

No. 45130-1-II

COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

DIVISION

ERICKSON LOGGING, INC.,

Respondent

Vs.

NATACHA SESKO, a single person, and the SESKO FAMILY TRUST,

Hsiao-Ming Ho, Trustee.

Appellants,

45130-1-II

FILED
COURT OF APPEALS
2011 JUN 13 PM 2:03
STATE OF WASHINGTON
BY LIBERTY

On Appeal from the Kitsap County Superior Court

Cause No 13-2-00616-4

Before the Honorable Jennifer Forbes

BRIEF OF APPELLANTS

Natacha Sesko Pro Se

3536 Arsenal Way

Bremerton WA 98312

(360) -649-4634

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

A. ASSIGNMENTS OF ERROR

1A

B. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

2

Sesko Request a Motion for Reconsideration.

8

9

C. ARGUMENT.

1. The Superior Court erred when it denied Ms. Sesko's Response in Opposition to Motion for Writ of Attachment. The Court failed to make finding of fact signature Exhibit A and C) that the Ms. Sesko's situation does not meet any of the grounds of the RCW 6.25.030

9

2. The Superior Court erred when it failed to enter in its findings of fact and Conclusions of law. Half of Sesko family Trust fund preceded from William Sesko estate, therefor Exempt from Seizure RCW 6.32.250, Rule 52. (b)

11

3 Did the Superior Court err when it became aware that Natacha Sesko was the subject of an pending Guardianship action placing her competency at issue by permitting respondent's summary judgment motion to go forward, without making Ms. Sesko's guardian Ad Litem a party to the summary judgment proceedings. June 7th 2013 (VRP Page 10 line 16-17, 22-25)

12

4. The Superior Court erred when it learned that English is the Ms. Sesko's second language, but precedes the trial without giving Ms. Sesko any opportunity to understand the question raised in trial before granting request for Chinese interpreter

13

5. The Superior Court erred in not finding access to the two most valuable five acre old growth parcels which are unaffected by any injunction before ordering the Writ. (CP36 Exhibit 3),(Mr. Nettleton Declaration Re: Electronic

15

6. The Superior Court erred in its order granting Summary Judgment an inequitable remedy without consideration that Erickson Logging has extreme "Unclean hands by granting an overbroad and oppressive blanket Writ of Attachment

16

7. The Superior Court erred and abused its discretion by not finding facts regarding the value of the timber and the land separately.

18

8. The Superior Court erred in not disciplining the opposing counsel for contempt for threatening criminal accusations to openly humiliate and prejudice the substantive rights out of pro se/defendant in the civil matter.(April 5 and June 7 2013 Hearing)

19

D. CONCLUSION

20

TABLE OF AUTHOURITIES

Page

Table of Cases.

<u>Snohomish County v. Rugg</u> , 115 Wash. APP 1012, 2008 WL 458617 (Div. 1 2002)	5
RAP 2.5 (a) 5. <u>O' Toole v. Faulkner</u> , 29 Wash. 544, 70 P. 58 (1902)	10
<u>RCW 6.32.250 (2)</u>	11
<u>RCW.6.32.250</u> ; (42 Wash.2d 234, 254 p.2d 732)	12
<u>Market operating Corporation v. Ernst Crull et al</u> .165 Wash. 306, 5 P.2d 340 (1931) Rem.Comp.Stat., s. 1125.	13
<u>RAP 2.5(a) 2</u>	13
<u>RCW 2.43.010</u>	14
<u>John Harper, Lana Kudina v. Coldwell Banker Barbra Sue Seal</u> 2007 WL 4303513 (Wash.App.Div.2) Unpublished Opinion	14
<u>Neuson v. Macy's Dept. Stores Inc.</u> , 160 Wash. App. 786 , 249 P.3d 1054,24 <u>A.D. Cas.(BNA) 1276 (Div.3 2011) review denied</u> , <u>172 Wash. 2d 1005, 257 P. 3e</u> <u>666(2011)</u>	14 15
<u>McNabb v. Department of Corrections</u> . 163 Wash.2d 393,180 P.3d 1257,1260 (2008)	16
<u>Oltman v Holland America Line USA, Inc.</u> , 163 Wash. 2d 236, 178 P. 3d 981, 987 (2008) Grant of summary judgment is reviewed de novo	18

A. ASSIGNMENTS OF ERROR

1. The Superior Court erred when it denied Ms. Sesko's Response in opposition to motion for writ of attachment. (CP 11)
2. The Superior Court erred in adopting the plaintiffs findings of fact by failing to acknowledge that the half of the Sesko Family Trust funds is exempt from Seizure RCW 6.32.250 Trust property exempt from Seizure. (CP2 Verified Complaint exhibit G. Sesko Family Trust Quit Claim Deed)
3. The Superior Court erred when it became aware that Ms. Sesko was subject of a pending guardianship action placing her competency at issue. The Court should have delayed the proceeding until the Guardian Ad Litem could participate before making the rulings. (June 7th 2013 Hearing)
4. The Superior Court erred when it denied Ms. Sesko's Declaration of Prejudice. The Court was bias knowing Ms. Sesko had a language problem, by proceeding trial.(June7 hearing) .
5. The Superior Court erred when it declared that Ms. Sesko does not have right to provide access to Erickson Logging for purpose of timber harvest. Without finding the fact that two five acre parcels access was established since 1978.
6. The Superior Court erred in its order granting Summary Judgment an inequitable remedy without reasonable consideration that Erickson Logging has extreme "Unclean hands" and granting an overbroad and oppressive blanket Writ of Attachment clouding all titles.
7. The Superior Court erred and abused its discretion by not finding facts regarding the value of the timber and land separately.
8. The Superior Court erred in not disciplining the opposing counsel for contempt for threatening criminal accusations to openly humiliate, intimidate and prejudice the substantive rights of a.pro se / defendant in the civil matter.
(April 5 and June 7 2013 Hearing)

Issue Pertaining to Assignment of Error

1. Did the trial court in finding Ms. Natacha Sesko meet the requirement of RCW 6.25.030. Writ of Attachment?.

2. Did the Superior Court err in not finding the Sesko Family Trust exempt from seizure in that half of the trust funds belong to William Sesko and Exempt Source. RCW 6.32.250

3. Did the Superior Court err when it became aware that Natacha Sesko was the subject of an pending Guardianship action placing her competency at issue by permitting respondent's summary judgment motion to go forward, without making Appellant's Guardian Ad Litem a party to the summary judgment proceedings... June 7th 2013 (VRP Page 10 line 16-17, 22-25)

4. Did the Superior court err when it entered "Order for Writ of Attachment' after finding that Ms. Sesko has Language Comprehension trouble, did not understand the content of court proceeding and received the fair trial without a Chinese. Interpreter (April 5th 2013 Trial) RAP 2.5(a).

5. Did the Superior Court err when declared Ms. Sesko does not have right to provide access to Erickson Logging for purpose of timber harvest, despite the existence of known access. June 7th 2013 Hearing (VRP Page 23, Line 11 and 22-25).

6. Did the Superior Court err in an order granting summary judgment without reasonable consideration of Erickson Logging's "unclean hands" for false and deceptive facts they presented (CP 36)

7. The Superior Court err and abused its discretion by not finding facts regarding the value of the timber and land separately.

8. The Superior Court erred in not disciplining the opposing counsel for contempt for making threatening criminal accusation to openly humiliate and prejudice the Pro Se / defendant in the civil matter.

B. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

In mid of July 2012. Erickson logging company with knowledge that
1. Ms. Sesko was in the process of law suit regarding a part of the access

over the adjoin Mr. Lindstrom. 2. had a logging contract with Manke's Lumber Company on 20.13 acres (Parcel Number 24250120021004) and 40.17 acres (Parcel Number 242500120011005) total 60.3 acres of property
3. Erickson verbally agreed to take over the contract (CP 36 Motion for Reconsideration Exhibit 1) and they will start logging no later than August 4th 2013. Erickson also told Ms. Sesko that he sold his 20 acres right next to Ms. Sesko's 20 acres to Mr. Lindstrom previously, therefore he knew the area and Mr. Lindstrom very well has no problem to negotiate with

On July 25,2012, Ms. Sesko agreed to add two 5.04 acres never harvest before the old growth property (Parcel Number 24250120061000) and (Parcel Number 24250120071009) which the Sesko Family Trust has legal access to adjacent to the 40 and 20 acres property.

Erickson then modified the contract to start logging no later than August 15,2013 (CP36 Motion for Reconsideration Exhibit 2) Ms. Sesko forwarded the Deed of legal access from the Kitsap County Public Works Engineering Division. File # 71845 to Erickson Logging (CP 36 Motion for Reconsideration Exhibit 3) also on (CP 3 Mr. Nettleton's Motion and Declaration for Writ of Attachment Exhibit A) the Legal easement that lead to two 5 acres property that are adjacent to 20 and 40 acres.

On July 31st 2012 Erickson Logging extend the starting harvest date from August 15th to August 20th and offer Advance Stumpage verbally to Ms. Sesko (CP36 Motion for Reconsideration Exhibit 4 Contract)

On August 13th 2012, Ms. Sesko told Erickson Logging that **Judge Dixon granted Lindstrom access injunction** (Kitsap County Superior Court Case No. 11-2-00527-7) The Attorney handle the easement case advise Ms. Sesko to notified Erickson to hold on not to go in 20.13 acres (Parcel Number 24250120021004) and 40.17 acres (Parcel Number 242500120011005 (CP36 Motion for Reconsideration Exhibit 5)

On August 14th, 2012. Erickson knew the Injunction, assumed the risk, and still offer advance stumpage \$160,000 to exchange the extension harvest date until November 2012. with no need to payback until after harvest to avoid double tax charges (CP 36 Motion for Reconsideration Exhibit 6).

In December 2012, Sesko family had meeting where Family Attorney informed Natacha that She did not have the authority to sign the logging contract, only the trustee Hsiao Ming Ho of the Sesko Family Trust can sign the contract.

On January 2013, on behalf of Ms. Sesko, family attorney informed the Erickson Logging that Ms. Sesko did not know she does not have the authority to sign the logging contract with them but Natacha and Trustee of

the Sesko Family Trust will still honor the original logging contract with Erickson Logging.

On February 2013 the logger told Ms. Sesko they can advance additional \$2500, but the Trustee Hsiao-Ming Ho has to sign the note, The Trustee Hsiao-Ming Ho had a stroke and was in bed at that time, the Trustee Hsiao-Ming Ho never signed the note for Ms. Sesko, He was also advised by his attorney do not sign any advance money with Erickson Logging for Ms. Sesko, Natacha. So, no more advance money has been paid since.

Court Action For Writ of Attachment

On March 17th 2013 the Writ of Attachment was filed by Erickson Logging, for any property, held by Natacha Sesko and the Hsiao-Ming Ho, Trustee of the Sesko Family Trust, .is seized. (CP 25)

Citing as fraud a deed to Tanya and Rick Mahanoy daughter and husband filed April 2012 for a pre-existing loan. The only issue of alleged fraud supporting the writ was done one year prior to any dealings with Erickson Logging. (CP 3 Exhibit E)

Snohomish County v. Rugg 115 Wash. App 1012, 2008 WL 458617 (Div. 1 2002) Erickson's affidavit submitted in support of, or in response to, motion for summary judgment does not raise a genuine issue of fact.

On March 27 2013 the Petition for Guardianship of the Estate was filed by Ms. Sesko's daughters. Case No 13 4 00234 4 in Superior Court for Kitsap County.

On April 4 2013 Ms. Sesko served and filed Appearance Pro Se. And Response in Opposition to Motion for Writ of Attachment (CP. 11)

On April 5th 2013 Hearing (VRP Page 4 Line 3-6) Mr. Nettleton (Erickson Logging attorney) stated: " The response contains numerous references to hearsay, in particular page 1, lines 14through--, 16,-- of what an unidentified attorney told Ms. Sesko. I would just ask that as the order is entered.'

(VRP Page 11 line 6-15) However, Ms. Sesko also stated: "all of this statute in here I do not fit into any of this category. So that's why I think the motion of writ of attachment should be striking It should be denied....."

Ms. Sesko's statement here clearly not a hearsay

On April 5 2013 Hearing (VRP page 8 line 12-15)

Ms. Sesko stated:" English is my second language. Actually, I can't quite understand what he's trying to tell me. I wrote a written response to the Judge and submit in the court"

The Court ignore these facts and continued with the proceeding.

On April 5th the court ordered Directing Issuance of writ of Attachment of Defendant's property.

On April 29 2013 Ms. Sesko served and filed their Answer (CP 17)

On May 17 2013 Mr. Nettleton file the Writ of Attachment in court. (CP 25)

On June 5, 2013 Affidavit of Prejudice *AMLaury and request Judge from Outside of Kitsap was filed. (CP 28)

On June 6, 2013 Affidavit of Prejudice Judge Jennifer Forbes was filed along with the declaration of mailing (CP 30)

Ms. Sesko believes she can never secure a fair and impartial trial with Judge Jennifer Forbes of any matter due to the relationship she has with the Bremerton Mayor Lent. who's Lent's Oil Inc. owns the toxic waste pipe crossing Ms. Sesko's property at the Superfund site. (CP 30 Exhibit

1) Ms. Sesko requested the Court recuse herself and rescind her order

On June 7th 2013 Hearing through the translator the court stated that she has no concerns about her continuing to hear this case. VRP page 9 line 10-13)

The Court stated: "I note that I've made a prior ruling in this case and Ms. Sesko expressed no objections at that time" The interpreter stated: "I'm sorry, your honor, can you repeat that please?" On the April 5 2013 hearing (VRP page 16 line 15-17) The Court stated: "I haven't had anything to indicate to me that you have any comprehension troubles up until right now" **The Court acknowledged that Ms. Sesko had language comprehension trouble even the Court agreed herself but still expect Ms. Sesko to express any objection when Ms. Sesko was confused on the hearing.**

On June 7th 2013 Hearing the translator has repeated requested the court thirteen times to repeat the questions or statement during the entire court proceeding. (VRP Page 23 Line 17-25) The court: “Ms. Sesko does not have the right to provide access to Erikson Logging for purposes of timber harvest.” The Court granted the motion for summary judgment based on false finding

On June 7th 2013 The Court Order denying motion/petition Order Granting Summary Judgment.

On June 21 2013 Order Denying Motion to Reconsider

On June 17 2013. Appellant file Motion for Reconsideration request the Court to rescind her order and recues herself

Sesko Request a Motion for Reconsideration

On June 17 2013 Ms. Sesko request a motion for reconsideration (CP 36) which was denied (CP 37)

Ms. Sesko provided all the legal access to the two five acres property adjacent the 20 and 40 acres own by the Sesko Family Trust, from the Kitsap County Public Works Engineering Division and the Judge failed to review the fact (CP 3 Exhibit 3 Judgment No.71845 Counter Claim Case No. 112005277 Defendants Exhibit 2 Map to two five acre parcels C and

D) Mr. Nettleton even presented the same document to the Superior Court and the question is Why the Judge did not question Erickson Logger for not proceeding with the harvesting action.

Erickson Logging knew of the injunction but still offer Advance Stumpage to change the extension harvest date till November 2012

Judge Forbes entered an order for continuance is Ms. Sesko's guardianship case No 134002344 and setting the hearing date on May 10th 2013, which is less than one month before the June 7 2013 hearing in the Erickson case which Judge Forbes stated that she knew nothing about (CP36 Exhibit 9) This Court should rescind her order as premature.

C. ARGUMENT

1. **The Superior Court erred when it denied Ms. Sesko's Response in Opposition to Motion for Writ of Attachment. The Court has failed to make finding of fact that Ms. Sesko's situation does not meet any of the grounds of the RCW 6.25.030.**

At the time of the first hearing Ms. Sesko submitted the response in opposition to motion for Writ of Attachment based on the fact that all grounds on the issuance of Writ of Attachment have not been meet in Ms. Sesko's situation.(CP 11.)

1, Ms. Sesko is not a foreigner. 2. Is a Naturalized US citizen.3.

Never conceals herself ordinary process of law can't be served upon her. 4
has not absconded or absented herself from her usual place of abode in
this state.5. Has not removed or is about to remove any of her property
from this State, with intent to delay or defraud her creditors.6. has not
assigned, secreted, or disposed of , or is not about to assign, secrete, or
dispose of, any of her property, 7 is not about to convert her property or a
part thereof, into money for the purpose of placing it beyond the reach of
her creditors.8. Has not been guilty of an intentional fraud incurring the
obligation for which the action is brought: or 9. The damages for which
the action is brought are not for injuries arising from the commission of
some felony, gross misdemeanor, or misdemeanor; or 10.that the object
for which the action is brought to recover on valid contract, express or
implied.

Natacha Sesko did not know that she couldn't make a contract. (Ignorance
is not a fraud or an intentional crime.)

The Court decisions conflict with the statutory provisions with regard to
Ms. Sesko substantive rights. The opposing party failed to establish facts
upon which relief can be granted. RAP 2.5 (a) 5. O' Toole v. Faulkner, 29
Wash. 544, 70 P. 58 (1902)

The court's order must be stricken as the plain meaning of the statutes prevail.

2. The Superior Court erred when it failed to enter in its findings of fact and Conclusions of law. half of Sesko family Trust funds proceeded from William J. Sesko estate, therefor Exempt from Seizure. RCW 6.32.250 (2) Rule 52. (b).

Natacha Sesko was the Personal Representative of the William Sesko's estate. (Mr. Nettleton CP Verified Complaint Exhibit G Quick Claim Deed)

On June 7 2013 Hearing (VRP on Page 18 line 13) Mr. Nettleton stated: "Ms. Sesko could not enter into that contract with Erickson because she was not the owner of the property." **Mr. Nettleton was correct Ms. Sesko was not the owner of the property; the property is owned by the Sesko Family Trust.**

(VRP Page19 Line 17-20) Mr. Nettleton stated the exemption only applies to a trust created by a person other than the judgment debtor. **His statement is incomplete. He was deceptive in not quoting the entire statute.**

Trust Property Exempt From Seizure RCW 6.32.250 (2) Any money, thing in action or other property held in trust for a judgment debtor where

the trust has been created by, “or” “ The Fund” so held in trust has
“Proceeded from a person other than the judgment debtor

Inapplicable to property held in trust where trust has been created by one
other than beneficiary-judgment debtor has been to clothe every active
trust with statutory spendthrift provisions . RCW.6.32.250

Seattle First Nat. Bank v. Crosby et all (42 Wash.2d 234, 254 P.2d 732)

3. The Superior Court erred and abused its discretion when it acknowledged that Natacha Sesko was the subject of a pending Guardianship action placing her competency at issue by permitting Respondent’s summary judgment motion to go forward, without making Appellant’s Guardian Ad Litem a party to the summary judgment proceeding.

On June 7th Hearing (VRP page 2 line 15) Mr. Nettleton stated: “there is a pending guardianship for Ms. Sesko” (VRP page 10 line22-25) Mr. Nettleton stated: “**The Court** informed me (**ex parte?**) that there is a pending guardianship action... ,”.(VRP page 16 line 14-line 16).**The Court** stated: “I have no information or knowledge of any facts that would say that she is not competent, except for a filing of a guardianship action of which I know nothing about” (CP 36 Exhibit 9 is the superior court file on case No. 13400234-4) **Clearly shows the Court was in error for**

proceeding without waiting for a competency decision in the pending Guardianship case.

Market operating Corporation v. Ernst Crull et al. 165 Wash. 306, 5 P.2d 340 (1931) Rem. Comp. Stat., s. 1125. (June 7th trial, Guardianship) “In an action for foreclose a lien upon personal property, the levy of a writ of attachment upon the same property is not the prosecution of ‘any other action for the same debt or matter’ within the prohibition of Rem. Comp. Stat., s 1125

4.The Superior Court erred when it learned that English is Ms. Sesko second language, but proceed to trial without giving Ms. Sesko any opportunity to understand the question raised in trial before granting request for a Chinese interpreter on April 5th 2013 trial

RAP 2.5(a) Ms. Sesko has right to receive a fair trial

On April 5 2013 Hearing (VRP page 8 line 12-15) Ms. Sesko stated:” English is my second language. Actually, I can’t quite understand what he’s trying to tell me. I wrote a written response to the Judge and submit in the court.”

On April 5 2013 Hearing (VRP page 9 line 11-18.) The Court : What’s your reason for wanting to oppose the writ? **Ms. Sesko: Oppose the writ?**
The Court: Why do you think a writ shouldn’t be ordered by the Court? I understand you’re denying the underlying intentions on your part, but tell

me a little bit why the writ is of concern to you? **Ms. Sesko: What is a**

Writ?

Ms. Sesko has English vocabulary insufficiency problem to comprehension to understand the presentation of the question at the time of trial. Ms. Sesko did not know the word “oppose” & “writ” alone means at the time of trial.

John Harper, Lana Kudina v. Coldwell Banker Barbra Sue Seal

2007 WL 4303513 (Wash App.Div.2)

Non-English speakers and had a right to a interpreter under RCW 2.43.010

On April 5 2013 Hearing (VRP page 14, line 25 page 15 line 1-4. 6-7, 14, 17, 19, 21-22.) “I don’t ..lot of things he wants me to sign, I don’t understand. I need find the dictionary to find exact what it mean, It’s not I don’t want ... I have to know what I’m signing, the paper”. “ That’s why I need time to sign it, you know, to read it.” “Can I?....” “ Can I?...” “Can I have a translator...” to help me understand what I’m...what I’m...On April 15, 2013 Hearing (VRP page 18 line 11-12)

The Court stated: “Do you understand the difference?” Ms. Sesko:

“No”

Ms. Sesko really don’t understand what the Court means at the time.

Neuson v. Macy’s Dept. Stores Inc., 160 Wash. App. 786 , 249 P.3d

1054,24 A.D. Cas.(BNA) 1276 (Div.3 2011) review denied, 172 Wash.

2d 1005, 257 P. 3e 666 (2011) Trial court's "findings" in a summary proceeding are superfluous and are to be ignored on appeal

5. The Superior Court erred in not finding access to the two most valuable five acre old growth parcels which are unaffected by any injunction, before ordering the Writ of Attachment .

On June 7, 2013 hearing,(VRP Page 23, Line 11 and 22-25)

The Court declared Ms. Sesko does not have right to provide access to Erickson Logging for purpose of timber harvest, despite the existence of known access. easement granted by Judge Jay. Hamilton. Lindstrom v. O'day. Kitsap Superior Court Case No. 71845 "Judgment"(CP 3 Exhibit A.)(CP 36 Exhibit 3) (Nov 3rd 1978).

On April 5th Hearing (VRP Page 12 line 14 -16) Ms. Sesko stated: 'Instead of working with me to get the easement, the weeds clear out, then we have a road they can go proceed.'

Ms. Sesko was talking about the legal access to the two 5 acre parcels

On April 5th 2013 (VRP Page 11 line 22-24) Ms. Sesko also stated: I know I have the right, I even have the court that was saying I do have right to go to my five acres, to go into my property." (VRP Page 12 line 22-24.) Mr. Nettleton stated: "Your honor, it appears that Ms. Sesko wants my client to intervene in the Lindstrom litigation. We're not prepared to do that."

Erickson Logging ignored the legal access refuse to proceed the harvesting. Instead of determine a genuine issue of fact. The Court ignored Ms. Sesko's pleading look into the facts that Ms. Sesko and Mr. Nettleton presented previously. **The Court did not acknowledge that the Kitsap Superior Court case No. 112005277, granting the injunction DOES NOT apply to two five acre parcels .**

Instead of harvesting the two five acres parcels, Erickson Logging decided to advance the stumpage 8/14/2012 (CP 36 Exhibit 6) to prolong their harvesting starts date. 8/15/2012 all the way to November 2012 (CP 36 Exhibit 2)

Even knew the 20 and 40 acres injunction (Kitsap Superior Court case No. 112005277) was granted on 8/13/2012 (CP36 Exhibit 5).

Erickson Logging never discusses any repayment dates of the advance stumpage with Natacha Sesko what if the tree cannot be harvest? It was never an issue.

Ms. Sesko only knows that Erickson Logging will regain his advance money until the trees are harvest (No Specific Date or Year indicated) (CP 36 Exhibit 6)

6. The Superior Court erred in its Order granting Summary Judgment an inequitable remedy without consideration that Erickson

Logging has extreme “unclean hands” by granting an overbroad and oppressive blanket Writ of Attachment

(CP 30 and CP 2 Declaration RE: Verified Complaint Exhibit A.C.D.E.)

Erickson Logging did not keep their harvest date promises to increase their profit percentage within the agreed \$160,000 advance amount.

On October 31st Erickson Logging unilaterally decided to Starting 5% increase percentage first time from Erickson’s 31% to 36% and Natacha lose 5% harvest profit from 69% to 64% And with every each \$2000 addition advance within the \$160,000 agreed advance stumpage Natacha will lose 2% harvest profit to Erickson Logging.

It is unilateral dictated deal they set, Erickson should not charge any addition percentage within the agreed advance stumpage. Under the circumstance Natacha did need addition \$42,000 on November 15th, Natacha signed the agreement under duress and did not agree decrease percentage beyond 50%. That is how the 50/50 percent coming from.

Natacha did received \$164,500 as advanced stumpage and promised to pay it back when the tree is harvested as Erickson Logging proposed and agreed. (But without specific date, because Erickson Logging kept changing the harvest date as it goes.) Erickson Logging choose not to harvest the tree to get his advanced Stumpage instead of bring Ms. Sesko in Court ask for reward all the Sesko Family Trust Estate.

McNabb v. Department of Corrections. 163 Wash.2d 393,180 P.3d 1257,1260 (2008) On review of an order granting summary judgment, facts and reasonable inferences are considered in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party and question of law are reviewed de novo

Oltman v Holland America Line USA, Inc. 163 Wash . 2d 236, 178P. 3d 981, 987 (2008) Grant of Summary judgment is review de novo

7. The Superior Court erred and abused its discretion by not finding facts regarding the value of the timber and land separately.

The issue of the case is the gross inequity between the amounts of advance stumpage as compared to the value of the timber and property to be seized. The Court awarded writ of attachment clouding the title of all of Natasha's property including all the Sesko Family Trust So Natacha and the Sesko Family Trust have no ability to sell or borrow on any of their assets to pay the money Natacha advanced.

"The opposing party failed to established comparative value facts upon which relief can be granted." O'Toole v. Faulkner, 29 Wash. 544, 70 p. 58 (1902)

Erickson's proposed Settlement pressured Ms. Sesko to sell her four parcel's properties that worth \$1.750,000 **Property market value and**

timber survey value for \$400,000 to Erickson who otherwise would execute a sheriff sale within 2 days ... (CP 36 motion Exhibit 7) April 5th hearing (VRP. Page 4 Line 12-15) Mr. stated Nettleton.” Ms. Sesko makes references to allegedly what was offered....”

Ms. Sesko concerned this has become legalized extortion. Instead of go ahead to harvest the two five acres, which they have the legal access right after they obtained the DNR logging permit, Erickson asked the Court to order an unconscionable writ of attachment

8. The Superior Court erred in not disciplining the opposing counsel for contempt for threatening criminal accusations to openly humiliate and prejudice the substantive rights out of pro se/defendant in the civil matter. (April 5 and June 7 2013 hearing)

On April 5 2013 hearing. (VRP Page 5 line 15-16) Mr. Nettleton stated: Ms. Sesko is guilty of a fraud or probably guilty of a fraud in incurring this obligation (VRP Page 6 line 6-7.12-13) Mr. Nettleton stated: “Ms. Sesko is guilty of number felonies:” Then She’s guilty of ...probably guilty of theft in the first degree and theft in the second degree....That’s Class C felony

The Court erred in not disciplining the opposing counsel for contempt for threatening criminal accusation to openly humiliate and prejudice the substantive rights of the pro se /defendant in a civil matter.

D. CONCLUSION

For the reasons indicated above, Natacha Sesko respectfully request the Court of Appeals to reverse the Grant of Summary Judgment, release the Writ of Attachments, Grant of Attorney fees and remand these issues with directions for entry of findings of facts and Conclusion of the law to conform to the law and facts as presented here. Therefore, the Grant of Summary Judgment and Writ of Attachment should be Vacated and Judge Forbes to be recused.

Respectfully submitted; on this 13th day of January 2014.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Natacha Hsiao-Ling Ho Sesko', is written over a horizontal line.

Natacha Hsiao-Ling Ho Sesko (Pro Se)

3536 Arsenal Way

Bremerton, WA 98312

Tel: 360-649-4634

FILED
COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION II

2014 JAN 13 PM 2:33

STATE OF WASHINGTON

BY 
DEPUTY

Declaration of Service::

I certify that on January 13, 2014, I personally delivered a copy of this document to Robert Nettleton, Attorney at law, One Tacoma Avenue N. Suite 300 Tacoma WA 98403.



By Natacha Sesko