due process requires The

prosecution to disclose
Evidence of perjury;

IN: WASHINGTON Securities Act
R.C.W. 21.20.400
concealment,

Accord)

Discovery
To uncover that which is
hidden or concealed from
everyone.

Allen vs. Qualley Co.,
C.C.A. Ill, 87 F.2d 104, 108,

(pursuant)
U.C.C. ss. 1-201 (25)
refers to knowledge rather
than to know.

(pursuant)

WASHINGTON Practice (STATE)
Vol. 11,
WPIC ss 10.02

2 of 9)

"PRINCIPALS of LIABILITY";

"KNOWLEDGE" - "KNOWINGLY"
"ACTING KNOWINGLY OR WITH KNOWLEDGE ALSO ESTABLISHED IF A PERSON ACTS INTENTIONALLY"

(A)(i)
R.C.W. 9A.08.010 (1)(b)

(A)(ii)
R.C.W. 9A.08.010 (2)

The Supreme Court HAS held THAT:

"WITH INTENT AS AN ELEMENT OF A CRIME CHARGE, THE DEFENDANT IS ENTITLED TO HAVE WPIC 58. 10.01 GIVEN."

STATE VS. ALLEN, 101 WN. 2d 355, 678 P. 2d 798. (1984)

STATE vs. Leech, 114 WN. 2d 700, 790 p. 2d 160; (1990)
Specifically approves,
WPIC 10.02

PURSUANT WITH,

"KNOWN" · "KNOWledge" "KNOWS"
CANON LAW Rules of
Judicial CONduct.
(CANON Rule 1-2)

• • •

2.) R.C.W. 9A.72.050
OATH AND AFFIRMATION
INCONSISTANT STATEMENTS,

• • •

3.) R.C.W. 5.28.060
deemed perjury
PURSUANT WITH:
WASH. ST. ART. 2. SS 30 AND
ARTICAL 4. SS. 8,

• • •

4). SUBORNATION OF PERJURY,
procuring ANOTHER TO
COMMIT PERJURY PER.
R.C.W. 10.32.140

10=9).

5.) U.S.C.A. (18) ss. 1622
SUBORNATION OF PERJURY;
PROCURING ANOTHER TO
COMMIT PERJURY.

• • •

6.) R.C.W. 48. 36A. 360
PENALTIES for FALSE
STATEMENTS, FRAUD.

• • •

7. R.C.W. 2. 28. 010
POWERS OF COURT IN
CONDUCT OF JUDICIAL
PROCEEDINGS - OATH AND
AFFIRMATION.

• • •

8). R.C.W. 42. 40. 010
MISCONDUCT (ET. SEQ)

• • •

9.). R.C.W. 9. 81. 110
MISTATEMENTS PUNISHABLE
AS PERJURY.

• • •

10.) R.C.W. 21.20.400

Any person knowingly, alters, conceals or destroyes a record, document or other object or attemps to do so, with the intent to impair the object integrity,

per. U.S. Art. 1. ss8. cl (6)

"knowledge"

U.C.C. 1-201 (25)

refers to known rather than reason to know.

• • •

11.) R.C.W. 2.48.180

"Unlawful practice a crime".

"Unprofessional conduct";

ss. (3) (A)

Unlawful practice of law is a crime,

A single violation of

 This section is a crime

AND CONSTITUTES guilt.
R.C.W. 2.48.180
is contemp of court,
Failure to make discovery:

pursuant to:

R.C.W. 18.130.180
unprofessional conduct

ss. (2) misrepresentation of the county and state as a government instrument in the superior court of King county.

ss. (7) any violation of this section in violation of state and federal law is unprofessional

• • •

12.) Insider information

referring to anyone who has knowledge of fact not available to the general public;

per. (15) U.S.C.A. §78 p. (A) Securities Exchange.

pursuant to:

Securities Exchange Rule 10b-5 "where he or she fails to:

IN: VIOLATION of WASHINGTON STATE Securities Section:
R.C.W. 21.20.380

"FALSE or misleading STATEMENTS IN Filed documents.

R.C.W. 21.20.480
UNLAWFUL use of disclosure of Filed

INFORMATION;

PURSUANT WITH:

SECURITIES EXCHANGE
RULE 10b-5 (15) U.S.C.A.
SS. 78 (J) · (B)
DISCLOSURE OF NON
PUBLIC INFORMATION;

REFERING TO CONCEALED
INFORMATION LEADING TO
PROSECUTORS GUARANTEE
FROM PROSECUTION DUE
TO PERJURY COMMITTED
BY STATES WITNESSES:

* PHOENIX SECURITY OFFICER'S *

JEREMY REED AND
MICHAEL JONES.

(END)

PLEASE SEE: ATTACHED EXHIBIT
(B)·(5) PROSECUTOR'S VIOLATIONS
DUE TO SUBORNATION OF PERJU

Exhibit (B)(5)
prosetorial power;

Hedi Jacobsen-Watts

IN VIOLATION OF:

* Rules of professional conduct 2010 *

pursuant with subornation of perjured statements made in the probable cause S.P.D. Report in association with perjury committed July 12th & 26th, 2011 and July 13th.
S.P.D. 2011-28504/11100341.4.se

please see: violations according as attached to:
Exhibit (B)(4)
as by this document parallel and pursuant, as well as:

(1 of 3)

MANDATED OATH OF AN ATTORNEY IN VIOLATION OF * 8.4 - Rules of Professional Conduct 2010* (misconduct) under:

1. WASHINGTON COURT RULES

2. WASHINGTON Revised Code

3. WASHINGTON STATE CONST (1889)
{ ARTICAL 1. SS. 6 }
OATH'S.

AS PERJURY IN VIOLATION OF A CONTRACT:

IN order TO PROTECT AND Serve TO Welfare AND Security Of the public.

ALSO. Please See Prosecutors VIOLATIONS IN Exhibit (B)(4) Pages 1-9.

20-23)

Prosecutors perjured
OATH as defined
per. R.C.W. AND R.P.C.

R.C.W. 9A.72.010
R.C.W. · R.P.C.
Rule 8.4. MISCONDUCT

END

Exhibit (B)-(6)

Judicial power;

michael Hayden

IN VIOLATION OF:

* Rules of Judicial conduct *
2011,

pursuant with;
subornation of
perjured statements
made in probable cause
Report (S.p.D.) in association
with perjury committed
July 12th - 13th & 26th 2011,

S.p.D. 2011-28504 /
11.1.00341 - 4. Sea;

Judge michael is not
only in violation of
Exhibit (B)(4) pages 1-9
but also:
impairment of

his Obligated Duty
Mandated CONTRACT
IN LAW AND CONST.,
IN PERJURY AND IN
VIOLATION Of
WASHINGTON STATE LAW &
Securities R.C.W. 21.20.900

PURSUANT WITH:
WASH ST. ARTICAL 4.55.28
OATH of Judges

Shall Enter duties Of
his Office,
Subscribe AN OATH
That he'll Support The
CONST. AND Will
FAITHFULLY discharge his
DUTIES,

Per:
R.C.W. 2.08.080

perjured OATH defined!
R.C.W. 9A.72.010

END

(20F2)

EXHIBIT (C)

WASHINGTON COURT RULE'S;

IN Reference With:

1. Judge- michael Hayden,
2. prosecutor- Hedi JACOBSEN-WATTS,
3. Rep. counsel- cherilyn church
5. Jeremy Reed AND michael JONES- phoenix Security officer's,

RE: perjured Testimony AND procurring Subornation of perjury

committed during TRIAL proceeding's AT Seattle Superior court

July 12th - 14th, 2011 AND

Sentencing July 26th, 2011;

per. defendant:

SCOTT CARROLL BOLTON
S.P.D.- C.O.P.C.
*2011-Z8504
S.S.C.* 11-1-00341-4-SEA

pursuant with:

* CRIMINAL Superior COURT Rules *

(A). *pre-TRIAL Hearings* and procedures prior TO ARREST AND OTHER SPECIAL PROCEEDINGS;

Regarding:

*The Seattle police Report of probable cause; JAN. 25th, 2011; *2011-Z8504-11-1-00341-4-SEA

2 OF 8) IN: MATERIAL TESTIMONY

1. Phoenix Security Officers;

(A) Jeremy Reed
(B) Michael Jones

2. Seattle police Officers

(A) Detective Bruce Larse #3629
(B) Officer Feurnstein # 7565

3. A.C.A. Law Office

(A) Cherilyn church

4. Superior court Judges AND prosecutor;

(A) Judge- Theresa B. Doyle
(B) Judge- Ronald Kessler
(C) prosecutor- Erin Becker

IN RE:

Jeremy Reed and Michael Jones
Security Officer's;

Committing material perjured testimony

Jan. 25th, 2011, in a probable cause certificate 2011.28504

1. "Suspect exited the store"

2. "Suspect was stopped in the parking lot"

3. "Suspect made an attempt to flee, after a brief struggle".

(A) perjured material testimony
Jan. 25th, 2011
2011.28504 / 11.1.00341.4.Sef

pursuant with:

procurrment subornation
of perjury;

By:

1. S.P.D. · Detective Bruce Larsen
Officer Feurnstein

JAN. 25th, 2011

* 2011 · Z8504 / 11 · 1 · 00341 · 4 · Sea

2. Judge: Theresa B. Doyle

(A) April 28th as by "knowledge"
C. J. C. - Cr RLJ
AND
(B) May 5th, 2011, May 24th, 2011

procurring subornation
of perjury;

2(i) · prosecutor · Erin Beeker

of 8 2(ii) · Rep. counsel · Cherilyn Church

3. Judge Ronald Kessler

procurring subornation of perjury;

(A) June 3rd, 2011
(B) June 13th, 2011
(C) July 3rd, 2011

3(i). - Hedi Jacobsen Watts

3(ii). - Rep. counsel Cherilyn Church.

Againt: (1) R.C.W. 21.20.400
"concealment and contempt"
Failure to make discovery.
Brady vs. Maryland and
CrRLJ Discovery; &
R.P.C. 2010 - CrRLJ
Rule 8.4 misconduct
(A) - (N)

(2) R.C.W. 21.20.380
R.C.W. 21.20.350

"FALSE OR MISLEADING STATEMENTS FILED IN DOCUMENTS;"

PURSUANT WITH:

(3) R.C.W. 21.20.480
"UNLAWFUL USE OR DISCLOSURE OF FILED INFORMATION"

PURSUANT WITH:
Rule 10b-5 Security Exchange
R.C.W. 2010

Where he or she fails TO disclose MATERIAL NON-public INFORMATION,

FALSE STATEMENTS Elements Of DeceitfulNess, or UNTruthfulNess of FALSIFICATION bearing ON WITNESSES propensity TO TESTify Truthfully

IN RE:

GOVERNMENT OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

VS.

TOTO, CA. VIRGIN ISLANDS,

Please See: Exhibit (A)(i)

Defendant:

[signature]

Pro. SE

Exhibit (D)

* Judges and prosecutor's OATH AND AFFIRMATION

* Declaration of Rights *
WASHINGTON CONSTITUTION
ARTICAL 1. SS 6

"The mode of administering OATH. AND AFFIRMATION" "Shall be binding".

(PURSUANT WITH)

U.S. CONSTITUTION
ARTICAL 6. SS 3
"OATH OF OFFICE"

"All Judicial officers, shall be bound by OATH or AFFIRMATION".

(PARALLEL WITH)

1 OF ZO)

WASHINGTON COURT ROOM RULES

Rule 1.1. Scope

SHALL NOT AFFECT OR DEROGATE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF ANY DEFENDANT.

Rule 1.2

"They SHALL Secure procedure IN ADMINISTRATION AND JUSTICE".

"R.C.W. Superior Court Judges OATH of OFFICE"

R.C.W. 2.08.080 SHALL Support The CONSTITUTION, Such OATH or AFFIRMATION"

ARTICLE 4. 58 Z8
"OATH OF Judges"
SHALL SUPPORT THE CONSTITUTION,
SUPPORTED BY OATH AND
AFFIRMATION;

R.C.W. 9A. 9Z. 010
"PERJURED OATH defined"

PURSUANT WITH

"OATH AND AFFIRMATION"
R.C.W. Z. Z8. 060

"Judicial Officers, Powers,
powers Of The CONSTITUTION"

R.C.W Z. Z8. 010

Powers Of Court IN
CONDUCT OF Judicial
Proceedings,
"OATH AND AFFIRMATION"

OF ZO

R.C.W. 5.28.060

"A false Affirmation is to be deemed perjury."

"Affirmation Equivalent to Oath."

(pursuant with)

WASHINGTON ARTICAL 2. SS 30 AND ARTICAL 4. SS 28

(According with)

1. Penal code 2A1.4,
2. U.S.C.A. (18) SS. 1621
3. U.S.C.A. (18)

Any person making false statement under oath or equivalent by affirmation or affirms

The Truth of a Statement
To be True:
Henry vs. Deen (N.C.)

R.C.W. 9.01.110
"Mistatements are
punishable as perjury."

Pursuant with:

* Code of Judicial Conduct *
IN: Washington Court Rule's

(Canon 1)

(A.) "Judges shall uphold
the Integrity of
Judiciary."

(Canon 2)
"Judges should avoid
impropriety"

(A) "Judges should respect AND comply with the LAW IN the INTEGRITY AND IMPARTIALITY OF the JUDICIARY

(CANON 3) "Judges SHALL perform the DUTIES of their office IMPARTIALLY AND diligently."

(C)-(Z)

Judges HAVING ACTUAL KNOWledge THAT A LAWYER HAS COMMITTED VIOLATIONS OF the Rules of PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT.

(According)

* Rules of PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT

(Rule 8.4) "MISCONDUCT"

(F)

KNOWINGLY ASSIST A Judge or Judicial officer IN

CONDUCT THAT IS A VIOLATION OF APPLICABLE RULES OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT OR OTHER LAW.

PURSUANT WITH:

(CANON LAW 3)

"JUDGES HAVING ACTUAL KNOWLEDGE THAT A LAWYER HAS COMMITTED A VIOLATION OF THE RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT THAT RAISES A SUBSTANTIAL QUESTION AS TO THE LAWYER'S FITNESS AS A LAWYER SHOULD TAKE OR INITIATE APPROPRIATE CORRECTIVE ACTION, WHICH INCLUDE INFORMING THE APPROPRIATE AUTHORITY.

AS ACKNOWLEDGED IN:

* R.P.C. AND C.J.C. *

"KNOWLEDGE", "KNOWINGLY", "KNOWN" OR "KNOWS" DENOTE ACTUAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE FACT IN QUESTION.

PERJURY COMMITTED

PURSUANT WITH:

Rule 8.4 MISCONDUCT

IT IS PROFESSIONAL MISCONDUCT FOR A LAWYER TO:

(A)

VIOLATE OR ATTEMPT TO VIOLATE THE RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT, KNOWINGLY ASSIST OR INDUCE ANOTHER TO DO SO, OR DO SO THROUGH THE ACTS OF ANOTHER;

(d) ENGAGE IN CONDUCT WHICH IS PREJUDICIAL TO THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.

(C) ENGAGE IN CONDUCT INVOLVING DISHONESTY, FRAUD, DECEIT, OR MISREPRESENTATION,

(E) STATE OR IMPLY AN ABILITY TO INFLUENCE IMPROPERLY AN OFFICIAL, OR TO ACHIEVE RESULTS BY MEANS THAT VIOLATE THE RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT OR OTHER LAW;

(F) KNOWINGLY ASSIST A JUDGE OR JUDICIAL OFFICER IN CONDUCT THAT IS A VIOLATION OF APPLICABLE

rules of Judicial conduct or other law,

(i) commit any act involving moral turpitude or corruption, or (any) unjustifide act which reflects disregard for the rule of law, whether the same be committed in the course of his/her conduct as a lawyer, or otherwise, and whether the same constitutes a felony or misdemeanor.

(k) violate his or her oath as an attorney.

(m) violate the code of Judicial conduct.

(Accord)

"KNOWS", "KNOWINGLY" "KNOWN" DENOTES ACTUAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE FACT IN QUESTION.

KNOWINGLY ENGAGING IN FRAUD OR COMPTION.

"PERJURY AS COMMITTED"

According TO:

R. P. C. - Rule 1.0.

(d) "FRAUD" OR "FRAUDULENT"

"DENOTES CONDUCT THAT HAS A PURPOSE TO DECEIVE AND IS FRAUDULENT."

PURSUANT WITH:

ROFZO

CrRLJ 4.7 "Discovery"

(A) "prosecuting Authority Obligations"

The prosecuting Authority shall upon written demand, disclose to the defendant the following material and information within his or her possession or control concerning:

" perjury committed and knowledge of such in documents, paper and statements made by the defendants attorney and the defendant concerning perjury committed in the probable cause certificate - 2011-Z8504 / 11-1-00341-4-SEA as well as the IN-DASH-CAMERA-video discrediting perjured

STATEMENTS IN The
probable cause report
ZOII-Z8504 / II.1.CO341.4.Sea
JAN. Z5th, ZOII;

AS WELL AS documents
ADMINISTered TO Judges:
THERESA B. DOYLE
RONALD KESSLER AND
PROSECUTORS Office:
Regarding PERJURY
COMMITTED BY:
MR. REED AND MR. JONES
PHOENIX SECURITY OFFICERS;

(CrRLJ 4.7) "DISCOVERY"

(i)

ANY WRITTEN OR RECORDED
STATEMENTS MADE BY
THE DEFENDANT.

(ii)

ANY PAPERS, DOCUMENTS

which were obtained from or belonged to the defendant.

(iv) together with any written or recorded statements and the substance of any oral statements of such witnesses.

(v) any electronic surveillance of conversations to which the defendant was a party any record thereof,

(x) the acquistion of specified statements from the defendant; and

(X:) The relationship, if any, of specified persons to prosecuting authority.

(Z) disclosure of discoverable materials shall be made available for inspection and copying within 21 days of arraignment,

(3) The prosecuting Authority shall disclose to the defendants lawyer (any) material or information within his or her knowledge which tends to negate defendants guilt as to the defendant offence charged.

(4) The prosecuting Authority's obligation under this section is limited to material and information within actual knowledge, possession or control of members of his or her staff.

(B). "The defendant's obligation"

(1) Shall disclose to the

prosecuting Authority.

(2) discoverable materials shall be made available for inspection and copying not later than 14 days prior to trial

(3) References in this section to defendant shall be deemed to include the defendants lawyer where appropriate

(d) *material Held by others*

upon defendants request and designation of material or information in the knowledge, possession or control of

other persons which would be discoverable if in the knowledge, possession or control of the prosecuting authority. The prosecuting authority shall attempt to cause such material or information to be made available to the defendant.

If the prosecuting authority's efforts are unsuccessful and if such material or persons are subject,

the court shall issue suitable subpoenas or order to cause such materials to be made available to the defendants;

(g) "Regulation of Discovery"

(Z) "CONTINUING DUTY TO DISCLOSE"

If, AFTER COMPLIANCE WITH THIS RULE OR ORDERS PURSUANT TO IT, A PARTY DISCOVERS ADDITIONAL MATERIAL OR INFORMATION WHICH IS SUBJECT TO DISCLOSURE HE OR SHE SHALL PROMPTLY NOTIFY THE OTHER PARTY OR HIS OR HER LAWYER OF THE EXISTENCE OF SUCH MATERIAL. IF THE ADDITIONAL MATERIAL OR INFORMATION IS DISCOVERED DURING TRIAL THE COURT SHALL ALSO BE NOTIFIED.

(7) "SANCTIONS"

(iii) A LAWYERS WILLFUL VIOLATIONS OF AN

Applicable discovery Rule may be subject the Lawyer to appropriate SANCTIONS by the court.

Scott C. Bolton

SCOTT C. BOLTON
pro-se status
by Rep. COUNSEL

COURT OF APPEALS DIV I
STATE OF WASHINGTON
2012 MAY 22 PM 4:08