

COURT OF APPEALS  
 DIVISION TWO  
 OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

~~COURT OF APPEALS  
 DIVISION II  
 11 JUL 15 PM 12:45  
 STATE OF WASHINGTON  
 BY \_\_\_\_\_  
 DEPUTY~~

STATE OF WASHINGTON )  
 )  
 Respondent, )  
 )  
 v. )  
 )  
MR. ALONZO BRADLEY )  
 (your name) )  
 )  
 Appellant. )

No. 41546-1-II  
 STATEMENT OF ADDITIONAL  
 GROUNDS FOR REVIEW

FILED  
 COURT OF APPEALS  
 DIVISION II  
 11 JUL 29 AM 9:09  
 STATE OF WASHINGTON  
 BY sm  
 DEPUTY

I, MR. ALONZO BRADLEY, have received and reviewed the opening brief prepared by my attorney. Summarized below are the additional grounds for review that are not addressed in that brief. I understand the Court will review this Statement of Additional Grounds for Review when my appeal is considered on the merits.

Additional Ground 1

(1.) APPELLATE COUNCILS (REFUSAL) TO RAISE "ILLEGAL SEARCH AND SEIZURE" (4TH AMENDMENT VIOLATION) (FRUIT OF THE POISONOUS TREE) (I.E.) LACK OF VALIDITY OF ANY OF THE "HEARSAY" VIOLATIONS THE OFFICER CLAIMED WAS HIS MOTIVE IN ILLEGALLY SEIZING THE APPELLATE (I.E.) CITY'S UNADOPTED BIKE LAW. VIOLATIONS THAT WERENT VIOLATED NOR HAD A WRITTEN CITATION TO JUSTIFY ANY CLAIM OF OBSTRUCTION, AND THE FAISE TRAFFIC VIOLATIONS THAT NEVER RESULTED IN A CITATION AS WELL.

Additional Ground 2

(2.) THE ORDINANCE OF WASHINGTON STATE THAT SHOWS WITHOUT MISLEADING INTENT THE ONLY WAY A PERSON IS ABLE TO VIOLATE SUCH AN ORDINANCE (I.E.) IS WHEN OCCUPYING A BIKE LANE ONLY, OR AS WHEN RIDING IN ACTUAL TRAFFIC (I.E.) WHERE "CARS LOW BEAMS" ARE DIRECTLY BEHIND A PERSON RIDING A BIKE (3.) NO CONFLICTING TESTIMONY WAS EVER BROUGHT FORTH TO SHOW THE THINT OF THE CASE IN TOTALITY (I.E.) THE EVENTS OF ARREST OF THE APPELLATE, WHERE THE OFFICERS' "RESPONSE PARTNER" TESTIFIED TO NEVER SEETING THE APPELLATE "JUMPOFF"

If there are additional grounds, a brief summary is attached to this statement.

Date: 6-18-11

Signature: MR. ALONZO BRADLEY

FILED  
 COURT OF APPEALS  
 DIVISION II  
 11 JUL 29 AM 9:09  
 STATE OF WASHINGTON  
 BY \_\_\_\_\_  
 DEPUTY

12

THE BIKE," APPROACH THE ARRESTING OFFICER (EUGLEY) WAIVE HIS HANDS IN THE AIR, WALK AROUND THE BIKE, COME TOWARDS THE OFFICER IN AN AGGRESSIVE MANNER WITH CLENCHED FIST, THEN LAY IN BETWEEN A SIDEWALK AND BUSHES WHILE PLACING ONE HAND, THEN BOTH IN THE BUSHES. WHILE THE ARRESTING OFFICER CONTINUED TO YELL DIRECT ORDERS FOR THE APPELLATE TO COOPERATE "OR ELSE BE TAZED."

THIS, IS EXTREMELY CRUCIAL TO THE WORST OF ALL CHARGES (I.E.) THE FELONY HARRASSMENT. AS, THIS SHOWS THAT THE AMOUNT OF FEAR WAS NOT PRESENT IN ANY EVENT (I.E.) ON THE SCENE NOR WHILE IN TRANSPORT. AS, POINTED OUT BY BOTH COUNCELS TRIAL AND APPELLATE, THAT THERE WAS "NEVER ANY USE OF FORCE." AS, THE RESPONDING OFFICER (HOBBS) TESTIFIED WITHOUT REFERENCES TO ANY MEMORY DIFFICULTIES. THAT WHEN HE ARRIVED, HE NEVER OBSERVED "ANY HOSTILITY" OR "VERBAL ABUSE" FROM THE APPELLATE, AS HE ONLY OBSERVED THE APPELLATE ON HIS STOMACH, ALREADY CUFFED, WITH OFFICER EUGLEY UPON HIM WITH HIS TAZER DRAWN UPON THE APPELLATE. THIS, SHOWS "ABSOLUTE LACK OF FEAR" AS OFFICER HOBBS TESTIFIED THAT "HE NEVER TOUCHED THE APPELLATE AND STOOD 20 FEET AWAY WHILE OFFICER EUGLEY DID ALL THE SEARCHING AND PLACED THE APPELLATE IN THE BACK OF OFFICER EUGLEY'S PATROL CAR ALL BY HIMSELF."

THIS, SHOWS CLEARLY THAT THERE WAS DELIBERATE DECEIT FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE EVENTS AS TO WHAT TRUTHFULLY TRANSPIRED. AND THAT AT MANY POINTS IN EACH OF THE STATES' WITNESSES TESTIMONY, THERE WERE "REHEARSED STATEMENTS" THAT WERE PURGERED WITHOUT ANY FEAR OF CONSEQUENCE BEFORE THE COURT. THIS, WAS DONE IN SUCH AN OBVIOUSNESS, TO WHERE THE TESTIMONY OF OFFICER HOBBS SHOULD NOT BE IGNORED, AS, HE ALSO STATED THAT HE AT FIRST OBSERVED THE APPELLATE "YELLING INCOHERENTLY" AS HE STOOD 20 FEET AWAY AND OBSERVED OFFICER EUGLEYS "4 POINT OR 3 POINT RESTRAINT TACTIC," BEING INITIATED. LEADING TO THE APPELLATE BEING PLACED INTO OFFICER EUGLEYS PATROL CAR BY OFFICER EUGLEY ALONE.

FIRST, WHAT IS THE OFFICERS EXPLANATION OF "YELLING INCOHERENTLY"? THIS, WAS NEVER FOCUSED UPON AS IT SHOULD'VE BEEN AND SHOULD BE AT THIS TIME. THE OFFICERS' WHEN QUESTIONED ON THIS, MADE SEVERAL MANIPULATING STATEMENTS BEFORE THE COURT AND IN THE 3.5 - 3.6 HEARING, HIS POLICE REPORT AND IN TRIAL OFFICER EUGLEY CHANGED HIS VIEW OF HIS EXPLANATION. ONLY IN TRIAL NOTICED THE APPELLATES "YELLING INCOHERENTLY" AS "A SEEMING ILLNESS." JUST, AS OFFICER HOBBS' TESTIMONY WAS PURGERALLY REHEARSED BEFORE THE COURT, AS, HIS

VERSION WAS MOCKINGLY STATED BEFORE THE COURT AS THE IDENTICAL INTERPRETATION OF "OFFICER EUGLEY'S SECOND TESTIMONY". AS, AFTER THE APPELLATE WAS SUBJECTED TO "(2.) REUSED INCOMPETENCY HEARINGS" AT "WESTERN STATE HOSPITAL". BOTH, OFFICER HOBBS AND EUGLEY MADE FALSE TESTIMONY BEFORE THE COURT. CLAIMING THE APPELLATE "YELLING INCOHERENTLY": APPEARED TO BE AS IF THE APPELLATE WAS HAVING SOME FORM OF "PSYCHOLOGICAL ISSUE." AS, THERE WAS TESTIMONY OF THE APPELLATE "FROTHING AT THE MOUTH" AND "HAVING ISSUES OF LETHARGIC COMMUNICATION". THAT EUGLEY TESTIFIED TO AS THE APPELLATE MAKING STATEMENTS OF "NEVER STOPPING AT A STORE OR FIVE MOTEL". WHEN THE APPELLATE ONLY MADE STATEMENTS OF "THE OFFICER NEVER HAVING ANY PROBABLE CAUSE TO STOP HIM. DUE TO THE OFFICER NEVER SEEING HIM LOZTERING IN SUCH AREAS". AS NOT GIVE OFFICER EUGLEY ANY VALID MEANS OF SOLIDIFYING HIS REAL REASON FOR PULLING THE APPELLATE OVER. WHICH OFFICER EUGLEY ACTUALLY STATED TO THE APPELLATE WAS "BECAUSE HE LOOKED SUSPICIOUS".

THERE WAS ALSO TESTIMONY BY OFFICER EUGLEY IN TRIAL. WHERE HIS STATEMENTS WERE FALSE AND PURGERIZED BEFORE THE COURT. WHERE HE STATED THAT THE DEFENDANT "THREW HIS HANDS IN THE AIR, IN A ROTATED CIRCLE MOTION THAT OFFICER EUGLEY

PHYSICALLY DEMONSTRATED. AS HE STATED THE APPELLATE MADE A "WHOOOP, WHOOOP" SOUND. ALSO STATING "HE ALMOST HIT THE APPELLATE WITH HIS VEHICLE WHILE IN TRAFFIC."

THIS, WAS NOT THE TESTIMONY IN THE 3.5-3.6 HEARING NOR WAS IT ON HIS "POLICE REPORT." AS, NOR THE APPELLATE APPEARING TO BE DISPLAYING SIGNS OF "A MENTAL ILLNESS OR PSYCHOLOGICAL ISSUE" OR EVEN "YELLING INCOHERENTLY IN A WHOOOP, WHOOOP" SOUND. NOR EVEN APPEARING TO BE "INTOXICATED OR ON SOME SORT OF DRUGS" AS OFFICER EUGLEY TESTIFIED TO IN TRIAL, THOUGH NEVER WAS BACKED UP BY OFFICER HOBBS\* IN OFFICER HOBBS' TESTIMONIE(S). NOR, THAT "HE ALMOST HIT THE APPELLATE WITH HIS VEHICLE WHILE IN TRAFFIC."

THIS, IS CRUCIAL. AND NEEDS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE APPELLATE COURT AND REBRIEFED BY THE APPELLATE'S COUNCIL APPOINTED. AS, THIS WILL SHOW THAT THE CASE IS WITHOUT QUESTION INITIATED BY "ILLEGAL SEARCH AND SEIZURE FOURTH AMENDMENT VIOLATIONS". AS, "THE INCONSISTANCIES" OF BOTH OFFICERS\* AND THE STATES' WITNESS OF THE "EVIDENCE ROOM STAFF OF THE FZFE POLICE DEPARTMENT." ARE A RESULT OF THE "OUTRAGIOUSNESS OF DISREGARD OF THE LAW" AND PROCEDURES. TO WHERE IT IS ONLY IN CONTENTION THAT THE LOWER COURTS ALLOWED THE PROCEEDINGS TO BE CARRIED FURTHER. AND PLACED A BLEMISH ON

THEMSELVES BY REFUSING TO DISMISS SUCH A "TEXT-BOOK CASE" OF (FRUIT OF THE POISONOUS TREE) THAT SAT BEFORE THEM. AS THIS STATEMENT IS "WITHOUT EMOTION" BEFORE THE COURT. BEING, THAT THE APPELLATE UNDERSTOOD THIS, AND WOULD'VE ENACTED HIS RIGHT TO A "STAY OF JUDGEMENT" (RAJ) 4.1, 4.2 ETC, THAT WOULD'VE KEPT THE CASE IN ITS SUPPRESSIVE PLACE AND PROPER MEANS. AS, TO NOT ALLOW IT TO BE REMOVED FROM THE "SUPERIOR COURT" AND RIGHTFULLY CHALLENGE THE COURTS FAILURE TO SUPPRESS ALL THE EVIDENCE AS "FRUIT OF THE POISONOUS TREE. RESULTING FROM THE ILLEGAL SEARCH AND SEIZURE OF THE APPELLATE." (FRUIT OF THE POISONOUS TREE DOCTRINE) 1948 - CRIMINAL PROCEDURE, ALSO TERMED FRUITS DOCTRINE: SEE EXCLUSIONARY RULE; ATTENUATION DOCTRINE; INDEPENDENT-SOURCE RULE; INEVITABLE DISCOVERY RULE. [CASES: CRIMINAL LAW 394.1(3).] DEFINITION: THE RULE THAT DERIVED FROM AN ILLEGAL SEARCH, ARREST OR INTERROGATION IS INADMISSIBLE BECAUSE THE EVIDENCE (I.E. "THE FRUIT") WAS TAINTED BY THE ILLEGALITY (I.E. "THE POISONOUS TREE"). (2.1) UNDER THIS DOCTRINE, FOR EXAMPLE "A MURDER WEAPON" IS INADMISSIBLE IF THE MAP SHOWING ITS LOCATION AND USED TO FIND IT WAS SEIZED DURING AN ILLEGAL SEARCH. (I.E.) THE TOTALITY OF CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE INCIDENT.

THE APPELLATE KNEW THIS RIGHT WOULD CHALLENGE THE COURTS DECISIONS BEFORE AN APPELLATE COURT WITHOUT PROCEEDING FURTHER INTO THE STAGES OF OMNIBUS OR OTHER PROCEEDINGS AFTER THE ARRAIGNMENT, INCLUDING THE PROCEEDING TO TRIAL. THE COUNSEL(S) BEFORE THE COURTS AS IN ANY CASE THE APPELLATE HAS FACED,

DELIBERATELY REFUSED TO ENACT THE APPELLATES RIGHT

ADDITIONAL TO A "STAY OF JUDGEMENT," INCLUDING THIS CASE.

GROUND

ISSUE 3 ) THE FAILED MENTION OF "COERCION AND ENTRAPMENT AS WELL AS ILLEGAL SEARCH AND SEIZURE" AS A DEFENSE INSTEAD OF JUST "GENERAL DENIAL" WAS AN ERROR THAT THE COURT IS UNABLE TO IGNORE AS THE APPELLATES' COUNSEL HAS, AS, BY THE FAILURE OF THESE DEFENSES AND BY THE FAILURE OF THE DEFENSE COUNSEL(S) IN RAISING SUCH ISSUES, LEFT THE APPELLATE IN APPEARANCE AS "A LAUGHING STOCK" BEFORE THE COURT.

AS, THE JUDICIAL PARTIES OFTEN MADE "OPEN SMIRKS\* AND JOKES" AT THE APPELLATE AS HIS COUNCELS PARTICIPATED IN THESE SAME ACTS. THIS, VIOLATED THE APPELLATES FIFTH, SIXTH, EIGHTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS. THIS, LEFT THE APPELLATE WITHOUT COUNSEL AND LEFT THE APPELLATE OPENED TO "PHYSICAL ASSAULTS AND DURESSIVE TACTILTS" TO

THIS IS A CASE OF "CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT / UNEQUAL PROTECTION". AS, THE APPELLATE HAD AN IDEA OF THE "RULE (RALJ) 4.1", THOUGH COUNCEL KNEW ENACTING THIS WOULD END THE ABUSES UPON THE APPELLATE. THIS, IS WITHOUT FILING A JUDICIAL DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE COMPLAINT. THOUGH, ENACTING SUCH PROTECTION BY FILING AN (RALJ) 4.1 "STAY OF JUDGEMENT" WHEN THE MOTION TO DISMISS FIRST BECAME AN ISSUE. THIS, WOULD'VE KEPT PROTECTION OF BOTH COUNCEL AND APPELLATE FROM BEING ACTED AGAINST. AND MORE THAN LIKELY GOT THE CASE DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE AFTER THE DENIAL OF THE 3.5-3.6 HEARING.

IN TOTALITY, THE CORRECT WAY THAT THE CASE SHOULD BE VIEWED AND ACCEPTED BEFORE THE COURT, IS AS CORRECTLY WRITTEN BY THE "APPELLATES STATEMENT OF ADDITIONAL GROUNDS", AND RULED WITHOUT ANY FURTHER DELAY IN FAVOR OF THE APPELLATE. AS, STATEMENT OF ADDITIONAL GROUNDS ISSUE (#2.), COMBINED WITH (#3.), LEAD TO THE CONCLUSION THAT THE COURT HAD OTHER MOTIVES BEHIND REFUSING TO EQUALLY PROTECT THE APPELLATE FOR THE LAST 18 YRS. SINCE 1993. POINTING DIRECTLY TOWARDS WHETHER THE APPELLATE HAS NOT BECOME WISE ENOUGH TO ENACT HIS RIGHTS TO AN IRREFUSABLE "RECORD EXPUNGEMENT / RESTORATION OF RIGHTS".

AS, BY PAYING ALL COURT FINES AND ORDERED  
RESTITUTION WETHER MISDEMEANOR OR FELONY.  
WHILE SATISFYING ALL PROBATION ORDERS AND  
STATUTORY TIMELINES WITHOUT FURTHER INCIDENT(S)  
(I.E.) MISDEMEANOR 3 YRS., <sup>UNRANKED</sup> CLASS (C) FELONY / GROSS MISDEMEANOR 5  
YRS., CLASS (B) FELONY 10 YRS., CLASS (A) FELONY 20 YRS.  
THEN, FILE PETITION IN EACH COURT AND COUNTY  
OF EACH INCIDENT, CONTACT STATE PATROL AND  
CLEAR ALL RECORDS OF INCIDENTS / CONVICTIONS FROM  
THE DATA BASE, WOULD BE ABLE TO EXIST WITHOUT  
"FURTHER ASSUMPTION" OF WETHER THE APPELLATE  
IS IN "SELF-CORRECTION," AND "UPSTANDING AS THE  
GENERAL CITIZEN OF THE STATE AND ITS MANY  
COMMUNITIES."

THE APPELLATE ONLY CONCLUDES WITH THIS FACT,  
THE STATES' WITNESSES TESTIMONIES ARE UNRELIABLE, AND THE  
LAST SUPPORTING STATEMENT IS: THE "EVIDENCE ROOM  
STAFFS TESTIMONY" OF WHERE SHE TESTIFIED  
IN PURGERY THAT SHE WAS THE ONLY PERSON TO  
TEST THE EVIDENCE BEFORE THE COURT, NO ONE ELSE  
COULD POSSIBLY HAVE TOUCHED IT OR EVEN HAVE  
ACCESSES TO IT. AS SHE'S THE ONLY ONE WHO HAS  
THE KEY TO THE EVIDENCE SAFE, AND WENT INTO  
DETAZL AS TO ITS DESIGN AND TO THE ACCESS  
OF THE EVIDENCE (I.E.) FROM THIS OF HER OFFICE.

INTERD TESTIM: SHE WAS ONE OF THE FIRST WITNESSES CALLED TO THE  
STAND IN TRIAL. AS OFFICER HOBBS WAS THE SECOND  
CR MAY HAVE BEEN THE SECOND PERSON TO TESTIFY.

RECORDED 6-29-11

NOTE: AFTER THOUGH, WHEN OFFICER EUGLEY TESTIFIED, JUST  
AS THE APPELLATE ALSO TESTIFIED IN CORRECTNESS.

TO THE FACT THAT IT WAS OFFICER EUGLEY ONLY  
WHO FIELD TESTED "THE DRUGS ON THE SCENE", AND

THE CONTENTS WAS TESTED IN VIEW OF OFFICER  
HOBBS. THE APPELLATE POINTED THIS OUT, THAT

OFFICER EUGLEY TESTED THE CONTENTS OF THE  
"DIRTY WHITE BAG" IN VIEW OF ALL PARTIES TO

WHERE THE OFFICERS WERE IN "PLAIN VIEW", THOUGH  
THE APPELLATE WAS IN POSITION OF DIFFICULTY

WITH "FOGGY WINDOWS" IN THE BACK OF THE POLICE  
VEHICLE, AS THE WINDOWS WERE FOGGY DUE TO THE

APPELLATE ATTEMPTING TO NOTIFY OFFICER HOBBS  
OF THE CONTENTS BEING "TAINTED AND PLANTED

ON THE SCENE" AS HE ACCUSED OFFICER EUGLEY  
OF "FRAMING HIM."

SO THE APPELLATE  
OFFICER HOBBS THEN TESTIFIED TO NOT SEEING  
ANYTHING NOR SEEING OFFICER EUGLEY TEST THE

CONTENTS OF THE SUBSTANCE IN FRONT OF HIM.  
THOUGH, SAW EUGLEY BRING THE CONTENTS TO

FIXING VEHICLE AND MENTIONING THAT HE MAY HAVE

FOUND DRUGS.

WITH ALL THESE DIRECT PURGERY STATED TESTIMONIES,  
IT'S EASILY AND RIGHTFULLY ASSUMED BEFORE  
THE COURT THAT THE STATEMENTS MADE BY THE  
OFFICERS MAINLY EUGLEY, ARE ALL LIES, MIXED AND  
REHERSED BY THE STATE TO ITS WITNESSES IN  
SOME PARTS, AS WELL AS MIXED AND REHERSED BY  
THE WITNESSES THEMSELVES, ALSO BY THE  
APPELLATES OWN DEFENSE (COUNCELS), AS FURTHER  
EXPLAINED IN THE APPELLATES "STATEMENT OF ADD.  
GRANDS.", PAGE (8-9 OF 15) BEGINNING ON BOTTOM PAGE  
OF (B) ISSUE #13 TITLED "TO: COURT OF APPEALS P. 1-15  
REG: ISSUES OF MAJOR ERRORS LEADING TO TRIAL"  
DATED 11-4-10 CASE# 09-1-041682-6 STATE V. BRADLEY.

THE TOTALITY OF THE ISSUE MISSED, IS THAT IT  
IS FACT BEFORE THE (COURTS) INCLUDING THE  
APPELLATE, THAT THERE WAS "NEVER ANY LEGALITY  
IN THE REASON" FOR OFFICER EUGLEY TO STOP  
AND ARREST THE APPELLATE MR. BRADLEY. AND  
THE REASONS STATED AS WELL AS ANY STATEMENTS  
THAT THE OFFICER STATED THE APPELLATE MADE,  
WERE ALL TYPICAL STATEMENTS THAT OFFICERS  
USE BEFORE THE COURT IN REGULARITY. THIS, IS  
ALSO DATED OUT TO THE APPELLATES "AND ALL STATE"

ON PAGE # 28 OF 38 OF THE APPELLATES: STATEMENT OF ADDITIONAL GROUNDS MAIN TITLE: "SUPPORTING LAW, LAW FACTS," INCLUDES: (1 OF 38). THOUGH, SUBTITLED: "PER LEGAL LIBRARY, A LAW BOOK TITLED: "WARRANTLESS SEARCH LAW DESK BOOK". BY THE SAME AUTHOR: WAYNE R. LAFAVE DATED 6-22-10. BEGINNING ON PAGE 28 OF 38 AND CONCLUDING ON PAGE# 33 OF 38,

THAT GIVES A CLEAR NARATION OF A REAL CASE BEFORE THE COURT. THAT SHOWS THESE STATEMENTS MADE BY AN OFFICER, THIER TYPICAL ROUTINENESS AND HOW IT POSES A PROBLEM BEFORE THE COURT. AND POSES A PROBLEM FOR AN APPELLATE, DEFENDANT AND DEFENSES WHEN THE COURT CHOOSES TO ACCEPT SUCH WEAK EXPLANATIONS (IE) ~~HEARSAY~~ "IT'S THEN CLEARLY MISLEADING AND INSULT TO THE JUSTICE S, THIER AUTHORITY AND THIER INTELLIGENCES. WHEN, FACED WITH SUCH UNLAWFUL ACTS BY POLICE OFFICERS.

ALSO, PER THE APPELLATES' CURRENT "ACCESS OF LEGAL LIBRARY USE. THE APPELLATE SOUGHT TO GET A CLEAR, BETTER AND MORE EXPLANATORY DEFINITION OF THE WORD AND ACT OF "ENTRAPMENT".

ENTRAPMENT; IN (1899) I. A LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS' OR GOVERNMENT AGENTS' INDUCEMENT OF A PERSON TO COMMIT A CRIME, BY MEANS OF FRAUD OR UNDUE PERSUASION, IN AN ATTEMPT TO LATER BRING A CRIMINAL PROSECUTION AGAINST THAT PERSON. [CASE CRIMINAL LAW ~~37~~ 37.] (2.) THE AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE OF HAVING BEEN SO INDUCED. TO ESTABLISH ENTRAPMENT (IN MOST STATES), THE DEFENDANT MUST SHOW THAT HE OR SHE WOULD NOT HAVE COMMITTED THE CRIME BUT FOR THE FRAUD OR UNDUE PERSUASION. - ENTRAP, VB.

NOTE OF TOTALITY: BY ROLLIN M. PERKINS AND RONALD N. BOYCE, CRIMINAL LAW 1161 (3d. ED. 1982). STATES: ENTRAPMENT, SO CALLED, IS A RELATIVELY SIMPLE AND VERY DESIRABLE CONCEPT WHICH WAS UNFORTUNATELY MISNAMED, WITH SOME RESULTING CONFUSION. IT IS SOCIALLY DESIRABLE FOR CRIMINALS TO BE APPREHENDED AND BROUGHT TO JUSTICE. AND THERE IS NOTHING WHATEVER WRONG OR OUT OF PLACE IN SETTING TRAPS FOR THOSE BENT ON CRIME, PROVIDED THE TRAPS ARE NOT SO ARRANGED AS LIKELY TO RESULT IN OFFENSES BY PERSONS OTHER THAN THOSE WHO ARE READY TO COMMIT THEM.

WHAT THE STATE CANNOT TOLERATE IS HAVING  
CRIME INSTIGATED BY ITS OFFICERS WHO ARE  
CHARGED WITH A DUTY OF ENFORCING THE LAW...

THE APPELLATE HAS BEEN VICTIMIZED BY, OBJECTIVE  
ENTRAPMENT: ENTRAPMENT AS JUDGED BY FOCUSING ON  
EGREGIOUS LAW-ENFORCEMENT CONDUCT, NOT ON THE  
DEFENDANTS' ~~PRE~~-DISPOSITION. [CASES: CRIMINAL LAW  
~~§~~ 37(2.1)]. THIS, IS THE ISSUE BEFORE THE COURT.  
THIS, SHOULD BE THE FOCUS OF THE APPEAL, THIS IS WHAT  
WAS OBVIOUSLY STATED IN TOTALITY TO THE COURT AND TO  
THE JURY, THOUGH, NEVER EFFECTIVELY STATED TO THE  
"COURT NOR JURY", NOR EFFECTIVELY CONCLUDED IN THE  
"CLOSING ARGUMENTS" NOR DURING THE CONCLUSION OF THE  
"CROSS-EXAMINATION OF THE STATES WITNESSES". THOUGH,  
EVEN WHETHER THIS WAS EFFECTIVELY CONCLUDED BEFORE  
ALL MENTIONED. THE ACTS THAT I WILL BRING FORTH AS  
MAJOR ISSUES AND CRIMINAL VIOLATIONS BEFORE THE COURT  
BY THE TRIAL OR RECORDS STENOGRAPHER. WOULD'VE STILL  
RESULTED IN A VERDICT AGAINST THE APPELLATE.

IMPRETTION 1.) TAINTED JURY POOL - ALL JURORS EXCEPT FOR (1) OR (2)  
DAY 6-30-11. HAD TIES TO LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS IN SOME WAY  
OR ANOTHER OR WERE PREVIOUSLY EMPLOYED BY LAW ENFORCEMENT  
IN SOME WAY.

2.) TAMINATED TRIAL RECORDS - THE RECORDS THAT ARE SWORN BEFORE THE APPEALS COURT "IS NOT ACCURATE IN ITS CLAIM OF ACCURATELY REPORTED VERBATIM. IN FACT THE TESTIMONIES HAVE BEEN ALTERED AS I NOTED ON THE LEFT HAND MARGIN OF (PAGE # 10) OF THIS STATEMENT OF ADDITIONAL GROUNDS. AS THE APPELLATES TESTIMONY ON (PAGE# 370 - LINE 18.) OF WHERE THE STENOGRAPHER ALTERED THE TESTIMONY STATING THE APPELLATE CLAIMED WHEN "I LOOK BACK AND AM THINKING, HE IS GOING TO BACK INTO ME." THIS, IS VERY UNTRUE AND MISLEADING BEFORE ALL EYES WHO ARE DETERMINING THE APPELLATES FREEDOM. AS, THE APPELLATE IS VERY AWARE TO THE TESTIMONY HE PRESENTED AS WELL AS THE STATES WITNESSES. AS ALL PRE-PREPARED BRIEFS OF STATEMENTS OF ADDITIONAL GROUNDS. WERE WRITTEN AND PREPARED BEFORE THE TRIAL, 3.5, 3.6 HEARINGS AND BEFORE THE APPELLATE RECEIVED THE APPELLAT COURTS MAILED COPIES OR ANY COPIES OF THE TRANSCRIPTS, AS (LINE 17) IS TAMINATED ALSO.

THE APPELLATE ACTUALLY TESTIFIED TO THE FACT THAT AS HE PASSED THE OFFICER WHO WAS PARKED IN A DRIVEWAY HE ONLY NOTICED THE OFFICER BECAUSE THE OFFICER "TURNED OR FLICKED ON HIS DOME LIGHT", APPEARING TO BE READING OR DOING A REPORT. HE COULDN'T RECOGNIZE HIS FACE AS HE WAS TOO FAR AWAY AND ONLY INTERESTED IN HIS CONTINUED TRAVEL. AND AS WHEN HE PASSED THE OFFICER HE NOTICED THE OFFICER PULL OUT WITH HIS LIGHTS FLASHING AND A WHIRL WITH HIS SPEED.

AS WHEN HE HEARD THIS, HE LOOKED BACK AND SAW THE OFFICER APPEARING TO TRAVEL BACK TOWARDS THE MAIN INTERSECTION (I.E.) WHAT THEY'RE CALLING 54TH AVE. THOUGH ONCE THE OFFICER APPEARED TO GET CLOSE TO SEEMING AS IF THAT WAS HIS DIRECTION. THE OFFICER MADE A QUICK U-TURN AND ACCELERATED WITH WHAT SOUNDED IN APPEARANCE TO BE MAXIMUM SPEED BACK TOWARDS THE APPELLATE'S DIRECTION. THIS, WAS AFTER THE OFFICER ~~REMOVED~~ ALLOWED THE APPELLATE TO GET QUITE AWAYS DOWN THE BLOCK OR DESTINATION OF TRAVEL.

THE COURT MUST VIEW THIS AS TAINTED RECORD. AND MUST DISMISS THE CASE AGAINST THE APPELLATE. THE CLEARST FACT BEFORE THE COURT, IS, WHEN THE APPELLATE WAS SWORN BEFORE THE COURT AND ASKED TO STATE HIS NAME AND SPELL HIS NAME. THEY HAVE THE APPELLATE SPELLING HIS NAME WITH AN (S) IN HIS NAME, WHEN THERE'S NO (S) AND ONLY A (Z) IN HIS NAME. HOW, WOULD THE APPELLATE MISPELL HIS OWN NAME VERBALLY WHILE BEING SWORN BEFORE THE COURT? THIS IS ON (PAGE# 360) WHILE BEING CROSS-EXAMINED BY THE DEFENSE COUNSEL (E. BENJAMIN) ON (LINE 18). DOES THE COURT BELIEVE THAT THE APPELLATE DOESN'T KNOW HOW TO CORRECTLY STATE NOR SPELL HIS NAME? AS, EVEN ON LINES 22-23, THEY CONTINUE THIS ERROR WITHOUT STOPPING SHORT OF SUCH A PURGERISTIC ACT.

THE REST OF THE STATEMENTS HAVE BEEN ALTERED IN SPECIFIC PLACES THROUGHOUT THE TRANSCRIPT. INCLUDING THE APPELLATE'S SENTENCING SPEECH THAT'S BEEN PROVIDED TO THE COURT ALONG WITH THIS (SAG), AND THE TESTIMONY AND STATEMENTS MADE BY THE STATES WITNESSES HAVE BEEN ALTERED IN PLACES THAT SHOW FAVOR TO THE STATES WITNESSES. AS, THE STENOGRAPHER ALSO COMPLETELY REDACTED CRUCIAL TESTIMONY AND STATEMENTS OF THE STATES WITNESSES (I.E.) OFFICER HOBBS' STATEMENT OF TESTIMONY OF WHERE HE CLAIMED THAT HE OBSERVED THE APPELLATE "FROTHING AT THE MOUTH AS HE WAS YELLING." AND THE PROSECUTION'S QUESTIONS WERE REMOVED FROM THE RECORD THAT LED TO SUCH STATEMENTS. AS, OFFICER EUGLEY EVEN MADE STATEMENTS THAT CONTRADICTED HIS ORIGINAL TESTIMONIES OF HIS BELIEF THAT HE VIEWED THE APPELLATE'S BEHAVIOR AND COMMUNICATION TO HIM AS THOUGH THE APPELLATE MAY HAVE BEEN DISPLAYING SIGNS OF A MENTAL ILLNESS, OR UNDER SOME INFLUENCE OF INTOXICANT.

HE WAS LED INTO THOSE COMMENTS ON (PAGE# 48) OF THE QUESTION/ANSWER (3.5. 3.6 HEARING 9-7-10). AND IN OTHER TESTIMONY AS THE (9-7-10) IS WHAT LED TO THE OTHER COMMENTS BY OFFICER HOBBS AND EUGLEY.

THE APPELLATE AFFIRMS THAT EVEN HIS TESTIMONY WAS REDACTED. WHEN HE HAD TO TESTIFY AS TO EXPLAIN THE CONDITIONS OF THE BACK OF OFFICER EUGLEYS VEHICLE AS TO HIS MOUTH BEING DRY "THOUGH NOT FROTHING". AS, HE WAS TRYING TO EXPLAIN THE ILLEGAL ACTS OF EUGLEY TO HOBBS WHILE THEY WERE AT THE FRONT OF HOBBS' VEHICLE TOWARDS THE TRUNK OF EUGLEYS VEHICLE. AS THE BACK OF EUGLEYS CAR WAS HUMID AND LACKED PROPER VENTILLATION.

→ AND WOULD NOT (3.) ~~TAINTED PICTURES~~ - THE DATES TO WHEN THE NEW PICTURES

WERE TAKEN WAS NOT PLACED ON THE RECORD. AS THE PICTURES WERE TAKEN AS THE TRIAL WAS ALREADY IN PROGRESS. THIS WAS THE DEFENSES PROVIDING PER THEIR HIGHERED INVESTIGATOR JILL HALLEN. WHO NEVER TESTIFIED NOR PROVIDED ANY WRITTEN STATEMENTS AS TO SHOW DATES OF HER DUTIES OF INVESTIGATION.

(4.) LACK OF TESTIMONY - BY THE DEFENSES WITNESSES.

(5.) NO WRITTEN STATEMENTS OF THE DEFENSE WITNESSES.

(6.) NO ADDITION OF THE RECORD OF THE JURY POOL SELECTION -

APPELLATES (I.E.) (REMOVAL OF EVIDENCE). TAINT.

(7.) D.O.C COUNTY JAIL AND PRISON STAFFS' DIRECT INVOLVEMENT IN EVIDENCE

WITH THESE ACTS OF ESTOPLED INFLUENCES AS IN ALL (13)

DEFINITIONS OF THE CRIMINAL DEFINITIONS OF ESTOPE.

THE CASE BEFORE THE APPELLATE COURT IS ABSOLUTELY

IMPOSSIBLE TO AFFIRM THE CONVICTION OF THE APPELLATE.

TURN  
OVER

FROM PREVIOUS

PAGE

ISSUE

(8) OFFICER EUGLEY ALSO TESTIFIED TO THE APPELLATE BEING 270 LBS. IN WEIGHT AFTER VIEWING HES (I.D.), THIS IS ALSO NOT TRUE, JUST AS OFFICER EUGLEY'S STATING HE WANTED TO STOP THE APPELLATE FOR "TERRY" AND "SAFETY" REASONS. THE APPELLATE IS (265 LBS) ON HIS "DRIVERS LICENSE" AND THIS SHOWS THAT THE APPELLATE'S TESTIMONY OF "EUGLEY" THROWING HIS WALLET AND CONTENTS 10 FEET AWAY OR MORE, IS TRUE, AS HE ALSO STATED THAT "EUGLEY" NEVER LOOKED AT HIS BELONGINGS AND JUST BAGGED THEM. IT'S EASY TO BELIEVE AND FACT. THAT THE ONLY WAY EUGLEY GOT THE INFORMATION OF THE APPELLATE'S PREVIOUS WEIGHT FROM ALMOST (11 ~~MRS~~) AGO. WAS BY THE COUNTY JAZZS PAST BOOKING WEIGHT. AS THE APPELLATE'S WEIGHT HAS BEEN (235 LBS.) AND ABOVE SINCE THAT TIME. THE COURT SHOULD CHECK THE APPELLATE'S CURRENT AND VALID DRIVERS LICENSE THAT EXPIRES IN THE LAST MONTH OF (2011). IT WILL SHOW THAT THE APPELLATE IS (265 LBS.) IN WEIGHT. AND THAT EUGLEY'S EXCUSE OF "TERRY" WAS FALSE.

THIS CASE MUST BE DISMISSED.

IN LATER PAGES

SUPP. LAW FACTS:

BOOK TITLED

SEARCH AND SEIZURE FOURTH EDITION

PAGES 375 - LINES 457-459 AND 460-461

REG. CONSENT ELEMENTS

WESTLAW KEY 11.4(J) -

EXCLUSIONARY RULE

CASE # 41546-1-II

PAGES 315 AND 380 FRUIT OF THE POISONOUS TREE (PAGE #20)

A.) 1.) HARRASSMENT - § 1508 JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION - HARRASSMENT  
LINE (4.) PAGES (17 AND 18) OF (52). (PAGES (1) AND (2) CHAPTER (3) PER  
COPIED PAGES BY PIERCE CO. LAW LIBRARY. THIS IS STATED TO  
SHOW THAT I DONE MY RESEARCH AND COMPETENTLY KNOW WHAT  
THE JUDICIAL TEXT BOOK INTERPRITAZION OF HARRASSMENT IS  
AND WHAT ACTUALLY CONSTITUTES THE ELEMENT OF FELONY  
HARRASSMENT.

2.) POSSESSION / CONSTRUCTIVE POSSESSION DEFINITION(S).

SUPPORTED BY KEYS AND EXAMPLES. § 906. JUDICIAL INTERPRITAZION -  
WESTS KEY NUMBER DIGEST / DRUGS AND NARCOTICS 6665  
FROM OPENING TO [1], [2], [3], [4] TO [31] PAGES (1-4) SAME  
LAW LIBRARY SOURCE AS ABOVE PAGE (1.) CASE LAW: PG. (2), (3), (4).

3.) POSSESSION - DEFINITION - WIPIC 50.03 PAGES (1-5). THESE

PAGES GIVE CLEAR DETAIL OF PROXIMITY AS A MAJOR FACTOR  
AND WHAT HAS TO BE PROVEN TO CONSTITUTE A LAW VIOLAZION.

THESE ELEMENTS WERE NOT PROVEN IN ANY FORM IN THE ABOVE  
CASE. AS THE PHYSICAL EVIDENCE IS BASIC TRAIT OF CIRCUMSTANTIAL  
PHYSICALITY. (I.E.) "AS LONG AS DRUGS WERE PRODUCED THEN A CRIME  
WAS COMMITTED. SUPPORTED BY LACK OF FINGER PRINTS AND VIDEO  
AND LACK OF WORK ORDER OR TRUE AMOUNT OF SUBSTANCE (I.E.) 2 GRAMS  
OR 4 GRAMS."

4.) OBSTRUCTING A LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER - DEFINITION

9A. TC.020. PAGE (1-14) SAME SOURCE ON PREVIOUS PAGE. PAGE (1.)

BOTTOM PARAGRAPHICAL EXPLANATORY DEFINITIONS.

RE WRITE SECTION: SUPPORTING "VALIDITY FACTORS" BEGIN ON PAGE (4.) OF (14) THROUGH (5.), (6.), (7.), (8.), (9.), (10.) (12.) AND (13.) OF (14.) BEGINNING WITH (2.) "VALIDITY OF PRIOR LAW" (I.E.) CONSTITUTIONAL TEST EXIST OF CERTAINTY. STATE V. GRANT. NO SIMILARITY IN THIS CASE, JUST SHOWS THAT THERES AN EXISTANCE OF A CONSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGE AND THE CHALLENGE IS WHAT IS THE MAIN FOCUS BEFORE THE COURT. AS THIS, IS THE APPELLATES MAIN APPEAL MERITS. THAT LACK OF SOLID PROOF OTHER THAN "HEARSAY" AND THE OFFICERS TITLE AND JOB DUTIES BEING USED AS THE ONLY MEANS TO VALIDIFY HIS VERSION OF EVENTS. IS PREJUDICIAL AND BIASED AND WITHOUT CAUSE TO BE UPHOLD BY ANY JUDICIAL COURT. OPENLY VIOLATES SEVERAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS, MAINLY THE FOURTH AMENDMENT. THE COURT SHOULD MAKE SWIFT ITS DECISION OF RELIEF OF THE VERDICT BEFORE IT.

INCLUDING THE "OBSTRUCTION" CHARGE, AS THERE WASNT ANY CRIME OF OBSTRUCTION. THE ORDER TO "STOP FIVE POLICE" IS AUTHORIZED IN GRAMMAR. THOUGH, COERCIVELY ENTRAPPING-OBJECTIVELY IN ITS NATURE TO INTIMIDATE THE APPELLATE TO CONSENTUALLY NEGATE HIS FOURTH AMENDMENT PROTECTION AND WILLFULLY SUBMIT TO AN ILLEGAL SEARCH AND SEIZURE,

DUE TO INTIMIDATION BY AN ORDER THAT WOULD MAKE IT APPEAR AS THOUGH THE APPELLATE VIOLATED SOME FORM OF LAW. THIS IS A TEXT BOOK PSYCHOLOGICAL TACTIC BY LAW OFFICERS THAT THE COURT HAS RECOGNIZED FOR YEARS. THE FACT THAT EXISTS IS THAT ANY FORM OF LAW OFFICER OR ACTING LAW PERSON HAS TO NOTIFY A PERSON OF THE DETAILED NATURE OF THEIR REQUEST FOR A PERSON TO SUBMIT TO ANY FORM OF DETENTION (I.E.) TERRY.

SUPPORTED BY PAGE (6 OF 14) TITLED: ENFORCEMENT.

DANIEL V. STATE THROUGH WASHINGTON STATE PATROL (1983) 36 WASH. APP. 59, 671 P.2D 802. STATES ~~67~~ 79 THE STATE ~~PATROL~~ OFFICER YELLED "STOP AND IDENTIFY" WHICH IS A DIRECT AND LAWFUL ORDER BY TEXT BOOK OF COMMON SENSE AS TO THE OFFICER'S INTENT. (I.E.) WHICH WAS TO "INITIATE" A TERRY INVESTIGATION. THE PURPOSE: TO IDENTIFY NOT TO JUST COERCE A DETENTION OF ILLEGALITY (I.E) WITHOUT ANY LAWFUL MERIT. THIS, UNLAWFUL MERIT WAS WHAT OFFICER EUGLEY INTENDED BY HIS COERCIVELY INTIMIDATING ORDER TO JUST "STOP FREE POLICE". THOUGH, HIS REASON WAS STATED THOUGH NEVER TESTIFIED TO, AS BECAUSE HE FELT THE APPELLATE "LOOKED SUSPICIOUS".

(A.) WHY WOULDN'T HE TESTIFY TO SUCH A STATEMENT

WETHER THIS WAS A LAWFUL REASON TO ~~BETRAY~~ THE APPELLATE OR ACCUSE AND BRING FORTH CHARGES OF OBSTRUCTION?

BECAUSE LOOKING SUSPICIOUS ISN'T A LAWFUL REASON FOR A TERRY. AND -

BECAUSE HE KNEW HIS INTENT WAS NOT TO CONDUCT A TERRY INVESTIGATION. THE COURT MUST CONSIDER THE APPELLATE'S CURRENT DRIVERS LICENSE WHICH IS THE SAME LICENSE HE CARRIED AT THE TIME OF THE INCIDENT. BRADUA\*256 RD LOOK IT UP IN THE DEP. OF LICENSING HEIGHT, WEIGHT OF 265 LBS. NOT 220 LBS. AS EUGLEY TESTIFIED TO. MEANING THE TERRY WAS NEVER THE CASE EVEN WHEN THE APPELLATE WAS IN ~~THE~~ BACK OF THE VEHICLE. LOOK AT ALL THE TIME THAT WENT BY AND UPON BOOKING. THE APPELLATE'S NAME WAS NEVER KNOWN OR REVEALED AT ANY POINT DURING THE ENTIRE INCIDENT. THIS GIVES FACT THAT EUGLEY LIED ABOUT THE BOOKING EVENTS. AND RELIED ON BOOKING RECORDS NOT THE APPELLATE'S LICENSE / I.D. BECAUSE THE APPELLATE KNEW TO REMAIN SILENT AND ONLY TACTFULLY REVERSED THE OFFICER'S ACADEMY PSYCHOLOGY AGAINST HIM. "THIS" IS WHY EUGLEY INITIATED THE FALSE HARRASSMENT CHARGES. BECAUSE THE APPELLATE WAS IN HIS FACULTIES AND APPEARED TO EUGLEY AS A "WISBE GUY". SO, EUGLEY DECIDED TO GO BEYOND THE LAW AND BRING FORTH FALSE THREATS AS A WAY TO RETALZATE AGAINST THE APPELLATE FOR THE APPELLATE'S REFUSAL TO SELF INCRIMINATE "<sup>(FOR)</sup> OR HIS LACK OF COOPERATION. "(I.E.) HIS CHOICE TO USE HIS "RIGHT TO REMAIN SILENT"."

(B.) EUGLEY HAS (11 YRS.) ON THE FORCE. HE KNOWS HOW TO CONDUCT THE BASICS OF TEXT BOOK PROCEDURES. HIS STATEMENTS OF HIS INTENT TO ENGAGE THE APPELLATE IN A HARMLESS WAY IS NOT FACT. AS HIS INTENT

IS EXACTLY AS THE INTENT OF THE OFFICER "MORAN"  
 IN THE CASE OF (COURT OF APPEALS OF WASHINGTON  
 DIVISION 3 <sup>CITED AS:</sup> ALSO 96 WASH ~~APP~~ 219, 978 P. 2d 1131)  
STATE V. IVAN EARL BARNES NO. 16798-4-II

WHICH WAS TO JUST GENERALLY HARRASS THE APPELLATE  
 IN THIS CASE. AS BOTH OFFICERS IN THIS CASE  
 USED A NUMBER OF COMMON EXCUSES OF ILLEGALITY BEFORE  
 THE (TRIAL AND LOWER COURTS). THAT IN 90% OF THESE  
 INSTANCES ARE ACCEPTED AND PROCEEDED AGAINST THE  
 DEFENDANT AND APPELLATES IN MOST CASES. THOUGH,  
 ONCE BROUGHT BEFORE AN "IMPARTIAL AND COMPETENT APPEALS  
 COURT." IS NOT ACCEPTED AND USUALLY GETS "OVERTURNED/  
 REVERSED". JUST AS THE CASE AGAINST BARNES WAS AND  
 JUST AS THIS CASE SHOULD BE IN SWIFTHNESS.

UNITED

STATES V. WARREN PATRICK BANKS JR. CITES AS: (553 F. 3d 1101)

NO. 08-2511. THIS CASE, SUPPORTS THE ISSUE OF A LAWFUL  
 DETENTION THAT WAS TRULY INITIATED BY A REAL BULK  
 VIOLATION IN WHICH THE "CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS" ACTUALLY  
 ADOPTED AN ORDINANCE. ALSO, "THE MENTION OF THE VIOLATION"  
 WAS THE FIRST INTENT AS THE APPELLATE "STOPPED CONSENTUALLY".  
 THOUGH, WAS ALSO LAWFUL AND BY TEXT BOOK PROMPTED  
 THROUGH A PROPER "TERRY INVESTIGATION". EVERYTHING  
 "IN APPEARANCE" WAS TEXT BOOK AND RULED LAWFULLY AGAINST  
 THE APPELLATE. AS THE TERRY SERVED ITS INTENDED  
 PURPOSE. WHICH WAS TO INVESTIGATE FOR ANY OTHER  
 LAW VIOLATIONS, WHICH RESULTED IN THE FINDING OF A GUN.

THE MENTION OF THE HARRASSMENT IN TESTIMONY BY THE APPELLATE REGARDING THE PREVIOUS EVENING 10-17-09 IS WHAT BRINGS BOTH CASES IN TO VIEW IN TOTALITY. SHOWING TRUE COMPETENCY BY THE APPELLATE AND HOW HIS COMPLAINTS REGARDING 4TH, 5TH, 6TH, 8TH, AND 14TH AMENDMENT VIOLATIONS ARE A VALID POINT OF FACT. ESPECIALLY THE FACT OF REFUSED AND INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNCELL(S) IS MOST AND OBVIOUS. IN REGARDS TO THE COUNCELLS ALLOWING THE APPELLATE TO BE ABUSED BEFORE THE COURT. THE COURT ALLOWING AND PARTICIPATING IN SUCH ABUSES, (I.E.) UNNECESSARY PHYSICAL ASSAULTS CLAIMING FORCED REMOVAL FROM THE COURT. AND THE "COMPETENCY HEARINGS" THAT WERE NEVER AN ISSUE BEFORE THE COURT. AND ONLY MANIPULATED BEFORE THIS COURT DUE TO THE TACTICS THAT THE (6TH AMENDMENT) WAS ENACTED TO ELIMINATE, (I.E.) A RIGHT TO A FAIR AND SPEEDY TRIAL. DUE TO THIS RIGHT BEING OPENLY DISREGARDED WITHOUT FEAR OF CONSEQUENCE. ALLOWED A SIMULTANEOUS VIOLATION OF THE 8TH AND 14TH AMENDMENTS (I.E) CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT AND EQUAL PROTECTION OF LAW.

AS 10-17-09'S EVENTS WERE THE ACTUAL REASON THAT EUGLEY INTENDED HIS ILLEGAL SEIZURE OF THE APPELLATE. IN ESSENCE TO FINISH WHAT HE FELT THE OTHER OFFICERS "SHOULD BE \* DONE", WHICH WAS TO PULL OVER AND ARREST THE APPELLATE. EUGLEY DECIDED THAT HE WOULD DO THIS

BY ANY MEANS. WHY WILL THE COURT IGNORE THIS?

THE APPELLATE KNEW NOT TO CONSENT TO EUGLEY'S COERCION. BECAUSE OF THE NUMEROUS ANGLES THE COURTS HAVE USED TO FAULT THE APPELLATES AND DEFENDANTS WITH CONSENSUAL ENGAGEMENT OF AN ILLEGAL OR LEGAL ACT OF AN OFFICER. AS A PERSON IS TO FIND A LAWFUL MEANS TO NOT WILLFULLY CONSENT TO A DETENTION LEGAL OR ILLEGAL. THE APPELLATE ACTED IN COMPETENT AND LAWFUL MEANS AS TO PROTECT HIMSELF WITHOUT CONSENSUALLY REMOVING HIS PROTECTION OF HIS LEGAL RIGHTS, ESPECIALLY HIS FOURTH AMENDMENT. THIS CHALLENGE IS SUPPORTED BY BOTH CASES MENTIONED IN THE PREVIOUS PAGES. AS ALL CHALLENGES BROUGHT BY EACH APPELLANT TOTALED IN SUMMARY ON THESE GROUNDS.

(B.) IN THE BOOK TITLED "SEARCH AND SEIZURE FOURTH EDITION (6 SECTIONS 11.1 END TABLES INDEX THOMPSON WEST (A TREATISE ON THE FOURTH AMENDMENT) BY: WAYNE R. LAFAYE, WEST CRIMINAL PRACTICE SERIES.

1.) THIS BOOK SHOWS IN CLARITY HOW AND WHAT CONSTITUTES "FRUIT OF THE POISONOUS TREE."

2.) HOW THE OFFICER KNEW BY TEXT BOOK, ALONG WITH THE STATE PROSECUTOR TO MANIPULATE OTHER CHARGES UPON THE APPELLATE. BY CITING "CRIME COMMITTED IN RESPONSE TO AN ILLEGAL ARREST"

OR SEARCH AS FRUIT. THAT THE BOOK MENTIONED GIVES AN EXAMPLE OF CLEAR SITUATIONS THAT ARE COMMON OR EXISTS BEFORE COURTS. ON PAGES: (375) CH(11) § 11.4 (J.) (J.) ~~OPENING~~ SENTENCE TO LINES (457)<sup>458</sup> (58)<sup>459</sup> (59)<sup>460</sup> (60) AND (61). AND PAGE# (379) THAT SHOWS HOW REGARDLESS OF THIS CITING. CIRCUMSTANCES STILL REMAIN THAT ALLOW COURTS TO SUPPRESS AND DISMISS CASES WITH PREJUDICE LEGALLY. AS THE TOTALITY OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES SHOW THAT THIS NEW CRIME(S) WOULD NOT HAVE EXISTED, AND ONLY EXISTS BECAUSE OF THE INITIAL ILLEGAL SEARCH AND SEIZURE AND IS CONSIDERED "FRUIT" OF SUCH AN ACT EVEN OF AN ARREST.

3.) EXPLANATION OF CONSENT AS A MAJOR FACT OR ISSUE ONCE A PERSON COMMITS TO SUCH AN ACT. IS EXPLAINED IN DETAIL, IN THE BOOK TITLED: "SEARCH AND SEIZURE FOURTH EDITION" THOMPSONS WEST BY: SAME AUTHOR AS THE PREVIOUS BOOK MENTIONED. PAGE 315 CH. 11 § 11.4 (D.) BEGINNING PARAGRAPH "FRUIT OF THE POISONOUS TREE", OF LINE 255.

(C.) TO SUPPORT HOW POINTING OUT THE OFFICERS INTENT IS SOMETHING THE COURT MUST CONSIDER. AND TO SHOW HOW OFFICERS USE BASIC EXCUSES BEFORE THE COURT, AND HOW THE COURTS ACCEPTS SUCH EXCUSES. AND HOW ENACTING THE (RALJ 4.1, 4.2 ETC) OF THE APPELLATE, WOULD'VE GRANTED A BETTER CHANCE OF RELIEF OF SUCH

(PAGE#28)

MANIPULATIVE EXCUSES TO INFLUENCE COURTS TO PROCEED  
AND EXCUSE UNLAWFUL ACTS OF OFFICERS. THE BOOK TITLED:

"WARRANTLESS SEARCH LAW DESK BOOK" BY THE SAME AUTHOR  
MENTIONED IN THE PREVIOUS BOOKS ON THE PREVIOUS PAGES.

BEGINS ON PAGES (300-301) LINES 41-53 <sup>SUB</sup> TITLED:

"INVESTIGATORY SEIZURES § 11.4 MINNESOTA V. DICKERSON (41).<sup>LINE</sup>"

(D.) OTHER SUPPORTING REFERENCES: REGARDING, HOW THE  
(FOURTH AMENDMENT) SHOULD SERVICE "THE AVERAGE CITIZEN."  
AND HOW ITS EMPOWERMENT OF ITS DUTIES OF PROTECTIONS  
SHOULD BE HONORED. ARE SUPPORTED BY (KEYS) CITED DIRECTLY  
OUT OF "WASHINGTON DIGEST."

1.) P.] WASH P. 2d. - 192- C 9 (3.) WEST / WASHINGTON DIGEST  
VOL. 18 WASH. 1961 \* WASH 2d. 367, 92 A.L. R 2d. 559.

2.) DEFINITION #2

3.) WASH C 5 P. 189-18 WASH D 2d. - 189

4.) BENDER V. CITY OF SEATTLE, 664 P. 2d, 492, 99 WASH 2d. 582.

REGARDING THE QUOTED EXPLANATIONS AND DEFINITIONS  
OF SUMMARY FROM THE WASHINGTON DIGESTS INTENDED  
REFERENCES.

(E.) BOOK TITLED: WEST LAW 2009; SEARCH AND SEIZURE  
CHECKLIST BY SAME AUTHOR ON PREVIOUS PAGES: WAYNER. LAFAVE.  
~~THAT~~ SHOWS IN SUPPORT OF APPELLATES; "INSTANCES OF  
ENCOUNTERS BETWEEN OFFICERS AND CITIZENS." BEGINNING  
ON PAGES (60 AND 62). SUBTITLED: "SIGNIFICANCE":

WHEN A PERSON IS SEIZED, FOURTH AMENDMENT PROTECTIONS ARE INVOKED, BEGINNING ON SECTIONS (4), (5), (12) AND (13) OF EXAMPLES THAT SHOW DIFFERENT MIND SETS OF ENCOUNTERS AND HOW THE FOURTH AMENDMENT IS INVOKED. AS BY (#12) THREE EXAMPLES ARE SHOWN REGARDING (ENCOUNTERS) BETWEEN POLICE AND CITIZENS THAT ARE CONSIDERED PERMISSIBLE ONLY WHETHER A REASONABLE AMOUNT OF ARTICULABLE SUSPICION IS PRESENT OF CRIMINAL ACTIVITY.

1.) IN SECTION §(4.1) TITLED: "DEFINITION". THIS, GIVES EXAMPLE OF SITUATIONS WHERE THE FINAL WORDS OF ARREST ARE NOT USED DURING AN ARREST HOLDING A ~~PERSONS~~ FREEDOM TO LEAVE. EXAMPLES (#12) (#14) P. 100, 101, 102.

2.) CONCLUSION OF THE COURTS INTENT: WHEN REVIEW OF THE TOTALITY OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES ARE CONSIDERED, IT IS CLEAR AND APPARENT WHAT EXISTS BEFORE THE REVIEW ~~TOWARDS~~ THE VERDICT UPON THE DEFENDANT. OR GIVE A LIGHTER SENTENCE IN EXCEPTION RATHER THAN A STRIFER IMPOSITION. THE CASE BEFORE THE COURT IS NOT A CASE OF WHETHER DEFENDANT ~~COMMITTED THE CRIMES AS THE JURY HAS~~ INDICATED. IT IS CLEAR EVEN BY THE STATES CLOSING ARGUMENTS COMBINED WITH THE INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF ALL COUNSEL MEMBERS. INCLUDING THE PUBLIC DEFENSE (D.A.C) SUPERVISORS AND HIRED INVESTIGATORS. THAT THIS CASE WAS BASED

ON WHETHER THE DEFENDANT IN THIS MATTER HAD A PROBLEM WITH DEFIANCE OF AUTHORITY. RATHER THAN ANY OF THE CHARGES AGAINST HIM. THE ENTIRE ACTIONS OF ALL AGENCIES, INCLUDING THE JAIL STAFF AND JURY. PARTICIPATED IN A PUBLIC REVIEW OF HOW TO DETERMINE THE DEFENDANTS COOPERATION AND RESPECT FOR AUTHORITY. THEN DECIDED TO EMPLOY PRIMITIVE MEASURES IN ESSENCE OF DURESSIVE CONDUCT, THAT PROVED THE DEFENDANTS ATTENTION AND PERSON PHYSICALLY. INTO A BATTLE OF RELIEVING HIMSELF OF THE ABUSIVE MEASURES. THAT WERE BEING ~~EMPLOYED~~ TO TEST HIM. IN ESSENCE OF THE COMPLAINTS FILED TO CHALLENGE THE ISSUES POINTED OUT IN HIS MULTIPLE APPEAL(S). INCLUDING: KITES, GRIEVANCES AND COMPLAINTS AGAINST COUNSEL(S) AND JAIL STAFF. COMBINED WITH THE ACTS AND SUBJECT MATTER OF THE COMPLAINTS. SHOW AS INDISPUTABLE AS TO THE FACT THAT "THE DEFENDANTS CHARGES WERE NOT THE DOMINANT FACTOR" IN QUESTION. EVEN THE JUDICIAL ACTIONS AND TRIAL JUDGES COMMENTS DURING VERDICT AND PRELIMINARY HEARINGS SUPPORT THIS. INCLUDING THE VERBAL ORDERS TO "WESTERN STATE HOSPITAL", UNDER <sup>THE</sup> REUSE AND INAPPROPRIATE EXCUSE OF COMPETENCY. AS A MEANS TO "INFLUENCE" THE JUDGES; HOGAN AND LEE TO GRANT SUCH A REQUEST. A REVIEW OF AUDIO AND VIDEO VERBATIM IS NECESSARILY URGENT AND CRUCIAL. THIS, MUST BE IMPOSED BEFORE ALL REVIEW COMMITTEES. IN ORDER TO VIEW THE OUTRIGHT

EMOTIONS OF ALL PARTIES. INCLUDING COUNSEL; JUDGE COMMISSONERS AND JAZZ STAFF, TO SHOW HOW THE DEFENDANT BECAME AFFECTED AS THE ACTS AGAINST HIM ESCALATED IN SEVARITY. IN SHORT, ALL OF THE DEFENDANTS COURT ~~PROCEEDINGS~~ SHOULD BE REVZEUED, AS TO SHOW HOW BECAUSE OF THE DZRECT VZOLATZONS OF THE DEFENDANTS FOURTH AMENDMENT, WHICH, INITZATED THE CHARGES AGAINST HIM, LED TO 5TH, 6TH, 8TH, AND 14TH AMENOMENT VZOLATZONS. AS ALL PARTES INCLUDING THE JURY, PARTZZPATED IN DZSCRIMZNATELY MANIZPLATZNG THE DUE PROCESS AND EQUAL PROTECTZON OF LAW. WHICH, THE DEFENDANT SHOULD ALWAYS BE ENTITLED TO AS A CITIZEN OF THIS COUNTRY.

THIS FORM, WAS PREPARED IN LIGHT TO VACATE ~~AND~~ REVERSE THE VERDICT AGAINST THE DEFENDANT. BY ANY MEANS THE COURT SEES FIT UNDER ZTS REVIEW. RESPECTFULLY,  
MR. ALONZO, BRADLEY 11-6-10.

(3.) THIS ABOVE CONCLUSION WAS READ UPON SENTENCING IN ITS ENTZRETY. THOUGH, WAS NOT RECORDED CORRECTLY IN VERBATIM DUE TO TAZNT. THIS WAS READ IN NORMAL EVEN READING PRESENTATZON AND DOES NOT REFLECT ON THE RECD. REGAURDLESS OF THIS BEING THE REASON THE APPELATE GOT A REDUCED SENTENCE AS THE PROSECUTOR REQUESTED THE MAX AND EXTRA TZE AGAINST HIS TYPED MEMO REQUEST. AND THE JUDGE ~~MAINTAINED~~ THE PROSECUTOR ABOUT THE COMPLAZINT OF EXZESSZUENESS, THAT ~~THEY~~ FURTHER REQUEST FOR A HARSH SENTENCE

OR ACTS UPON THE APPELLATE WOULD RESULT IN AN OVERALL DISMISSAL OF THE STATE'S CHARGES. THIS ONLY SHOWS THAT ROOM FOR DISMISSAL WAS LEGAL AND SHOULD'VE BEEN RULED AS SUCH. THE RECORD DOES NOT REFLECT THIS.

(F.) IN SUMMARY, THE ENCOUNTER AND ILLEGAL ARREST WAS VERY MUCH BASED OFF (HEARSAY) WITHOUT ANY ARTICULATABLE SUSPICION OF A CRIME OR LAW VIOLATION ABLE TO BE SUPPORTED AS JUSTIFIABLE UNDER THE "TEST OF LAW AND FACT," WITHOUT ANY FORM OF "CITATION" THAT WOULD VERIFY AS PROOF OF THE OFFICERS MANY REASONS OF QUESTIONING IN REGARDS TO WHAT HIS MOTIVE TRUTHFULLY WAS AROUSED BY, PROMPTING HIM TO ENCOUNTER THE APPELLATE. IN SUCH A WAY, AS TO BASE HIS TOTAL ACTS OF ARREST UNDER "OBSTRUCTION". THEN THERE'S NO WAY TO FIND THAT THE APPELLATE OBSTRUCTED ANY TRAFFIC OR BIKE ORDINANCE OF THE STATE. AS, IT IS UNDISPUTABLE THAT THERE'S NO CLUE ADOPTED BY THE CITY OF FIFE AND THAT THE MANY INCONSISTANT EXPLANATIONS OF EVENTS THAT THE OFFICER GAVE. IN HOPES OF INCRIMINATING THE APPELLATE ARE WITHOUT MERIT AND CANNOT BE ACCEPTED AS BELIEVABLE. BEING THAT THE OFFICERS' REPORT HAS A LARGE DIFFERENCE IN THE REST OF HIS SWORN TESTIMONIES THAT ARE UNABLE TO BE OVERLOOKED, AND JUST SIMPLY IGNORED AND ACCEPTED AS BELIEVABLE DUE TO THE OFFICERS JOB TITLE AS THE ONLY MEANS OF RELIANCE.

THEN, AS THE APPELLATE ACTED LAWFULLY UNDER STATE V. VALENTINE AS CITED 132 WASH 2D, 1, 935 P. 2D, 12914 (1997) [13] IN RELIANCE, IN THE STATE V. BARNES CASE ON (PAGE# 6) [13]. IN THE APPELLATES CHOICE TO LAWFULLY AVOID ~~BEING~~ BEING ILLEGALLY SEIZED "DID NOT OBSTRUCT ANY FORM OF A POLICE OFFICER DISCHARGING HIS LAWFUL DUTIES". AS, OFFICER EUGLY KNEW HIS COERCIVE ACTS WERE SO OUTRAGEOUS AS TO SHOCK THE UNIVERSAL SENSE OF FAIRNESS, WHEN ALL HE HAD TO DO WAS "REQUEST" TO SEE THE APPELLATES DRIVERS LICENSE & IDENTIFICATION AND CONDUCT A CLEAN TERRY. WITH SUCH A SIMPLE REQUEST MADE TO THE APPELLATE AND WHETHER THE APPELLATE CHOSE TO WILLFULLY OR UNWILLFULLY COOPERATE WITH SUCH A REQUEST WOULD BE BEEN A CLEAN AND UNQUESTIONABLE ACT OF OBSTRUCTION, UNABLE TO BE ARGUED BY ANY DEFENSE. DUE TO THIS BEING A LAW FOR CITIZENS TO OBTAIN I.D AT AGE 14 IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON FOR THIS AND OTHER PURPOSES. THE OFFICERS MOTIVES BEHIND THE ENCOUNTER WAS NOT FOR ANY REASON MOTIVATED BY LAW, THOUGH WAS AND WITHOUT QUESTION ENTRAPPING IN ITS OBJECTIVENESS. WHICH IS EGREGIOUS IN NATURE AND CANNOT BE ACCEPTED AS JUSTIFIABLE. THE TRIAL COURT ERRORED IN NOT DISMISSING SUCH A CASE ALONG WITH ALL ITS FRUITS "INCLUDING" THE CHARGE OF "FELONY HARRASSMENT." AFTER THE OFFICERS FAILURE TO EVEN IDENTIFY THE APPELLATE ANYWHERE THROUGHOUT THE ARREST AND BOOKING REGARDLESS OF HAVING THE APPELLATES LICENSE IN HIS

POSSESSION FOR OVER (45 MIN. TO 1 HR.) AND HAVING A PARTNER AS BACK UP WITH THE APPELLATE IN CUFFS AND ARRESTED IN HIS VEHICLE. INSTEAD, THE OFFICER FREELY GAVE A FALSE TESTIMONY AS TO VIEWING THE APPELLATES LICENSE AND STATED A (45 LBS.) DIFFERENCE IN THE APPELLATES WEIGHT. AS HE CLAIMED THE APPELLATE WEIGHED 220 LBS. ON HIS LICENSE, WHEN THE APPELLATE WEIGHED 265 LBS. THE APPELLATE HAD NO WARRANTS NOR DID THE OFFICER, LAB TECHS OR DEFENSE TEST FOR FINGER PRINTS OF THE DRUGS THAT WERE PLANTED ON THE SCENE. THERE WAS NO PROOF OF WORK ORDERS) TO SHOW THAT THE RECORDING DASH AUDIO OR VIDEO WAS DAMAGED OR RECENTLY WORKED ON. NOR ANY FORCE USED AT ANYTIME DURING OR AFTER THE APPELLATE WAS CUFFED. THE APPELLATES STATEMENTS ALONE OF "YOU SET ME UP" AND "THEY'RE NOT GOING TO CHARGE ME FOR THIS". SHOWS THE GENERAL SHOCK OF THE APPELLATES UNIVERSEL SENSES. AND AS EVEN THE OFFICER STATED THIS, IS SHOW OF THE APPELLATES "MIND SET AS TO AVOID BEING CHARGED OR SELF INCRIMINATED BY ANY MEANS OF ANY CRIME." AND DUE TO THE HEAR SAY AGAIN BY THE OFFICER. ONLY IS INCRIMINATED BY THE OFFICERS STATEMENT. WITH THE OFFICERS PROOF BEING ONLY HIS JOB TITLE AS THE PROOF OF MERIT. THIS IS UNLAWFUL AND "HEAR SAY" AND CANNOT BE ACCEPTED WITHOUT MORE AS PROOF. WITH, WHAT HAS BEEN CURRENTLY ACCEPTED AS THE APPROACH

CASE# 41540-1- II

(PAGE# 35)

THE TRIAL COURT HAS ALLOWED BEFORE A JURY. THE APPELLATE IS SUBJECT TO BEING REPEATEDLY PLACED IN SITUATIONS AS THIS. AS THIS SITUATION IS "TEXT BOOK" IN THE VIOLATIONS THAT <sup>WERE</sup> COMMITTED BY THE OFFICERS, STATE JURY AND COURT OF TRIAL AND THE OTHER LOWER COURTS, UNDER HEARSAY ACCUSATIONS THAT WERE NOT DISMISSED AS THE LAW REQUIRES. AND SHOULD BE DISMISSED ~~BY~~ THE COURT UNDER THIS REVIEW.

RESPECTFULLY,

MR. ALONZO BRADLEY

7-26-11

Alonzo Bradley,

I have received a kite from you stating that you were "doubled sanctioned". You state that you your visiting loss time as well as all other sanction should be removed. You also state "I've served 30 days in isolation as punishment. Anything else is cruel and excessive."

Your time in 3 South (isolation) is based on your classification which is based on your overall behavior. This classification determines your security level which determines you housing assignment. Classification is not a punishment.

The sanctions for visiting, commissary, etc. are sanctions for individual incidents based on written reports by staff. Sanctions are punishments for infractions to the rules of the Pierce County Jail. These sanctions, when administered, run consecutively to other like sanctions from different written reports. You visiting loss is the result of three separate incidents where at least one of the punishments was for visitation loss. All of these sanctions were approved by a Sergeant.

I have reviewed your Behavior Management file and saw that since 11/5 you have not had any negative reports and have been reclassified to a level 2 and moved from 3 South to 3 West. Based on this, here is what I will do. I will suspend the visiting sanction so that you may have visiting on Friday 12/3. This week of visiting loss is only suspended until you leave this facility. If I receive any reports from any of my Court Deputies that you have caused any kind of disturbance while in their custody I will add this week to whatever other sanctions imposed.

Sgt Heishman

Court Escort Supervisor



Pierce County Detention and Corrections Center  
Requested Disciplinary Hearing

Booking Number: 2009291062

Report ID: 3466698

Inmate Name: BRADLEY, SR, ALONZO LAMAR

Location: 3WB 4

Appeal Type: LVL1

KITE received by 99-030 PIHL on Oct 02, 2010 07:00

Prisoner's

Statement: You said that you were upholding your right to peacefully protest, by refusing to lockdown, to gain someone's attention about your property situation. You admit that you were not following the rules and ignored a direct order to lockdown. You said that you did not do anything to deserved to be reclassified from a level 4 to a 3 and that you wanted to appeal that as well.

Committee

Findings:

In response to your reclass to level 3 the sequence of events happened so close to your reclass to level 2 that we are reviewing them as one incident. We find you guilty of refusing a direct order and causing a disturbance during lockdown. You will remain a level 2 until your next review date 10/15/10. At that time you may return to level 3 for 15 days provided you have no further write ups. We explained to you about how to handle your property situation by using the kite and grievance system. C/D Journey will be forwarding a response and grievance form for you to fill out about your property.

NOTE: THE DEFENDANTS EVIDENCE WAS REMOVED BY FORCE BY THE JAIL STAFF, WHICH THE DEFENDANT HAD NUMEROUS WRITTEN FORMS OF COMPLAINTS, I.E THE UNDERLINED SUGGESTIONS REPORTED AS COMPLAINTS FINDINGS.

WHICH WOULD'VE SHOWN THE RESPONSE HE RECEIVED BY THE AUTHORITATIVE STAFF IN ORDER TO GET HIM AWAY FROM THE ABUSE HE HAS RECEIVED. WHICH WOULD'VE SHOWN THAT

Committee Decision: GUILTY

Special Recommendations:

Committee Officers

Officer Number

Officer Name

94-065

JOURNEY

THEY WOULD'VE BEEN ABLE TO RECOVER FROM THESE ABUSIVE REALITIES THAT HAVE PLACED AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL VERDICT UPON HIM. THIS IS NOT HOW WE SHOULD BE DEALING WITH OUR PRISONERS. AS TO LIMIT HIS ACCESS TO MORE AND REVIEW BOARD OR COMMITTEE EVEN INDIVIDUALLY.

43.99

7.5  
3  
3.25

.50

1.15 (1)  
 1.20 (1)  
 2.00 (1)  
 1.10 (1)  
 1.09 (1)  
 0.54  
 3.50 (5)  
 3.00 (5)  
 3.00 (5)  
 7.00  
 3.75 (4)  
 3.75 (3)  
 2.25 (3)  
 29.40  
 2.00 (4)  
 1.10 (1)  
 32.80  
 4.20 (1)  
 36.00  
 11.37 (1)  
 37.97  
 1.25 (5)  
 .56 (1)  
 39.78

TOTAL ITEMS

6  
 5  
 12  
 8  
 9  
 1  
 51 ITEMS

1.20  
 x 4  
 4.80

2.00  
 1.47  
 3.47

1.50  
 .50  
 2.00

27.19  
 27.18  
 4.29

h. B



**OFFENDER COMPLAINT**

**CHECK ONE:**  Initial Grievance     Emergency Grievance     Appeal to Next Level

**RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES:** Send all completed copies of this form to the Grievance Coordinator. Explain what happened, when, where, and who was involved or which policy/procedure is being grieved. Be as brief as possible, but include the necessary facts. A formal grievance begins on the date the typed grievance forms are signed by the Coordinator. Contact staff to report an emergency situation or to initiate an emergency grievance. Please attempt to resolve all complaints through appropriate staff before initiating a grievance.

**NOTE:** Complaints must be filed within 20 days of the incident. Appeals must be filed within 5 days of receiving the response. Include log ID # of response being appealed.

Name: Last <b>BRADLEY</b>	First <b>ALONZO</b>	Middle	DOC Number <b>718082</b>
Program Assignment	Work Hours	Facility/Office <b>WSP</b>	Unit/Cell <b>HOSPITAL E-10</b>
<b>COMMUNITY SUPERVISION:</b> Send all completed copies of this form directly to: Grievance Program Specialist, Offender Grievance Program, Department of Corrections, P.O. Box 41129, Olympia WA 98504-1129.			
MAILING ADDRESS: STREET OR P.O. BOX	CITY, STATE	ZIP CODE	TELEPHONE NUMBER

**I WANT TO GRIEVE:** NOT BEING GIVEN MY LEGAL WORK. THIS IS AN ON GOING SITUATION THAT WAS SUPPOSE TO BE REMEDIED BY JOANN, IRWEN. SHE HAS NOT ANSWERED NONE OF MY NUMEROUS REQUESTS TO RETURN ~~MY~~ LEGAL WORK BY TRACKING IT THROUGH THE PROPERTY ROOM. PLEASE, RETURN MY LEGAL WORK I'M IN GREAT RISK OF MISSING ANOTHER COURT DATE. I'VE ALREADY MISSED MY 4-11-11 COURT DATE REG. MY CHILD. I NEED TO SEND STUFF TO MY MY ATTORNEYS CRIMINAL AND CIVIL. AND HAVE BEEN WHAT I FEEL DELIBERATELY INTIMIDATED OUT OF MY LEGAL RIGHTS BY PHYSICAL FORCE!


**SUGGESTED REMEDY:**  
IS TO HAVE MY LEGAL PROPERTY RETURNED TO ME IMMEDIATELY. AS THIS SITUATION HAS NOT BEEN REMEDIED AS INDICATED BY L. YOUNG THE GRIEVANCE COORDINATOR AT WSP. I HAVE NOT EVEN BEEN GIVEN LEGAL CALLS AS I'VE REQUESTED DIRECTLY TO MS. IRWEN AS SHE STATED SHE WOULD

Mandatory Signature: MR. ALONZO BRADLEY  
Signature: (2) WKS. ABO AND  
Date: 5-9-11  
COUNTING!

<b>GRIEVANCE COORDINATOR'S RESPONSE</b> Your complaint is being returned because: <input type="checkbox"/> It is not a grievable issue. <input type="checkbox"/> You requested to withdraw the complaint. <input type="checkbox"/> You failed to respond to callout sheet on _____ <input type="checkbox"/> The formal grievance/appeal paperwork is being prepared.	Location Code <b>WSP-E01</b>	Date Received <b>5-9-11</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> The complaint was resolved informally. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Additional information and/or rewriting is needed. (See below.) Return within five (5) days or by: Due Date: <u>5/16/11</u> <input type="checkbox"/> No rewrite received. Date: _____	

**EXPLANATION:** you can rewrite your claimed legal call issue with Ms. Irwin. No legal property issues will be accepted, as you have filed numerous complaints (#1106942 + #1106943). you failed to follow directives and

INITIAL COMPLAINT OBTS INFORMATION						DATE OF RESPONSE	COORDINATOR'S SIGNATURE
TYPE	CATEGORY	AREA	SPEC	REMEDY	RESOLUTION		
01	08	515	345	08	08	5/9/11	L. Young



***All legal materials can be obtained through your attorney or the use of the law computer (scheduled through the law library). All forms and sentencing guidelines must come from your attorney.***

Tank 3-S-61

Date 11-4-10

TO: LAW LIBRARY

Message: CAN YOU PLEASE SIGN ME UP  
FOR LAW LIBRARY. AND CAN YOU PLEASE  
SIGN ME UP FOR THE NEXT SESSION? I  
WAS NOT GIVEN ACCESS YESTERDAY 11-3-10.  
LIKE WAS SCHEDULED. NO MATTER. IT'S  
IMPORTANT IF YOU CAN RE-SCHEDULE 10-5:10  
OR AS SOON AS YOU CAN. PLEASE STATE WHAT  
SO I CAN LOOK UP LE. BE INCLUDED I.E.

POSSESSION OF CONTROLLED  
NO KITES ACCEPTED  
AFTER 6:00 A.M. SUBSTANCE. MR. A. BRADLEY  
(Print Name)

Z-776

Sorry, but I brought the  
Computer by for you & was informed  
you were at court. I am booked  
until the 19<sup>th</sup>. I will put in for  
that date. If it is unneeded  
please let me know.

# Law Computer Schedule Notification

Date: 11-5 Location: 3S-C4

Inmate Name: Bradley, Alonzo

Use Date:

Time:

Use Date:	Time:
<u>11-19</u>	<u>@ 11-1 pm</u>
_____	@ _____
_____	@ _____
_____	@ _____
_____	@ _____
_____	@ _____
_____	@ _____
_____	@ _____
_____	@ _____
_____	@ _____
_____	@ _____
_____	@ _____
_____	@ _____
_____	@ _____
_____	@ _____

Tank 3-5-C-4

Date 11-7-10

TO: UNIT SGT, DUTY SGT.

Message: I'D LIKE TO GRIEVE  
BEING HARASSED, I

SHOULD NOT HAVE TO GO

INTO MORE DETAIL THAN

THIS, THAT'S WHY A

RELEASE LETTER, IF

IM DENIED AS OF 11-7-10

5:AM IT WILL BE AGAINST

THE PROCESS. MR. A. GRULLY

NO KITES ACCEPTED  
AFTER 6:00 A.M.

(Print Name) Z-776



I/M Bradley thank  
you for you thoughts  
but the ~~JMBT~~ jail has  
procedures, no matter  
who agrees. Explain  
your situation in a write.

2yt. Alexander  
11-8-10