

FILED
SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
9/2/2025
BY SARAH R. PENDLETON
CLERK

FILED
APPENDIX Court of Appeals
Division III
State of Washington
9/2/2025 8:00 AM

Case #: 1045247

PETITION FOR REVIEW
SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON

SEPTEMBER 1st, 2025

APPENDIX TO PETITION

PETITION FOR REVIEW
SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON

SEPTEMBER 1st, 2025

CASE No.

SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON

&

COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION THREE

JARED A. FRERICHs — APPELLANT

v.

VIRGINIA R. COOPER — RESPONDENT

PETITION FOR REVIEW

PRO SE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Table of Authorities</i>	2
<i>Issue Presented for Review</i>	3
<i>Statement of the Case</i>	4
<i>Argument</i>	5
Rules & Regulations	5
U.S. Const. amend. XIV § 1	5
Analysis	5
What is due process?	5
What are equal protections?	5
<i>Conclusion</i>	6
Relief Sought	7
<i>Appendix</i>	9
Appendix A: Opinion of Court of Appeals Division III	9
Appendix B: Opinion Of United States District Court For The Eastern District Of Washington	9
Appendix C: Declaration In Support Of Motion For Leave to Proceed In Forma Pauperis Amended	9

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Constitutional Provisions

U.S. Const. amend. XIV § 1 _____ 5, 6

Cases

Court of Appeals of the State of Washington Division Three, case number 40552-4 4

Spokane County Superior Court case number 21202489-32 _____ 5

Superior Court of Spokane County Case Number 18205630-32 _____ 10

Superior Court of Spokane County Case Number 19302410-32 _____ 9

ISSUE PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

I, JARED A. FRERICHES, *Pro Se Appellator In forma pauperis* petition the Honorable Justices of the Supreme Court of the State of Washington to review the decision in the Court of Appeals of the State of Washington Division Three, case number 40552-4, in accordance with the Rules of Appellate Court 13.4.(a). The Honorable Judges of Division Three: Fearing, J., Murphy, J., & Staab, A.C.J. misapprehend respectfully.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Spokane County Superior Court, of the State of Washington failed to protect my Rights, Immunities and Guarantees emanating from U.S. Const. amend. XIV § 1:

This complaint arises in answer to Spokane County Superior Court case number 21202489-32. Analyze substance or context over consequences in this matter to see in 2018, an Extreme Risk Protection Order was obtained by Virginia Cooper under false pretenses, which has been wielded by her representation against me in court. Without this nefarious report Cooper's representation would not have been able to obtain the outcomes she did in our marriage dissolution along with the subsequent restraining orders, warrants, restrictions and so on which have deprived me of life, liberty, property, due process and equal protections.

ARGUMENT

The Petition for Review is timely filed. The Appellate Court misapprehends: My equal protections, and due process guarantees were breached through the seizure of my person and then my property without adjudication. A fact which Spokane County Superior Court officials have held against me. I am asking for that to no longer be the case.

RULES & REGULATIONS

U.S. CONST. AMEND. XIV § 1: All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

ANALYSIS

WHAT IS DUE PROCESS?

I don't know? I thought the Police needed a warrant to take property and hold people against their will?

WHAT ARE EQUAL PROTECTIONS?

Equal protections imply one party is as equally protected as the other. This hasn't been the case in this matter. I remain dispossessed of arms whilst Virginia, the

City, County and State remained armed. This fact colors me in Court unjustly; for equality means all parties are disarmed if one be.

CONCLUSION

Neither State nor County nor City nor Ms. Cooper has standing for grievance or quarrel with my personage.

If the record reflects an adjudication of domestic violence on my part this is an error...

I haven't been within spitting distance of Ms. Cooper in nearly a decade. I left since it was, she who harmed me and not the other way around. At no time have I threatened myself or anyone else. I haven't been arrested. No charges have been brought against me. I have violated no contract or agreement.

This complaint against Ms. Cooper was filed on November 8th, 2022; prior to the Superior Court's finding of litigation abuse on January 25th, 2023. See Superior Court of Spokane County Case Number 19302410-32 Sub # 175. There Beit, pre-authorization to file would not be necessary considering the complaint had already been filed. Regardless, the fact I am under any restrictions violates my equal protections under the law, considering at no time have I used litigation to harass, intimidate, or maintain contact with Virginia Cooper. In fact, the opposite is true.

Regarding the matter of attorney fees; as the victim of paper abuse, I find it improper to have to pay for my abuser's fees, so I failed to think to mention them in

my brief. On the other hand, if you believe Ms. Cooper is the victim of litigation abuse, it isn't by me. Those most probable being them who proffer these legal fees; that being the case award her whatever seems proper from the responsible parties.

RELIEF SOUGHT

The injuries and aftermath from one afternoon in December remain unhealed seven years later; leaving me confused, houseless, Rightless, jobless and incomplete. For that which, VIRGINIA RYAN COOPER is culpable, I seek restitution to make whole what was broken as well as to protect others from such travesty.

I need complete restoration and recognition of my Right to bear arms.

I need a retraction of the Extreme Risk Protection Order issued on December 19th, 2018, so that it may no longer be used for ignoble deeds by Ms. Cooper, her legal teams or others. See Superior Court of Spokane County Case Number 18205630-32

Further, I need any mention of domestic violence relating to my person expunged.


At no time have I, JARED A. FRERICHES, perpetrated domestic violence.

I need the dissolution of marriage and associated cases including this one sealed.

I need to be made whole for injuries sustained while in Police custody, which include memory loss, Civil Right violations, loss of wages, loss of property and emotional distress. Therefore, I need punitive damages from the parties responsible as restitution and deterrence against such egregious and reckless behavior.

I need a writ of mandamus enforcing as much if not more.

Respectfully Submitted September 1st, 2025,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jared A. Frerichs". The signature is stylized with large, sweeping loops and a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Jared A. Frerichs

Pro Se

406-909-0914

jared.frerichs@gmail.com

JARED FRERICHS

September 01, 2025 - 7:28 PM

Transmittal Information

Filed with Court: Court of Appeals Division III
Appellate Court Case Number: 40552-4
Appellate Court Case Title: Jared A. Frerichs v. Virginia R. Cooper
Superior Court Case Number: 23-2-03857-1

The following documents have been uploaded:

- 405524_Petition_for_Review_Plus_20250901192300D3181855_3791.pdf
This File Contains:
Affidavit/Declaration - Service
Petition for Review
The Original File Name was Petition for Review.pdf

A copy of the uploaded files will be sent to:

- Evan@allenfischer.com
- jaredfrerichs@gmail.com

Comments:

Sender Name: Jared Frerichs - Email: jared.frerichs@gmail.com
Address:
PO Box 50730
Billings, MT, 59105
Phone: (406) 909-0914

Note: The Filing Id is 20250901192300D3181855

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

JARED A. FRERICHs,)	No. 40552-4-III
)	
Appellant,)	
)	
v.)	
)	
VIRGINIA R. COOPER,)	UNPUBLISHED OPINION
)	
Respondent.)	

FEARING, J. — Jared Frerichs files suit against his former wife, Virginia Cooper, despite a superior court previously entering an order precluding suit without advance approval from the court. Because Frerichs failed to obtain pre-suit authorization, we affirm the superior court’s dismissal of the suit and grant Cooper reasonable attorney fees and costs on appeal.

FACTS

The plaintiff Jared Frerichs and defendant Virginia Cooper are former husband and wife.

In December 2018, officials detained plaintiff Jared Frerichs in a mental health facility. During the commitment, law enforcement seized Frerichs’ firearms, which remain in police custody today. During the 2020 marital dissolution action between Frerichs and Virginia Cooper, the superior court entered a restraining order based on a finding that Frerichs committed domestic abuse against Cooper. In 2021, the superior court entered a domestic violence protection order against Frerichs.

On January 25, 2023, the superior court, pursuant to RCW 26.51.070(6), granted Virginia Cooper an order to restrict abusive litigation prohibiting Jared Frerichs from filing, initiating, advancing, or continuing any litigation against Cooper until January 12, 2029, without first obtaining approval from the court. When granting the order, the superior court found that Frerichs pursued court actions primarily for the purpose of harassing, intimidating, or maintaining contact with Cooper.

PROCEDURE

On September 18, 2023, Jared Frerichs filed this lawsuit against Virginia Cooper, alleging that she, along with her legal team, conspired to violate his constitutional rights by obtaining extreme risk protection orders that deprived him of his right to bear arms. In his complaint, Frerichs sought a declaration that Cooper violated, (1) his constitutional rights, (2) an order quashing a warrant presumably for his arrest, (3) damages for emotional distress, and (4) reimbursement for the loss of his firearms and home. In response to the complaint, Cooper filed the January 25, 2023, order to restrict abusive litigation.

On December 29, 2023, Jared Frerichs moved for summary judgment. On March 4, 2024, he filed a barely legible handwritten declaration accusing Virginia Cooper's counsel of manipulating information. Frerichs cited his disqualification from the U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary as evidence of counsel's and the court's negative impact on his

life. Frerichs also filed a pleading entitled a “motion status sheet” that complained the courts had failed to address multiple motions in various case numbers and alleged that opposing counsel refused to respond to his interrogatories due to a preoccupation with insignificant procedural matters. Clerk’s Papers (CP) at 35.

On April 9, 2024, Virginia Cooper’s counsel submitted RCW 26.51.070 to the court with an outline of the procedural requirements for individuals subject to abusive litigation orders who seek to initiate new legal actions. On April 12, 2024, the superior court denied Jared Frerichs’ summary judgment motion due to his failure to obtain pre-filing permission under RCW 26.51.070(2) but stayed the order to allow him an opportunity to comply.

On May 20, 2024, Jared Frerichs filed a declaration titled “Complaint History,” in which he claimed to be a victim of domestic violence and accused Virginia Cooper of repeatedly submitting false reports. CP at 66. Frerichs asserted that his firearm possession posed no threat to anyone. He alleged that a “secret hearing” held on December 19, 2018, before a Spokane County Superior Court Commissioner, led to the issuance of an extreme risk protection order and the seizure of his firearms. CP at 67. Frerichs also included a copy of an administrative complaint he filed with the Spokane Police Department Internal Affairs Division that grieved that law enforcement targeted

him for personal and political reasons. Frerichs speculated that Cooper maintained a romantic relationship with an SPD officer.

The superior court reviewed the case on June 12, 2024. Jared Frerichs failed to appear. The court concluded this lawsuit constituted abusive litigation. The superior court wrote:

Based on the laws of Washington and the persuasive authority of Federal and other jurisdictions, there is no basis in law for this action to be brought against Ms. Cooper, and this filing it is clearly being used as a mechanism of abusive litigation and domestic violence. This litigation is part of the pattern of abusive litigation and domestic violence directed at Ms. Cooper by Mr. Frerichs.

CP at 54. The superior court lifted the stay, dismissed the action with prejudice, and awarded attorney fees to Virginia Cooper for responding to the lawsuit.

LAW AND ANALYSIS

Abusive Litigation

On appeal, Jared Frerichs contends the superior court abused its discretion when denying him authorization to sue Virginia Cooper. Frerichs erroneously argues that Spokane County Superior Court lacks venue for a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claim. Frerichs then oddly argues that the existence of federal jurisdiction renders his state court filing non-abusive. He further asserts that the superior court erred when dismissing the suit because

his claims involve personal injury, defamation, reputational harm, and property loss.

Frerichs did not assign error to the sanctions imposed.

We review a trial court's decision to restrict a litigant's access to the courts for abuse of discretion. *Bay v. Jensen*, 147 Wn. App. 641, 657, 196 P.3d 753 (2008). A court abuses its discretion when its ruling rests on untenable grounds or is made for untenable reasons. *Marriage of Littlefield*, 133 Wn.2d 39, 46-47, 940 P.2d 1362 (1997). The superior court did not act unreasonably when it ruled that Jared Frerichs filed suit as part of a broader pattern of abusive litigation rooted in domestic violence.

The Abusive Litigation Act (ALA) of 2020 authorizes trial courts to impose prefiling restrictions on parties who engage in abusive litigation. RCW 26.51.020(1)(a) considers "abusive litigation" as:

(a)(i) The opposing parties have a current or former intimate partner relationship;

(ii) The party who is filing, initiating, advancing, or continuing the litigation has been found by a court to have committed domestic violence against the other party pursuant to: (A) An order entered under chapter 7.105 RCW or former chapter 26.50 RCW; (B) a parenting plan with restrictions based on RCW 26.09.191(2)(a)(iii); or (C) a restraining order entered under chapter 26.09, 26.26A, or 26.26B RCW, provided that the issuing court made a specific finding that the restraining order was necessary due to domestic violence; and

(iii) The litigation is being initiated, advanced, or continued primarily for the purpose of harassing, intimidating, or maintaining contact with the other party.

In 2023, the superior court found that Jared Frerichs had, (1) committed domestic violence against Virginia Cooper, (2) engaged in abusive litigation, and (3) had previously been sanctioned for filing pleadings deemed frivolous, vexatious, or made in bad faith. As a result, the court prohibited Frerichs from “filing, initiating, advancing, or continuing litigation against [Cooper] under any cause number” without first obtaining court approval. CP at 17. This order falls within the authority granted by the ALA.

Under RCW 26.51.070(3)(a), a person subject to a prefiling order must seek authorization from the issuing judicial officer before initiating any new litigation against the protected party. If the judicial officer determines that the proposed action would constitute abusive litigation, the court must deny authorization. RCW 26.51.070(c)(i).

Legal scholars have documented how abusers exploit the legal system to exert control over survivors of domestic violence. As one commentator explains, abusers often disguise themselves as victims in court filings, make false reports to child welfare and licensing agencies, and flood courts with excessive or frivolous pleadings designed to overwhelm, intimidate, and financially burden survivors and their counsel. Ashley Beeman, *The Need for More States to Adopt Specific Legislation Addressing Abusive Use of Litigation in Intimate Partner Violence*, 20 Seattle Just. for Soc. Just. 825, 832 (2022).

In his reply brief, Jared Frerichs attempts to challenge the 2023 order that declared him an abusive litigator. He maintains that the 2023 court denied him a full evidentiary

hearing required under RCW 26.51.040. Frerichs also asserts that ALA protects only “authentic victims” and Virginia Cooper obtained the order through material misrepresentations. CP at 3. Finally, he contends that the 2023 order unlawfully denied him access to the courts.

Jared Frerichs did not raise these arguments in his opening brief. This court does not consider contentions raised for the first time in a reply brief. *Marriage of Sacco*, 114 Wn.2d 1, 5, 784 P.2d 1266 (1990). Moreover, Frerichs failed to appeal the 2023 order after its entry and cannot now mount a collateral challenge.

Attorney Fees


Virginia Cooper seeks sanctions and attorney fees incurred on appeal under CR 11 and RCW 26.51.060(2)(b). Under RAP 18.1, a party may recover reasonable attorney fees on appeal when authorized by contract, statute, or a recognized equitable basis, and the party substantially prevails. *Superior Court Judges v. Killian*, 195 Wn.2d 350, 363, 459 P.3d 1082 (2020). The ALA expressly permits an award of attorney fees and costs. RCW 26.51.060(2)(b). Because Cooper has prevailed on appeal, we grant her request for attorney fees and costs.

CONCLUSION


We affirm the superior court’s dismissal of Jared Frerichs’ suit. We award Virginia Cooper reasonable attorney fees and costs incurred on appeal.


No. 40552-4-III
Frerichs v Cooper

A majority of the panel has determined this opinion will not be printed in the Washington Appellate Reports, but it will be filed for public record pursuant to RCW 2.06.040.


Fearing, J.

WE CONCUR:


Murphy, J.


Staab, A.C.J.

Tristen L. Worthen
Clerk/Administrator

(509) 456-3082
TDD #1-800-833-6388

*The Court of Appeals
of the
State of Washington
Division III*



500 N Cedar ST
Spokane, WA 99201-1905

Fax (509) 456-4288
<http://www.courts.wa.gov/courts>

August 14, 2025

Jared A Frerichs
2924 E Baldwin Avenue
Spokane, WA 99207
E-mail

Evan C. Dobbs
Allen Fischer
510 W Riverside Ave Ste 600
Spokane, WA 99201-0515
E-mail

CASE # 405524
Jared A. Frerichs v. Virginia R. Cooper
SPOKANE COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT No. 2320385732

Counsel and Appellant:

Enclosed please find a copy of the opinion filed by the court today.

A party need not file a motion for reconsideration as a prerequisite to discretionary review of this decision by the Washington Supreme Court. RAP 13.3(b), 13.4(a). If a motion for reconsideration is filed, it should state with particularity the points of law or fact that the moving party contends this court has overlooked or misapprehended, together with a brief argument on the points raised. RAP 12.4(c). Motions for reconsideration that merely reargue the case should not be filed.

Motions for reconsideration, if any, must be filed within twenty (20) days after the filing of a decision. RAP 12.4(b). Please file the motion electronically through this court's e-filing portal. If no motion for reconsideration is filed, any petition for review to the Supreme Court must be filed in this court within thirty (30) days after the filing of the decision (should also be filed electronically). RAP 13.4(a). The motion for

reconsideration and petition for review must be received by this court on or before the dates each is due. RAP 18.5(c).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Tristen L. Worthen".

Tristen L. Worthen
Clerk/Administrator

TLW:lmn

Enc.

c: **E-mail** Honorable Jeremy T. Schmidt