

74007-5

74007-5

No. 74007-5

Court of Appeals

**Division 1
Of the State
Of Washington**

**Jo Ann Currie
Appellant**

V.

**Alpha Therapeutic Corp.
Respondent**

**Appellant Opening
Brief**

APPELLANT'S BRIEF
FILED
JAN 11 11 53 AM '11

Jo Ann Currie
100 Melrose Avenue East
Seattle, WA 98102

Authorities

	Page
See - Case gid v. F.R. Publishing Company	
5 U.S.C. 552 g(1) (d)	9
5 U.S.C. 552 a(a) – 4-5	3
5 U.S.C. 552 a(g)	1
R.C.W. 42. 56. 050	3
Invasion of Privacy	
At Chapter 28 Section 652 (d)	3
Privacy Act 1974	2-3
Section 7. (a) 5 U.S.C. 552 note	
P.L. 93-579 Social Security	6-7
Exhibit 11 order	2
conclusion	
Summary of Provisions	8

1. Introduction

The question before this court is a simple one. May the donors in Washington State sue Washington businesses and individuals for relief from unwanted treatment. The answer is "yes." The first court judgement order was already written up. The court documents, the court erred in denying relief to a public donor. Defendant answered the complaint matter of public policy denying relief to donor who had been damaged by the defendant. This was an unfair and unlawful action. Appellant respectfully requests this court reverse the judgement and force liability on respondent 5 S.U.C. 552 (a) (g).

2. Statement of the Case

This appeal arises of a motion hearing dated August 25, 2015 granting council summary judgement.

By trial court and I did state that respondent passed over documents with my name and with private information without appellant's consent. Following the initial judgement January 20, 2001 and with other judgements and complaints, appellant provided the court with substantial evidence to demonstrate that the defendant failed the appellant, taking advantage of a past donor. I have a legal claim. In a series before this court and others, District Court 2005 order of a show cause by the judge. I did not know how to proceed with a show cause order, but I tried. District Court 2012 filing fee was \$350.00, which plaintiff had. Feedback why I didn't tell the judge. Appendix/Motion to dismiss, Exhibit Order 9 Vexation Litigant.

Courts dismissed all claims although I forgot the rules. King County Court 2004, Appeals Court 2004, and the Supreme Court after District Court 2005, show cause order (no date or time was given.) The judge erred. July 19, 2001 same judge as in 2001, and here am I at the Appeals Court with new case.

The no disclose without one's consent – the 1974 Act 5 U.S.C. 552 (a)

v. 1007-

subsection (b) no agency shall disclose any record contained in a system of records by means of communication to any person outside the scope of the organization, pursuant to written request by or with prior written consent. The underlying litigation Alpha and appellant arose from an employee of the defendant who had control of a needle and damaged at site and injured appellant could have been prevented. 5 U.S.C. 552 a (a) 4-5. A record must be about an individual maintained by an agency identified. Invasion of privacy R.C.W. 42.56.070. A person's right to privacy, no concern to the public or anyone else.

3. Assignment of Error

Did the trial court err in lacking good judgement by granting the summary judgement for the defendant.

A. Issues

Was the disclosure from lower court mandated or voluntary? Disclosure of the information had an effect of the appellant for not providing the information disregard of appellant's rights, violation of maintaining the records – private disclosure of unwanted viewing without consent. The disclosure was communicated either to public or enough people that it is likely it reached the greater public. The nature would be highly offensive to any person for disclosure.

Argument

They should not get any privileges whatsoever. Liability on the respondent. I have to change some things around. Was it or willful or intentional. I was not informed of any disclosure. So the effects of the disclosure, which is damaging to the appellant. That is not why the public goes in to donate for additional injuries, which is not doing anyone any favors.

Conclusion

Because the lower court, as the ones before them, erred in finding the appellant in the court system, Usage is to have an excuse to avoid a duty. Is it willful or internally done without owning up lacking in concern of past donor. Decision – this court forced liability, reversed the lower court decision for appellant.

DATED Feb 11/2016

Submitted
By Progo
JOANNE CURRI
Op Amber

Summary of Provisions

Permit an individual to prevent records pertaining to him or her obtained by such agencies for particular purpose from being made for another purpose without council. Negligence not notifying appellant or person of interest, conscious disregard of appellant's rights gave no option as to what to do. I did try to seal the records. Section 7. (a)

Allow retrieval of information by name of individual or its equivalent under control of agency. Citation 5 U.S.C. 552 a in reference the right to sue for violation of the statuses.

The appropriate relief for violation of Section 552 a (e) (7) is found in the statutes and allows for damages as well as amendment or expungement of unlawful records.

The legislative history which indicates that the court is not defined as an agency nor is it intended to be a person for purposes of the Privacy Act, and that the act was not designed to interfere with access of information to the court. 120 cong. Rec 36-967 1974 – pdf .

Summary of Review

The complaint states facts about this case. Allegation in the complaint to attaining substantial justice. Because lower court gave council / again whether this court must determine whether the complaint states facts constitutes a cause for action.

Civil Remedies

Damage lawsuits under Section 5 U.S.C. 552 a (g) (1) (c) and (g) (1) (d)
monetary damages.

Proof of Service and Delivery

1. June Rhoton

I am at least 18 year of age and not a party to the above-entitled action. I live in Seattle Washington

I served the foregoing Appellant Opening Brief on Feb 11/2016 by depositing copies thereof in the United States mail 212 Broad Station Seattle, Wash 98102 in sealed envelopes, with postage fully prepaid to 1201 3rd Ave Peking in care of Kathryn G. Gakpo. Appellants court hand delivered. By Appellant
Dated this DAY Feb 11/2016 / Feb 12/2016

June Rhoton

FEB 12 2016
DIVISION ONE
COURT OF APPEALS

The court of Appeals was
handed delivered proof
of service by appellant Prose
To Ann Curran on Feb 11/2016
With open Brief.

Dated this day
Feb / 2016

Submitted
by Prose
To Curran

RECEIVED
COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION ONE
FEB 12 2016