

1210-90

MAR 19 REC'D

[REDACTED]
North Bend, Wash. 98045
March 14, 1990

APR 18 ANS'D

Dear C Span,

In Washington State Courts as well as in our Federal Courts there is no way We, The People can take a civil matter to trial and be assured that judges will preserve our Constitutionally protected and guaranteed "inviolable" Rights to a jury trial.

This is because our Washington State and Federal judges "under color of the law, their identicle "waiver" law, CR 38, was made by them without Constitutional authorization to give themselves permission to say Citizens "waived" their Rights on the mere assumption of words and signatures from others, rather than judges seeking evidence from the original Citizen who holds those "inviolable" Constitutionally protected Rights. As you will see from my enclosed evidence this innocent looking CR 38 is nothing more than a scape goat Rule enabling judges to an excuse to fictionally waive Citizens "inviolable" Rights, "under color of the law" without even affording Citizens their Federal Due Process or Congressional 42 USCS 1983 protections to their "inviolable" Right to a jury trial. Ironically the "inviolable" Right to jury trial is the very Right that our Constitutional forefathers warned must be kept "inviolable" from judges so the We, The People can protect ourselves from judges abuse.

Although our Washington State and Federal Constitution dictate to our employee judges that both civil and criminal litigants have an "inviolable" Right to a jury trial, the identicle Court Rules which both Washington State and Federal Judges made up and use for criminal proceedings are so different from their identicle civil proceedings that only the criminal litigants Court Rule proceedings actually preserve Citizens "inviolable" Rights from an "assumed" waiver.

HISTORY - Uncontested by judges and supported by my attorney and my affidavits and public Court Documents.

March of 1982 Before I could take The Weyerhaeuser Corporation to court on charges of [REDACTED] the Weyerhaeuser Corporation was mysteriously set as a non-jury trial without my physical presence, knowledge, consent, or even authoritative signature. Who gave ANY judge the authority to set my case as a non-jury without my specific signature or other form of personal knowledge of my authorization?

Aug. 25, 1982. Immediately after I found out my Weyerhaeuser case had been set for non-jury trial without my physical presence, knowledge, consent, or even authoritative signature, my attorney filed my first pre-trial Motion for my State Established "inviolable" Rights to a jury trial. This was months before any non-jury pre-trial work commenced. That Motion was denied Aug. 25, 1982 without any reason discussed.

Nov. 10, 1982 I was permitted to amend my [redacted] case to add new causes of action, changing my complaint from [redacted] thereby reviving my State Established "inviolable" right to a jury trial. Government officials recognize in writing that I had indeed revived my State Established Right.

After November 10, 1982, but sometime (unknown to this day) before government officials November 24, 1982 response to my attorneys second motion for my State Established Rights, my case was again mysteriously set as a non-jury trial without my physical presence, knowledge, consent, or even authoritative signature. Again this was months before any pre-trial work had commenced that my second motion for my State Established Rights were denied.

Nov. 22, 1983 After I became frustrated in getting my State Established Rights through my original attorney I hired new attorneys who filed a third jury Trial pre-trial motion. That motion was also denied. (\$50.00 jury fee still held.)

April 27, 1987, [redacted], Washington Supreme Court Justices had a "En Banc" decision where they accused me two times within the Same Washington State lawsuit of "waiving" my State Established Rights through their interpretation of their Federaly adopted CR 38 even though they had no evidence, and mentioned no assumed evidence to support their accusations.

March 9, 1988, [redacted]. Federal District Court Judge admitted I had Stated a Federal Claim and Question, but took away my U.S Constitutional 7th Amendment demand, substituted himself, and dismissed my case on judges immunity through their (and his) "discretionary powers". With no facts to weigh how can judges create a discretionary act? With no facts revealed in the Judges decision that a citizen committed a waiver act, how can a citizen know how they "waived" their Rights? Most importantly why was I denied my US Constitutional 7th Amendment "Inviolable" right to answer my Federal Question and Complaint? Because the abuse of a Court Rule on eliminating a Citizens Right to a jury can not be determined by a jury?

June 22, 1989, [redacted] Federal Appellate Court Judges filed notice to dismiss my oral argument. Recently I have written and called asking what the status of my case is. To this date, which if you compare latter court case numbers to my case number you will find my case is long overdue, I have not heard from my Federal Appellate Court. I do not know why, after nine years of

consistantly demanding my State Established "inviolate" Rights why I have not gotten an explanation with common sence why I can not have my Rights back from We, The People's government employees. Could it be that our Judiciary only considers Federal Due Process and Congressional 42 USCS 1983 protections to laws that do not restrict the authority they gave themselves?

A Very Concerned Citizen

PS I have written to my State and Federal Legisltatures about this. What few did answer only told me I have a legal problem and to go hire a lawyer. Who runs our country? Our lawyers or We, The People?