


FILED  
COURT OF APPEALS

10 MAY 27 PM 1:23

STATE OF WASHINGTON

No. 39929-6-11



COURT OF APPEALS, DIVISION II  
OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

---

CHARLES L. EAKINS, Petitioner,  
v.  
BEVERLY J. EAKINS, Respondent.

---

BRIEF OF APPELLANT

---

Charles L. Eakins, Pro Se  
P. O. Box 1064  
Mukilteo, WA 98275

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

TOC

**Table Of Contents**

A. ASSIGNMENT OF ERRORS ..... 4  
Issues Pertaining to Assignments of Error.....4  
A. STATEMENT OF CASE..... 6  
B. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT ..... 8  
C. ARGUMENT ..... 8  
D. CONCLUSION..... 10

**Table of Authorities**

**Cases**

*Chai v. Kong*, 122 Wn. App. 247, 254, 93 P.3d 936 (2004).....6, 8, 10

**Statutes**

RCW 26.09.010 .....8

RCW 4.28.080 (15).....6

**Rules**

Civil Rule 4.....6

Civil Rule 5.....4, 7, 8, 9

**Constitutional Provisions**

14<sup>th</sup> amendment of the United States Constitution Section 1 .....4

Article 1 Section 3.....4

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

1  
2  
3 **A. ASSIGNMENT OF ERRORS**

- 4 1. The trial court improperly ignored my objections by not addressing the issue with  
5 proper service under Civil Rule 5 thus depriving me of my procedural due process  
6 rights.  
7 2. The trial court committed obvious or probable error by denying my Motion for  
8 Reconsideration, even though I showed irregularity in the proceedings of the  
9 court, because the motion and supporting declarations were not served on the  
10 petitioner in accordance with the requirements in Superior Court Civil Rule 5

11 Issues Pertaining to Assignments of Error

12 1. The 14<sup>th</sup> amendment of the United States Constitution Section 1 states  
13 “All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the  
14 jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they  
15 reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges  
16 or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any  
17 person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any  
18 person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.” In this case the  
19 emphasis would be on property. The proper civil procedures were not followed in  
20 this case by either Beverly Eakins attorney Kathleen Hathaway or by the court.

21 Furthermore the Washington State Constitution essentially reinforces the  
22 14<sup>th</sup> amendment in Article 1 Section 3 by stating “No person shall be deprived of  
23 life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.”

24 Judicial Canon 1 states “Judges shall uphold the integrity and  
independence of the judiciary.” After the hearing I had no confidence in this  
courts integrity because it ignored civil procedure, ignored my objections and  
proceeded on like nothing happened.

Further the court continued to deny my due process rights when it denied  
my motion for reconsideration when I brought up arguments under civil rule 5  
and case law.

2. Civil Rule 5 (b)(1) states:

(b) Service--How Made.

(1) On Attorney or Party. Whenever under these rules service is  
required or permitted to be made upon a party represented by an attorney  
the service shall be made upon the attorney unless service upon the party  
himself is ordered by the court. Service upon the attorney or upon a party  
shall be made by delivering a copy to him or by mailing it to him at his  
last known address or, if no address is known, filing with the clerk of the  
court an affidavit of attempt to serve. Delivery of a copy within this rule  
means: handing it to the attorney or to the party; or leaving it at his  
office with his clerk or other person in charge thereof; or, if there is no

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

one in charge, leaving it in a conspicuous place therein; or, if the office is closed or the person to be served has no office, **leaving it at his dwelling house or usual place of abode with some person of suitable age and discretion then residing therein.** Service on an attorney is subject to the restrictions in subsections (b)(4) and (5) of this rule and in rule 71, Withdrawal by Attorneys.

1  
2 It's quit clear to me the legislators intent when personal service is  
3 happening that personal service has to be on someone of legal age at the persons  
4 home, because it is repeated in RCW 4.28.080 (15) "In all other cases, to the  
5 defendant personally, or by leaving a copy of the summons at the house of his or  
6 her usual abode with some person of suitable age and discretion then resident  
7 therein." This RCW is also referenced by Civil Rule 4.

8 Further in the July 6th, 2004 Published Washington State Court of  
9 Appeals Division I Opinion, "CHAI, APP./CROSS-RES. VS KONG,  
10 RES./CROSS-APP." Docket Number 52379-1-I. The Appeals Court Opinion  
11 States in Part:

12 *"The rule permits service by personal delivery or by mail to a last  
13 known address. But Mu Chai simply left a copy of his motion in a  
14 mailbox. This method of 'service' did not comply with the rules,  
15 substantially or otherwise. Where the court has personal and subject  
16 matter jurisdiction, procedural irregularities render a judgment voidable,  
17 not void. Chai's decree of dissolution was thus voidable."*

18 Further down the Appeals Court continues its Opinion:

19 *"The further question is whether Chai's failure to serve Kong makes  
20 the dissolution decree void, or only voidable. Where a court lacks  
21 jurisdiction over the parties or the subject matter, or lacks the inherent  
22 power to make or enter the particular order, its judgment is void.10 A  
23 motion to vacate a void judgment may be brought at any time,11 and the  
24 court must vacate the judgment as soon as the defect comes to light.12  
Where the court has personal and subject matter jurisdiction, a  
procedural irregularity renders a judgment voidable.13 A voidable  
judgment may be vacated if the motion to vacate is brought within a  
reasonable time, and not more than one year from the judgment if the  
grounds asserted are mistake, inadvertence, surprise, excusable neglect,  
or irregularity in obtaining the order.14" Chai v. Kong, 122 Wn. App.  
247, 254, 93 P.3d 936 (2004).*

20 **A. STATEMENT OF CASE**

21 On page 7 starting line 13 of "VERBATIM REPORT OF  
22 PROCEEDINGS", I bring up my objections to the court, the court acknowledges  
23 that it has seen my objections in my response to Beverly Eakins motion for  
24 temporary orders by stating "I saw that. And we should take that up first. Because  
that's a preliminary issue whether or not it can be heard today." The court then  
proceeds without taking the issue up and it is never brought up again.

I had previously filed the "Declaration of Charles L. Eakins/Response to  
Respondent's Motions" subject 78 in the court record on September 30<sup>th</sup>, and

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

served a copy on Beverly Eakins attorney Kathleen Hathaway. In the first paragraph I bring up my objections under Civil Rule 5. As you can see by the court transcript the court ignored my objections.

Further when I filed a motion for reconsideration with the same arguments, plus the process servers own statement, and case law I was once again ignored with a denial of my motion with no explanation or hearing.

1  
2  
3 **B. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT**

4 This order should be vacated because the motion was not served on me  
5 properly under Civil Rule 5.

6 **C. ARGUMENT**

7 The court erred when it did not dismiss or continue Beverly Eakins motions based  
8 improper service under Civil Rule 5 when I brought it up in my declaration and response  
9 filed on September 30<sup>th</sup>, 2009. The Court also erred when it ignored that declaration after I  
10 brought it up in court on October 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2009 and then again in my motion for reconsideration.

11 Process Server O. Fraga's "Declaration of Service" states "by then and there personally  
12 delivering 1 true and correct copy(ies) thereof, by then presenting to and leaving the same  
13 with POSTED ON DOOR, AS DIRECTED.". Please see process servers declaration. The  
14 Petitioner assumes that "AS DIREECTED" means that the Respondent's lawyer Kathleen  
15 Hathaway directed them to leave the "NOTE FOR MOTION DOCKET; SEALED  
16 FINANCIAL SOURCE DOCUMENTS; SEALED FINANCIAL SOURCE DOCUMENTS  
17 COVER SHEET; MOTION AND DECLARATION FOR TEMPORARY ORDER;  
18 FINANCIAL DELCARATION RESPONDENT;" on the Petitioner's door. Please note  
19 Petitioner did not receive any Sealed Financial Source Documents on September 25th, 2009,  
20 only the cover sheet.

21 There is no basis under Washington State Superior Court Civil Rule 5 – "SERVICE  
22 AND FILING OF PLEADINGS AND OTHER PAPERS" or under the Revised Code of  
23 Washington for serving a pleading, a paper relating to discovery, a written motion, a written  
24 notice, and appearance, a demand, an offer of judgment, designation of record on appeal, and  
similar paper by leaving it at a person's home on their door or any other place at the home. In  
fact CR 5 states "Delivery of a copy within this rule means:...leaving it at his dwelling house  
or usual place of abode with some person of suitable age and discretion then residing  
therein."

RCW 26.09.010 "Civil practice to govern — Designation of proceedings —  
Decrees." affectively makes the civil rules in domestic cases the law, where RCW 26.09.010  
states "(4) The initial pleading in all proceedings under this chapter shall be denominated a  
petition. A responsive pleading shall be denominated a response. Other pleadings, and all  
pleadings in other matters under this chapter shall be denominated as provided in the civil  
rules for superior court."

Further in the July 6th, 2004 Published Washington State Court of Appeals Division I  
Opinion, "CHAI, APP./CROSS-RES. VS KONG, RES./CROSS-APP." Docket Number  
52379-1-I. The Appeals Court Opinion States in Part:

1  
2       *“The rule permits service by personal delivery or by mail to a last known address. But*  
3 *Mu Chai simply left a copy of his motion in a mailbox. This method of 'service' did not*  
4 *comply with the rules, substantially or otherwise. Where the court has personal and subject*  
5 *matter jurisdiction, procedural irregularities render a judgment voidable, not void. Chai's*  
6 *decree of dissolution was thus voidable.”*

7  
8               Further down the Appeals Court continues its Opinion:

9       *“The further question is whether Chai's failure to serve Kong makes the dissolution*  
10 *decree void, or only voidable. Where a court lacks jurisdiction over the parties or the*  
11 *subject matter, or lacks the inherent power to make or enter the particular order, its*  
12 *judgment is void.<sup>10</sup> A motion to vacate a void judgment may be brought at any time,<sup>11</sup> and*  
13 *the court must vacate the judgment as soon as the defect comes to light.<sup>12</sup> Where the court*  
14 *has personal and subject matter jurisdiction, a procedural irregularity renders a judgment*  
15 *voidable.<sup>13</sup> A voidable judgment may be vacated if the motion to vacate is brought within a*  
16 *reasonable time, and not more than one year from the judgment if the grounds asserted are*  
17 *mistake, inadvertence, surprise, excusable neglect, or irregularity in obtaining the order.<sup>14</sup>”*  
18 *Chai v. Kong, 122 Wn. App. 247, 254, 93 P.3d 936 (2004).*

19  
20               Civil Rule 5 states in part:

21               ***(b) Service--How Made.***

22               ***(1) On Attorney or Party. Whenever under these rules service is required or***  
23 *permitted to be made upon a party represented by an attorney the service*  
24 *shall be made upon the attorney unless service upon the party himself is*  
25 *ordered by the court. Service upon the attorney or upon a party shall be made*  
26 *by delivering a copy to him or by mailing it to him at his last known address*  
27 *or, if no address is known, filing with the clerk of the court an affidavit of*  
28 *attempt to serve. Delivery of a copy within this rule means: handing it to the*  
29 *attorney or to the party; or leaving it at his office with his clerk or other*  
30 *person in charge thereof; or, if there is no one in charge, leaving it in a*  
31 *conspicuous place therein; or, if the office is closed or the person to be served*  
32 *has no office, leaving it at his dwelling house or usual place of abode with*  
33 *some person of suitable age and discretion then residing therein. Service on*  
34 *an attorney is subject to the restrictions in subsections (b)(4) and (5) of this*  
35 *rule and in rule 71, Withdrawal by Attorneys.*


1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**D. CONCLUSION**

This court should vacate Kitsap Superior Courts October 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2009 temporary orders. Order the respondent to pay court costs, and levy a monetary sanction of \$2240 against Kathleen Hathaway and her Client based on the fact I've spent about 52 hours working on this case which caused me to take time off from work, I averaged around \$40 an hour.

The Superior Courts failure to protect the Petitioners Rights under the Constitution and the Rules of Civil procedure are what this court should review.

May 26<sup>th</sup>, 2010

Respectfully submitted,  
  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Charles L. Eakins, Pro Se

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**RECEIVED**  
MAY 27 2010  
CLERK OF COURT OF APPEALS DIV II  
STATE OF WASHINGTON

No. 39929-6-II

COURT OF APPEALS, DIVISION II  
OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

---

CHARLES L. EAKINS, Petitioner,  
v.  
BEVERLY J. EAKINS, Respondent.

---

BRIEF OF APPELLANT

---

Charles L. Eakins, Pro Se  
P. O. Box 1064  
Mukilteo, WA 98275

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

TOC

**Table Of Contents**

A. ASSIGNMENT OF ERRORS ..... 4  
Issues Pertaining to Assignments of Error.....4  
A. STATEMENT OF CASE..... 6  
B. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT ..... 8  
C. ARGUMENT ..... 8  
D. CONCLUSION..... 10

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**Table of Authorities**

Cases

*Chai v. Kong*, 122 Wn. App. 247, 254, 93 P.3d 936 (2004).....6, 8, 10

Statutes

RCW 26.09.010.....8

RCW 4.28.080 (15).....6

Rules

Civil Rule 4.....6

Civil Rule 5.....4, 7, 8, 9

Constitutional Provisions

14<sup>th</sup> amendment of the United States Constitution Section 1 .....4

Article 1 Section 3.....4

1  
2  
3 **A. ASSIGNMENT OF ERRORS**

- 4 1. The trial court improperly ignored my objections by not addressing the issue with  
5 proper service under Civil Rule 5 thus depriving me of my procedural due process  
6 rights.  
7 2. The trial court committed obvious or probable error by denying my Motion for  
8 Reconsideration, even though I showed irregularity in the proceedings of the  
9 court, because the motion and supporting declarations were not served on the  
10 petitioner in accordance with the requirements in Superior Court Civil Rule 5

11 Issues Pertaining to Assignments of Error

12 1. The 14<sup>th</sup> amendment of the United States Constitution Section 1 states  
13 “All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the  
14 jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they  
15 reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges  
16 or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any  
17 person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any  
18 person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.” In this case the  
19 emphasis would be on property. The proper civil procedures were not followed in  
20 this case by either Beverly Eakins attorney Kathleen Hathaway or by the court.

21 Furthermore the Washington State Constitution essentially reinforces the  
22 14<sup>th</sup> amendment in Article 1 Section 3 by stating “No person shall be deprived of  
23 life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.”

24 Judicial Canon 1 states “Judges shall uphold the integrity and  
independence of the judiciary.” After the hearing I had no confidence in this  
courts integrity because it ignored civil procedure, ignored my objections and  
proceeded on like nothing happened.

Further the court continued to deny my due process rights when it denied  
my motion for reconsideration when I brought up arguments under civil rule 5  
and case law.

2. Civil Rule 5 (b)(1) states:

(b) Service--How Made.

(1) On Attorney or Party. Whenever under these rules service is  
required or permitted to be made upon a party represented by an attorney  
the service shall be made upon the attorney unless service upon the party  
himself is ordered by the court. Service upon the attorney or upon a party  
shall be made by delivering a copy to him or by mailing it to him at his  
last known address or, if no address is known, filing with the clerk of the  
court an affidavit of attempt to serve. Delivery of a copy within this rule  
means: handing it to the attorney or to the party; or leaving it at his  
office with his clerk or other person in charge thereof; or, if there is no

1 one in charge, leaving it in a conspicuous place therein; or, if the office  
2 is closed or the person to be served has no office, **leaving it at his**  
3 **dwelling house or usual place of abode with some person of suitable**  
4 **age and** **discretion then residing therein.** Service on an attorney is subject to the  
5 restrictions in subsections (b)(4) and (5) of this rule and in rule 71,  
6 Withdrawal by Attorneys.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

1  
2 It's quit clear to me the legislators intent when personal service is  
3 happening that personal service has to be on someone of legal age at the persons  
4 home, because it is repeated in RCW 4.28.080 (15) "In all other cases, to the  
5 defendant personally, or by leaving a copy of the summons at the house of his or  
6 her usual abode with some person of suitable age and discretion then resident  
7 therein." This RCW is also referenced by Civil Rule 4.

8 Further in the July 6th, 2004 Published Washington State Court of  
9 Appeals Division I Opinion, "CHAI, APP./CROSS-RES. VS KONG,  
10 RES./CROSS-APP." Docket Number 52379-1-I. The Appeals Court Opinion  
11 States in Part:

12 *"The rule permits service by personal delivery or by mail to a last  
13 known address. But Mu Chai simply left a copy of his motion in a  
14 mailbox. This method of 'service' did not comply with the rules,  
15 substantially or otherwise. Where the court has personal and subject  
16 matter jurisdiction, procedural irregularities render a judgment voidable,  
17 not void. Chai's decree of dissolution was thus voidable."*

18 Further down the Appeals Court continues its Opinion:

19 *"The further question is whether Chai's failure to serve Kong makes  
20 the dissolution decree void, or only voidable. Where a court lacks  
21 jurisdiction over the parties or the subject matter, or lacks the inherent  
22 power to make or enter the particular order, its judgment is void.10 A  
23 motion to vacate a void judgment may be brought at any time,11 and the  
24 court must vacate the judgment as soon as the defect comes to light.12  
Where the court has personal and subject matter jurisdiction, a  
procedural irregularity renders a judgment voidable.13 A voidable  
judgment may be vacated if the motion to vacate is brought within a  
reasonable time, and not more than one year from the judgment if the  
grounds asserted are mistake, inadvertence, surprise, excusable neglect,  
or irregularity in obtaining the order.14" Chai v. Kong, 122 Wn. App.  
247, 254, 93 P.3d 936 (2004).*

25 **A. STATEMENT OF CASE**

26 On page 7 starting line 13 of "VERBATIM REPORT OF  
27 PROCEEDINGS", I bring up my objections to the court, the court acknowledges  
28 that it has seen my objections in my response to Beverly Eakins motion for  
29 temporary orders by stating "I saw that. And we should take that up first. Because  
30 that's a preliminary issue whether or not it can be heard today." The court then  
31 proceeds without taking the issue up and it is never brought up again.

32 I had previously filed the "Declaration of Charles L. Eakins/Response to  
33 Respondent's Motions" subject 78 in the court record on September 30<sup>th</sup>, and

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

served a copy on Beverly Eakins attorney Kathleen Hathaway. In the first paragraph I bring up my objections under Civil Rule 5. As you can see by the court transcript the court ignored my objections.

Further when I filed a motion for reconsideration with the same arguments, plus the process servers own statement, and case law I was once again ignored with a denial of my motion with no explanation or hearing.

1  
2  
3 **B. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT**

4 This order should be vacated because the motion was not served on me  
5 properly under Civil Rule 5.

6 **C. ARGUMENT**

7 The court erred when it did not dismiss or continue Beverly Eakins motions based  
8 improper service under Civil Rule 5 when I brought it up in my declaration and response  
9 filed on September 30<sup>th</sup>, 2009. The Court also erred when it ignored that declaration after I  
10 brought it up in court on October 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2009 and then again in my motion for reconsideration.

11 Process Server O. Fraga's "Declaration of Service" states "by then and there personally  
12 delivering 1 true and correct copy(ies) thereof, by then presenting to and leaving the same  
13 with POSTED ON DOOR, AS DIRECTED.". Please see process servers declaration. The  
14 Petitioner assumes that "AS DIREECTED" means that the Respondent's lawyer Kathleen  
15 Hathaway directed them to leave the "NOTE FOR MOTION DOCKET; SEALED  
16 FINANCIAL SOURCE DOCUMENTS; SEALED FINANCIAL SOURCE DOCUMENTS  
17 COVER SHEET; MOTION AND DECLARATION FOR TEMPORARY ORDER;  
18 FINANCIAL DELCARATION RESPONDENT;" on the Petitioner's door. Please note  
19 Petitioner did not receive any Sealed Financial Source Documents on September 25th, 2009,  
20 only the cover sheet.

21 There is no basis under Washington State Superior Court Civil Rule 5 – "SERVICE  
22 AND FILING OF PLEADINGS AND OTHER PAPERS" or under the Revised Code of  
23 Washington for serving a pleading, a paper relating to discovery, a written motion, a written  
24 notice, and appearance, a demand, an offer of judgment, designation of record on appeal, and  
similar paper by leaving it at a person's home on their door or any other place at the home. In  
fact CR 5 states "Delivery of a copy within this rule means:...leaving it at his dwelling house  
or usual place of abode with some person of suitable age and discretion then residing  
therein."

RCW 26.09.010 "Civil practice to govern — Designation of proceedings —  
Decrees." affectively makes the civil rules in domestic cases the law, where RCW 26.09.010  
states "(4) The initial pleading in all proceedings under this chapter shall be denominated a  
petition. A responsive pleading shall be denominated a response. Other pleadings, and all  
pleadings in other matters under this chapter shall be denominated as provided in the civil  
rules for superior court."

Further in the July 6th, 2004 Published Washington State Court of Appeals Division I  
Opinion, "CHAI, APP./CROSS-RES. VS KONG, RES./CROSS-APP." Docket Number  
52379-1-I. The Appeals Court Opinion States in Part:

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

*“The rule permits service by personal delivery or by mail to a last known address. But Mu Chai simply left a copy of his motion in a mailbox. This method of 'service' did not comply with the rules, substantially or otherwise. Where the court has personal and subject matter jurisdiction, procedural irregularities render a judgment voidable, not void. Chai's decree of dissolution was thus voidable.”*

Further down the Appeals Court continues its Opinion:

*“The further question is whether Chai's failure to serve Kong makes the dissolution decree void, or only voidable. Where a court lacks jurisdiction over the parties or the subject matter, or lacks the inherent power to make or enter the particular order, its judgment is void.<sup>10</sup> A motion to vacate a void judgment may be brought at any time,<sup>11</sup> and the court must vacate the judgment as soon as the defect comes to light.<sup>12</sup> Where the court has personal and subject matter jurisdiction, a procedural irregularity renders a judgment voidable.<sup>13</sup> A voidable judgment may be vacated if the motion to vacate is brought within a reasonable time, and not more than one year from the judgment if the grounds asserted are mistake, inadvertence, surprise, excusable neglect, or irregularity in obtaining the order.<sup>14</sup>”*  
*Chai v. Kong, 122 Wn. App. 247, 254, 93 P.3d 936 (2004).*

Civil Rule 5 states in part:

*(b) Service--How Made.*

*(1) On Attorney or Party. Whenever under these rules service is required or permitted to be made upon a party represented by an attorney the service shall be made upon the attorney unless service upon the party himself is ordered by the court. Service upon the attorney or upon a party shall be made by delivering a copy to him or by mailing it to him at his last known address or, if no address is known, filing with the clerk of the court an affidavit of attempt to serve. Delivery of a copy within this rule means: handing it to the attorney or to the party; or leaving it at his office with his clerk or other person in charge thereof; or, if there is no one in charge, leaving it in a conspicuous place therein; or, if the office is closed or the person to be served has no office, leaving it at his dwelling house or usual place of abode with some person of suitable age and discretion then residing therein. Service on an attorney is subject to the restrictions in subsections (b)(4) and (5) of this rule and in rule 71, Withdrawal by Attorneys.*


1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**D. CONCLUSION**

This court should vacate Kitsap Superior Courts October 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2009 temporary orders. Order the respondent to pay court costs, and levy a monetary sanction of \$2240 against Kathleen Hathaway and her Client based on the fact I've spent about 52 hours working on this case which caused me to take time off from work, I averaged around \$40 an hour.

The Superior Courts failure to protect the Petitioners Rights under the Constitution and the Rules of Civil procedure are what this court should review.


May 26<sup>th</sup>, 2010

Respectfully submitted,  
  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Charles L. Eakins, Pro Se

FILED  
COURT OF APPEALS  
DIVISION II

10 MAY 27 PM 1:23

STATE OF WASHINGTON

BY  DEFENDANT

**COURT OF APPEALS, DIVISION II  
OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON**

In re the Marriage of:

**Charles L. Eakins**

Petitioner,

and

**Beverly J. Eakins**

Respondent.

**No. 39929-6-II**

**DECLARATION OF MAILING**


Name of Declarant: Charles Eakins

On May 26<sup>th</sup>, 2010 I e-mailed Kathleen Hathaway a copy in PDF format, she has an established history of accepting legal documents this way, see previous declarations of mailing the following documents.

The documents are: Change of Address, and Brief of Appellant

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

Signed at Mukilteo, Washington on May 26<sup>th</sup>, 2010.



Charles L. Eakins, Pro Se  
P. O. Box 1064  
Mukilteo, WA 98275



Charles Eakins <ceakins@gmail.com>

---

## Appellant Brief and Change of Address

---

Charles Eakins <ceakins@gmail.com>

Wed, May 26, 2010 at 1:49 PM

To: Kathleen Hathaway <b98226@live.com>

Here is my Appellant Brief and Change of Address.

Sincerely

Charles Eakins

--

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email communication may contain private, confidential, or legally privileged information intended for the sole use of the designated and/or duly authorized recipient(s). If you are not the intended recipient or have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by email and permanently delete all copies of this email including all attachments without reading them. If you are the intended recipient, secure the contents in a manner that conforms to all applicable state and/or federal requirements related to privacy and confidentiality of such information.

---

### 2 attachments

 **APPELLANT BRIEF.pdf**  
180K

 **Change of Address.pdf**  
73K

---