79841-9

THE SUPREME COURT
OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

AMEL DALLUGE
PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF WASHINGTON
RESPONDENT

RECEIVED
SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
07 APR 30 AM 8:23
BY RONALD R. CARPENTER
CLERK

REPLY TO RESPONDENT'S RESPONSE

"NO. 79841-9"

AMEL DALLUGE

PO [illegible]

THE COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION III (THREE) DID NOT TAKE THE TIME NOR THE CONSIDERATION I MUST HAVE AS A PRO SE LITIGANT!

GOMEZ-DIAZ V. US, 433 F3d 788 (11TH CIR. 2005),

TAYLOR V. US PROBATION OFFICE, 409 F3d 426 (D.C. CIR. 2005),

MCCORMICK V. CITY OF CHICAGO, 230 F3d 319 (7TH Cir. 2000),

BOAG V. MACDOUGALL, 454 US 364, 70 LEd2d 551, 102 SCt 700 (1982),

HAINES V. KERNER, 404 US 519, 30 LEd2d 652, 92 SCt 594 (1972).

"PRO SE LITIGANTS PLEADINGS ARE TO BE CONSTRUED LIBERALLY AND HELD TO LESS STRINGENT STANDARD THAN FORMAL PLEADINGS DRAFTED BY LAWYERS; IF COURT CAN REASONABLY READ PLEADINGS TO STATE VALID CLAIM ON WHICH LITIGANT COULD PREVAIL, IT SHOULD DO SO DESPITE FAILURE TO CITE PROPER LEGAL AUTHORITY, CONFUSION OF

LEGAL THEORIES, POOR SYNTAX AND SENTENCE CONSTRUCTION, OR LITIGANT'S UNFAMILIARITY WITH PLEADING REQUIREMENTS."

ALSO SEE,

US V. SESSING,
234 F3d 456 (9TH CIR. 2000).

"PRO SE COMPLAINTS AND MOTIONS FROM PRISONERS ARE TO BE LIBERALLY CONSTRUED."

FOR ADDITIONAL SUPPORT SEE APPENDIX I.

THAN THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OBFUSCATED AND CONFUSED MY ARGUMENT.

WHILE I AM INCARCERATED: I DO NOT DO MONTHLY REPORTS (A PROBATION CONDITION). I DO NOT

DO URINE ANALYSIS. I AM NOT IN THE COMMUNITY. I DO NOT HAVE TO DO ANY AFFIRMATIVE ACTS TOWARDS MY PROBATION AND I NEVER SEE MY PROBATION OFFICER.

THE COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION III WANTS US TO BELIEVE IT'S WELL

FOR A COMMUNITY BASED PROBATION TO VIOLATE ME WHILE I'M IN PRISON AND NOT IN THE COMMUNITY FOR LET'S JUST SAY NOT REPORTING (WHICH I CAN'T DO). LEGISLATURES INTENT OF COMMUNITY BASED PROBATION IS TO CATCH REOFFENDERS, IT'S FOR THE COMMUNITY. TO FURTHER

SUPPORT THIS, I GET NO CREDIT FOR THIS UNUSUAL TREATMENT.

Amel Dalluge

AMEL DALLUGE
PRO-SE

APRIL 25TH 2007.

"APPENDIX I"

BOGUSLAVSKY v. KAPLAN, 159 F3d 715 (2ND Cir. 1998):

"PRO SE LITIGANTS IS ALLOWED SOME DEGREE OF FLEXIBILITY IN PLEADING HIS ACTION."

PAPANTONY v. HEDRICK, 215 F3d 863 (8TH Cir. 2000):

"PRO SE HABEAS PETITIONER SHOULD NOT UNREASONABLY BE SUBJECTED TO STRINGENT PROCEDURAL NICETIES."

MCBRIDE V. DEER,
240 F3d 1287 (10TH CIR. 2001).

"COURT WAS TO LIBERALLY CONSTRUE PLEADINGS OF PRO SE PETITIONER."

HOWARD V. US, 262 F3d 811 (8TH CIR. 2001).

"COURTS INTERPRET PRO SE PETITIONS FOR POST-CONVICTION RELIEF LIBERALLY."

BINFORD V. US,
436 F3d 1252 (10TH CIR. 2006);

"THE COURT OF APPEALS AFFORDS A LIBERAL CONSTRUCTION TO PLEADINGS OF A HABEAS PETITIONER APPEARING PRO SE."