SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

NO. 1033222

Review of Division II Cause 57601-5
22-2-02806-34
Before the Honorable Judge Wilson
Thurston County

Joe Patrick Flarity, a marital community
v.
Unknown Officials, in their official and personal capacities,
State of Washington, Et Al.

MOTION TO INCLUDE SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY

Treated as a statement of additional authority

SUPPORTING ABUSE OF DISCRETION
FOR
SEPARATION BY CLASS

---

1. IDENTITY OF PETITIONER

Joe Flarity, a marital community, residing at:

101 FM 946 S

Oakhurst, TX 77359

piercefarmer@yahoo.com

2. AUTHORITY TO INCLUDE

Supplements are allowed for recent decisions that influence the outcome by RAP 10.8(b).

3. APPLICABILITY

Applicability for "systemic" court discrimination against a disfavored class of plaintiff as decried in Resolution 400 and this Panel's own letter of June 4, 2020. Flarity's Brief, P6-7,13; Flarity's Reply to State, P3,5,7-9,11-14; Flarity's Letter contesting Acting Clerk's Motion to Strike Reply, P1-3.

4. REASON

The Record should reflect that a Recall of a Mandate issued in error is easily accomplished when the State makes the request. **AP-2, AP-4.** Despite *Rozner* and *Gunwall* protections referencing Federal due process, an improperly issued State Mandate completely eliminates the

people's right to be heard, the most basic right of all democracies dating back to the Magna Carta of 1215.

Division II fell below the "floor"[1] of Federal rules by refusal to Recall an improperly issued Mandate in 56271-5-II, when the Motion was made by Flarity. **AP-5.**

As illustrated by *State v. Towessnute*, 486 P.3d 111, 197 Wash. 2D 574 (2021), any prejudice impacting core rights should be documented so that future generations might reverse declines in the Rule of Law for systemic court bias.

5. CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated, the Clerk's Recall of Mandate for this Case should be included on the record so that systemic prejudice for disfavored classes of plaintiffs are placed on the scales to offset institutional bias.

1 *Rozner v. City of Bellevue*, 804 P.2d 24, 116 Wash. 2D 342 (1991); *State v. Gunwall,* 720 P.2d 808, 106 Wash. 2D 54 (1986); *State v. Gregory*, 192 Wn.2d 1, 16, 427 P.3d 621 (2018).

CERTIFICATION OF WORD LIMIT. The Word Count is 228 words and is within the limit of the RAP for Supplemental Authorities.

CERTIFICATION AND SIGNING:
Per RCW 9A.72.085, I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct and I have followed the RAP 13 to the best of my knowledge for this Motion.

Date of Signing: December 8, 2024
Signature of plaintiff: */S/*

Joe Flarity
101 FM 946 S.
Oakhurst, TX 77359
piercefarmer@yahoo.com

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

DESCRIPTION PAGE NUMBER

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
DIVISION II

JOE PATRICK FLARITY, Appellant, v. STATE OF WASHINGTON, et al., Respondents.	No. 57601-5 MANDATE Thurston County Cause No. 22-2-02806-5

The State of Washington to: The Superior Court of the State of Washington in and for Thurston County.

This is to certify that the Court of Appeals of the State of Washington, Division II, entered an opinion in the above entitled case on July 2, 2024. This opinion became the final decision terminating review of this Court on October 9, 2024. Accordingly, this cause is mandated to the Superior Court from which the appeal was taken for further proceedings in accordance with the determination of that court. Costs has been awarded in the following amount:

Judgment: $557.50
Judgment Creditor: State of Washington
Judgment Debtor: Joe Patrick Flarity

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of said Court at Tacoma.

Derek Byrne
Clerk of the Court of Appeals,
State of Washington, Div. II

Matthew Kernutt
Attorney General of Washington
1125 Washington St Se
Olympia, WA 98504-0100
matthew.kernutt@atg.wa.gov

Joe Patrick Flarity
101 Fm 946 South
Oakhurst, TX 77359
piercefarmer@yahoo.com

Thurston County Superior Court

Dept Of Revenue A.G. Office
Attorney at Law
7141 Cleanwater Lane Sw
P O Box 40123
Olympia, WA 98504-0123
revolyef@atg.wa.gov

Andrew J Krawczyk
Atty Generals Ofc/Revenue Division
PO Box 40123
Olympia, WA 98504-0123
Andrew.Krawczyk@atg.wa.gov

Washington State Court of Appeals
Division Two

909 A Street, Suite 200, Tacoma, Washington 98402
Derek Byrne, Clerk/Administrator (253) 593-2970 (253) 593-2806 (Fax)
General Orders, Calendar Dates, and General Information at http://www.courts.wa.gov/courts OFFICE HOURS: 9-12, 1-4.

November 26, 2024

Matthew Kernutt
Attorney General of Washington
1125 Washington St SE
Olympia, WA 98504-0100
matthew.kernutt@atg.wa.gov

Joe Patrick Flarity
101 FM 946 South
Oakhurst, TX 77359
piercefarmer@yahoo.com

Dept Of Revenue A.G. Office
Attorney at Law
7141 Cleanwater Lane SW
P O Box 40123
Olympia, WA 98504-0123
revolyef@atg.wa.gov

Andrew J Krawczyk
Atty Generals Ofc/Revenue Division
PO Box 40123
Olympia, WA 98504-0123
Andrew.Krawczyk@atg.wa.gov

CASE #: 57601-5-II Joe Patrick Flarity v. State of Washington, et al.
Case Manager: Jodie

Counsel:

On the above date, this Court entered the following notation ruling:

A RULING BY THE CLERK:

This matter comes before the undersigned upon a Motion by the Court to Recall the Mandate issued in the above-entitled matter on November 20, 2024. The Mandate was inadvertently issued due to a clerical error and should therefore be recalled.

The Mandate in the above-entitled matter is recalled and Thurston County Clerk is directed to return said Mandate to the Clerk of this Court.

Sincerely,

Derek M. Byrne
Court Clerk

DMB:jlt

June 26, 2024

Joe Patrick Flarity
101 FM 946 S.
Oakhurst, TX 77359

Washington State Supreme Court
PO Box 40929
Olympia, WA 98504-0929

RE: **CASE 56271-5-II:** Review of Denial to Vacate Mandate and modify Retaliation Charges

Dear Supreme Court of Washington State:

I respectfully Move the Panel as Joe Patrick Flarity on my own behalf. Although this is a joint Cause, this letter is personal and describes events not applicable to the marital community. It is intended to replace a legal filing, using the precedent of *State v. Gentry*, 356 P.3d 714, 183 Wash. 2D 749 (2015). I take advantage of the creativity this Panel encouraged in *Bryant v. Joseph Tree, Inc.*, 829 P.2d 1099, 119 Wash. 2D 210 (1992). The word count is 3278 words and within the words limit for Motions. Meaning no disrespect to any party, titles are shortened to save word count. All emphasis is my own, unless otherwise noted.

RULING DEFIES RIGHT TO BE HEARD: Div. II's denial without explanation on May 28, 2024, is provided. **AP-2**. The Order guts our basic right to be heard by playing loose with court rules and actively defying RCW 2.06.040, which demands that grounds be stated. Grounds in rulings are an important point this Panel recently recognized, *State v. Sunnyside*, 101205-5:

> Although the court did not specifically state the basis for the grant of summary judgment, we review each ground raised by the defendants and reverse and remand….

I have hope, along with the people, that the Panel gives equal importance to this principle for ALL parties seeking to restore *fundamental principles*. This is especially critical when we seek to check STATE misconduct. The right to be heard before our peers forms the organic

foundation of all our rights by common law.[1] If the highest court treats parties alleging civil rights abuses unevenly, that undermines the Panel's June 4, 2020 letter, and also defies the intent of Art. 1, Sec. 8 and Art. 1, Sec. 12, where the founders sought to level the field for the "weakness of the individual."[2] Denial of the right to even have the Panel read the Petition thwarts the founders purpose below its foundation.

IN DEFENSE OF STARE DECISIS. A basic function of our court system is to educate the people on clearly stated legal principles. How else are the people to understand how to conduct ourselves as responsible citizens? This is especially important when exercising our power by voting. Besides the plainly stated RCW 2.06.040, the Order, **AP-2,** violates the spirit of the law because it refuses to address any recognized legal theory or cite precedents in support. The Motion to Recall, **AP-778,** and Replies, **AP-866, AP-872, AP-889**, listed numerous Supreme Court Rulings with particular application to the Motion. Not a single precedent was addressed by the Defendants or the Div. II Panel.

Without Supreme Court review, the only logical conclusion is that no legal argument is allowed to common people in Washington Courts, that the Rule of Law has failed in Washington State at its core.

USURPING SUPREME COURT JURISDICTION: The Order, **AP-2,** undermines this Panel's fundamental purpose: that the Panel itself decides whether to accept or deny. The Order also precludes the possibility that a dissent might illuminate the enormous hurdles in place to obstruct regular people (and regular lawyers) to restrain officials violating core rights. Judicial dissent is often the starting point for the elimination of systemic abuse as recognized by the Panel's letter of June 4, 2020, which the court again cited in *Sunnyside* to correct municipality abuses much like we have requested in this Cause.

THE PETITION IS FILED. Our Petition to review Div. II's decision meets the stringent formatting requirements in the RAP and is shown in **AP-3**. Both Orders gives a potent

1 Starting from the Magna Carta of June 15, 1215.

2 *Snyder v. Ingram*, 48 Wn.2d 637, 639, 296 P.2d 305 (1956).

example recently decried by unanimous SCOTUS in *Axon Enterprise v. FTC*, No. 21-86, as "two forearms" on the scale of justice in state courts. Here is exactly the "shameful" lower court decision decried in the Panel's June 4, 2020 letter hidden in an unpublished decision defying a long list of this Panel's precedents. **AP-60.**

LEGAL AUTHORITY: Per RAP 13.5(b) (1)(2) or (3), I am aggrieved of Div. II refusal's to Recall the Clerk's Mandate, issued 5 days after this Panel's refusal to accept our Motion to correct the confusing rules violating the "floor"[3] of Federal due process and hiding a ruling contradicting precedents.[4] This letter is filed within the 30 day time allowed to challenge improper appellate decisions by RAP 13.5. The vacant Order defies every precedent for Recall of Mandates as we described in the Motion to Recall. **AP-778.** The Defendant's Responses were *notoriously* weak. Reply to Pierce County, **AP-866.** Reply to State, **AP-872**. Reply to AIC, **AP-889**. That the sovereign still prevailed in the face of numerous uncontested adverse precedents gives a potent indication of court prejudice further hidden by the Panel's refusal to state the grounds as required by law. **AP-120, AP-881.**

CRIPPLING THE PEOPLE AS DE FACTO COURT POLICY: The Jury Trial is a KEY feature of our right to be heard that formed the basis for the world's first functional democracy. On the other side of jury denials is a wasteland of desiccated civil rights corpses. The destruction of this core right in unconscionable in any court system that touts its allegiance to the Rule of Law. This "abridgment"[5] is a figurative kneecapping to civil rights plaintiffs when they enter the court's door. The founders sought to protect this right by using the most forceful possible language in Art. 1, Sec. 21: **The right is *inviolate*.** This Panel examined their intent in great detail in *Sofie v. Fibreboard Corp.*, 771 P.2d 711, 112 Wash. 2d 636, 112 Wash. 636 (1989). The people deserve an explanation on court violation of a plainly stated right we hold

---

3 *State v. Gregory*, 192 Wn.2d 1, 16, 427 P.3d 621 (2018). Accord *State v. Sieyes*, 168 Wn.2d 276, 292, 225 P.3d 995 (2010): ("the United States Constitution establishes a floor below which state courts cannot go to protect individual rights.").

4 The courts employ here a racist tactic perfected during the long reign of Jim Crow: TAKE A LETTER, YOUR HONOR: OUTING THE JUDICIAL EPISTEMOLOGY OF HART V MASSANARI, Penelope Pether [FNa1], Washington and Lee Law Review Fall, 2005.

5 *State v. Lewis*, 129 La. 800, 804, 56, So. 893, 894 (1911): "rights beyond the authority of the legislative department to destroy or abridge."

precious. The ruling here gives an alarm that Washington courts consider the people *counterfeit human beings* to a large degree. **AP-30.** Refusal of the highest court to address the de facto policy effectively bars the majority from meaningful use of the legal system to right wrongs.

CHARGES OF HARASSMENT LUDICROUS: It would be obvious to any jury that state damage from a pro se plaintiff "harassing" the 1000+ AG attorneys funded by nearly a half BILLION taxpayer dollars is preposterous. Every citizen called to a jury would likely insist that public attorneys observe their oaths to protect our core rights. The clearly stated claim here is exactly what the founders intended when they drafted Art. 1, Sec. 32.

RETALIATION EVIDENT: The Panel also refused to modify the Commissioner's assignment of further charges to *nominal parties,* **AP-803-808,** on our clearly stated claim. The Order, **AP-2**, refused to address the precedents or the RAP 18.1 requirements we insisted the Court observe, **AP-880-881**. If the Panel endorses retaliation on the people's role to restrain lawbreaking officials the founders plainly stated would be necessary in Art. 1, Sec. 32, then "express words" are required for the people's education per Art. 1, Sec. 29. Retaliation flips Art. 1, Sec. 32 on its head and is also prohibited by RCW 42.41.040. State retaliation was just decried by SCOTUS in *NRA v. Vullo*, 22-842, where Justice Jackson described the need for analysis of 1st Amendment rights v. retaliation. The Panel should note that Justice Jackson set aside her personal beliefs and ruled for the NRA as an equal party in New York even though the gun group is so unpopular they were recently fined millions by a jury.[6]

EXAMINATION OF RETALIATION: Administrative courts have greatly reduced powers to sanction which partially offsets their escape from court rules and the Judicial Code of Conduct. But when the judicial branch ignores the rules that hinder officials but then pivot to sanction the people trying to correct lawbreaking officials, that is a well recognized mark of pure tyranny identified by *NRA v. Vullo*, 22-842 as an **improper use of state power.** Retribution is particularity heinous when it is applied to the "weakness of the people,"[7] the

6 https://ag.ny.gov/press-release/2024/attorney-general-james-wins-trial-against-nra-and-wayne-lapierre

7 *Snyder v. Ingram*, 48 Wn.2d 637, 639, 296 P.2d 305 (1956).

most obvious of which are pro se plaintiffs. Besides the shame of CR12 dismissals on clearly stated claims, the addition of further charges "chill" the people and spur further abuses by officials. At the end of this trend is a "graveyard"[8] for the people and "fire" for the judicial institution itself.[9] We have shown obvious "irresponsible action" by officials.

TIMING OF RETRIBUTION: It is significant that Div. II did not add additional charges for the *nominal defendants*, **AP-803-808,** until we proceeded to complain about their "shameful" decision before this Panel. **AP-3**. The timing itself indicates that Div. II is "chilling" the people by raising spears to the backs of those that proceed. By refusing to accept this Motion for review, the Panel would send a flare to every lower state court that retribution is acceptable in spite of an appointed "gatekeeper" Commissioner guarding entry to Panel discretion.

PERSONAL DAMAGES FROM ASSIGNED FUTILITY: Instead of this seven year quest to restrain lawbreaking officials, I could have learned another language. Or perhaps several. I could have built a Home for Habitat. Or a row of low income townhouses. I could have ridden my motorcycle to Tierra del Fuego and back, with plenty of time left to turn north to Fairbanks. I could have written a novel, then expanded any success there into a series. My sacrifice for the good of the general public in my waning years has been substantial.

PROVOKING DEPRESSION AND SUICIDE THROUGH COURT FUTILITY. This Panel is included on the WSBA committee investigating the tremendous depression and suicide rates among attorneys and law students.[10] The Panel should take note of the enormous difference in the mental health of public versus private attorneys. I propose this difference is because the courts have anointed public attorneys to a royal status our founders went to extraordinary efforts to dismantle. This case represents the obvious inequality of which Resolution 400 complains: that court favoritism has provoked usurpation of democratic ideals by unrestrained

---

8 *West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624 (1943).

9 *Open Door Baptist Church v. Clark County*, 995 P.2d 33, 140 Wash.2d 143 (Wash. 2000), "As George Washington warned: "Government is not reason, it is not eloquence—it is force! **Like fire it is a dangerous servant and a fearful master; never for a moment should it be left to irresponsible action."**

10 https://www.wsba.org/Legal-Community/Committees-Boards-and-Other-Groups/well-being-task-force The Panel may wish to included this case in the WSBA study.

administrative officials. These court blessings to AG officials are corrosive to the Rule of Law at its very foundation.[11] More from *Sunnyside*:

> But as the State explains, "Voluntary cessation of allegedly illegal conduct does not moot a case because there is **still a likelihood of the illegal conduct recurring**." *State v. Ralph Williams' N.W. Chrysler Plymouth, Inc.*, 82 Wn.2d 265, 272, 510 P.2d 233 (1973); *see Braam v. State*, 150 Wn.2d 689, 709, 81 P.3d 851 (2003) (**a plaintiff may pursue injunctive relief unless it is "absolutely clear that behavior will not reoccur"**).

The AG arguments accepted by the *Sunnyside* Panel should be applied evenly to this Cause. Otherwise, why do we need courts when one branch is given the power to *capriciously* pick what rights are enforced and those that may be "destroyed" in defiance of *State v. Lewis? Sunnyside* (footnotes removed) claimed similar constitutional violations as Flarity:

> The complaint alleged seven causes of action: (1) denial of **procedural due process** under color of law, in violation of the United States Constitution, (2) denial of **substantive due process** under color of law, in violation of the United States Constitution, (3) denial of **due process under the color of law, in violation of the Washington Constitution**….The State requested declaratory relief, injunctive relief, **and damages**.

THE DESTRUCTIVE POWER OF GASLIGHTING: Both majority and dissent opinions in *303 CREATIVE LLC ET AL. v. ELENIS*, No. 21–476, examined the tremendous detrimental power of public humiliation and shame. *303* referenced numerous studies proving public attack and has the same impact on one's health as alcoholism or drug addiction.[12] As a Marine sworn to an oath to defend the Constitution, I am better prepared to resist what untrained people would perceive as an irresistible tidal wave of official bad faith conduct. I am also prepared to suffer ostracism (resulting from court *chilling*) from my long-time friends for simply summoning the strength to challenge law-breaking officials.

---

11 From the ABA June 1, 2024, ***State judicial oversight often lacks consistency and transparency***, Jim Moliterno, the Vincent Bradford Professor of Law, Emeritus at Washington and Lee University School of Law and an expert in judicial ethics: "It is imperative for democracy that judges are held to account for their behavior...Increased consistency between states...would send a stronger signal to the public that judges can be trusted. We've certainly seen countries where the people stop trusting the courts. That's when a country is ripe for anarchy.…"

12 "This ostracism, this otherness, is among the most distressing feelings that can be felt by our social species. K. Williams, Ostracism, 58 Ann. Rev. Psychology 425, 432–435 (2007)."

PROTEST NOT A JUST A RIGHT, BUT A DUTY. As Thomas Jefferson explained, coming forward to protest government wrongdoing is not just a right, but a *duty*. After their dismantling of Jim Crow abuse in *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954), SCOTUS suffered ostracism in their communities. But a major difference is that Supreme Court Justices should have taken Federalist #78 to heart when they stepped onto the nation's highest court. Whereas, I had no clue of the coming corrosion to my health.

IMPLICIT DAMAGE OF GASLIGHTING AND RETALIATION: I am above average intelligence and mental resolution based on my success at college and USMC training. The AG defenses are base, specious and absurd. They succeed by court abdication of Art. 1, Sec. 1 and Art. 1, Sec. 2, "two forearms" serving up sovereign power reminiscent of King George III, below the "floor" of Federal law, and in direct defiance of unanimous SCOTUS. The family of John T. Williams can attest to this favoritism, that the thin restraint of Washington's constitutional paper is easily pierced as noted by George Washington.[13] Here is the quote above my compute to counter court gaslighting: "Time is always on the side of Truth," by Ezra Taft Benson.

In spite of my *prophylactic* precautions,[14] and a firm grounding in constitutional law the USMC was compelled to provide,[15] the first collateral impact of our quest for justice was the disruption of my sleep. I now get around four hours of good sleep a night, when I used to get eight. Then those shortened hours were trampled by nightmares. The courts appear like a *Forbidden Planet* destructive force from the ID. This is not the cheesy evil that relies on sophomoric sound effects and gimmicks. This is the John Cusak 1408 treatment, the "banality of evil," of hotel room 1408 transformed into an roiling Dante's court, that raised knife now at my back as sanctions for my belief that plainly stated rights ARE enforced, that my idealism,

13 *Open Door Baptist Church v. Clark County*, 995 P.2d 33, 140 Wash.2d 143 (Wash. 2000).

14 NO GOOD DEED GOES UNPUBLISHED: PRECEDENT STRIPPING AND THE NEED FOR A NEW PROPHYLACTIC RULE, By Edward Cantu, UMKC School of Law

15 I benefited from additional legal training after the massacre at My Lai in 1968.

as DPA Hamilton has opined,[16] is a character flaw, a sign of mental instability and weakness.[17] This overwhelming fear comes with the suffocating feeling that no escape is possible, that no similar *Sunnyside*[18] constitutional fire brigade will appear to stop the AG firestorm we have identified.

This nightmare, that a noble institution has been possessed by blank-faced robed demons, creatures that revel in the reduction of citizens into subhumans, has easily overwhelmed my waking intellect. I describe to this Panel the actual reality of the warning that "twilight approaches," the dangerous specter described by William O. Douglas of which Justice Sanders liked to quote in his dissents.[19] I can attest those projections are NOT speculative.

THE BANALITY OF EVIL IN PRACTICE: The Panel should acknowledge that Div. II is avoiding its basic responsibility to enforce the Constitution in its ruling. But more important, the Panel should address sanctions on those that come forward in good faith as the embodiment of tyrannical evil that I have described as subconsciously able to subvert the most determined intellects, including those with a rare combination of skills and the fortitude to challenge state-wide abuses of civil rights.

WHAT HAS BEEN LOST? This Cause warns that our rights are illusions rather than core legal doctrines defended by experts whom have studied and sublimely respect the core principles, that those hard won rights are crushed before personal opinions or the vicissitudes of politics. And when our loss is hidden, "swept under the rug," **AP-362**, that is the exact opaque technique employed by tyrants. For every Palla Sum released from jail, there are a thousand Daniel L. Simms and Daniel Elwell parties whom were not.[20] For every Zamora

16 DPA Hamilton actually used the term *quixotic* in his pleading at Div. I.

17 Described in excruciating detail by Christine Blasey Ford, *One Way Back: A Memoir.*

18 "Briefs of amici curiae have been filed by the Fair Housing Center of Washington and Fred T. Korematsu Center for Law and Equality, Northwest Justice Project, and the American Civil Liberties Union of Washington."

19 *State v. Valentine*, 935 P.2d 1294, 132 Wash. 2D 1 (1997).

20 *Sum v. State, 99730-6; Simms v. Dept. of Corrections*, 21-2-00928-34; *Elwell v. State*, No. 99546-0.

exonerated after being beaten nearly to death, there are multiple John T Williams and Manual Ellis-like victims that must receive justice through the ether of karma.

The *Sunnyside* citation of Zamora is particularly offensive since we are "similarly situated" to the *Sunnyside* defendants and Zamora seems NOT similar.[21] This Panel should be equally incensed at the same violations if we are indeed equal parties per Resolution 400 and the Panel's June 4, 2020 letter to lower courts.

Time is heavy, and the banality of evil will not be overcome by the occasional corsage fixed to a Towesnute grave.[22] When evil dominates, the base results are perfectly predicted by Yeats in *The Second Coming:*[23]

> The best lack all conviction, while the worst
>
> Are full of passionate intensity.

This Cause gives notice that Washington courts routinely choose to ignore the warning of Justice Brandeis and unwisely fuel the intensity of the worst:[24]

> Crime is contagious. If the government becomes a lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for law; it invites every man to become a law unto himself; it invites anarchy.

---

21 How was Zamora's beating and Sunnyside's evictions without due process related? Flarity's farm was likewise destroyed by the same "as drafted" and "as applied" due process violations suffered by Angelita Guizar, Eliseo Vargas, Yvonne Chagolla, Heather and Rodney Francis, Hilda León, Yesica Santos Nuño, and Yolanda Paniagua Dimas.

22 *State v. Towessnute*, 486 P.3d 111, 197 Wash. 2D 574 (2021).

23 From *Sunnyside*: George Lipsitz, *"In an Avalanche Every Snowflake Pleads Not Guilty…"*

24 SCOTUS shortened Justice Brandeis eloquent dissent in the majority opinion for the famous Watergate burglary case, *U.S. v. McCord*, 166 U.S. App.D.C. 1, 501 F.2d 334, 341.

I WILL NOT ACCEPT COURT SHAMING: The shame belongs to every similar Dred Scott[25] like cell in the courtroom nightmare of 1408. This is a base pustule this Panel has the power to lance. Denial hurls more tinder onto an already blazing "fearful master." As Martin Luther King Jr. observed (along with Resolution 400,) riots are the inevitable result when courts refuse to hear their people.

CONCLUSION: I respectfully appeal to the "court of last resort" to bolster the Rule of Law in Washington State and preserve the only path for the people to defeat evil without the use of civil disobedience. Although our cause my be small, per the *Haines Doctrine*,[26] it is still vital the people are heard. The Panel should take this opportunity to till the karma of hubris into a more noble future for the institution. The shame described in *303 Creative,* the humiliation by CR12 abuse stopped in *NRA v. Vullo*, 22-842, the added retaliatory fines levied here--should be addressed and halted. Otherwise, what signal is sent to every lower court in Washington State? As Justice Kagan stated in *Axon*, Washington State enters an "existential court crisis" created by the courts themselves.

Civil disobedience, even in its most benign applications, is often lethal or crippling in the presence of evil power wielded by unrestrained officials. Journalist Linda Tirado entered hospice care from long-term brain damage after taking a rubber bullet to the eye covering the George Floyd protests.[27] Soren Stevenson also lost an eye in the same protest.

Why is this happening in the United States in the 21st Century?

---

25 *Browning v. Slenderella Systems of Seattle*, 341 P.2d 859, 54 Wash. 2D 440 (1959); *DeFunis v. Odegaard*, 507 P.2d 1169, 82 Wash. 2d 11, 82 Wash. 11 (1973); *In re Coats*, 267 P.3d 324, 173 Wash. 2D 123 (2011).

26 *In re Sinka*, 599 P.2d 1275, 92 Wash. 2D 555 (1979); *In re Young*, 622 P.2d 373, 95 Wash. 2D 216 (1980).

27 Karma is the long path to justice when the truth is "self evident:"

https://racketmn.com/linda-tirado-journalist-who-was-half-blinded-in-minneapolis-protests-enters-hospice-care

Sincerely,

Joe Patrick Flarity
101 FM 946 S
Oakhurst, TX 77359
253 951 9981

FLARITY FARM

December 08, 2024 - 10:36 AM

Transmittal Information

Filed with Court:	Supreme Court
Appellate Court Case Number:	103,322-2
Appellate Court Case Title:	Joe Patrick Flarity v. State of Washington, et al.
Superior Court Case Number:	22-2-02806-5

The following documents have been uploaded:

- 1033222_Motion_20241208103335SC270173_5591.pdf
  This File Contains:
  Motion 1 - Other
  The Original File Name was Supplemental for Mandate with Appendix.pdf

A copy of the uploaded files will be sent to:

- Andrew.Krawczyk@atg.wa.gov
- danielle.anderson@atg.wa.gov
- matthew.kernutt@atg.wa.gov
- revolyef@atg.wa.gov

Comments:

Motion for to include recent decision as Supplemental Authority for proof of systemic court bias to a disfavored class.

Sender Name: Joe Flarity - Email: piercefarmer@yahoo.com
Address:
249 Main Ave S. STE 107 #330
North Bend, WA, 98045
Phone: (253) 951-9981

Note: The Filing Id is 20241208103335SC270173