

FILED
AUG 30 1999
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

BEFORE THE COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT
OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

In Re the Matter of) CJC No. 98-2785-F-77
The Honorable Grant L. Anderson,) ANSWER
Pierce County Superior Court)

COMES NOW, The Honorable Grant L. Anderson answering the Statement of
Charges filed on August 9, 1999.

1. Paragraphs 1 and 2 relating to part I. Judicial Service are admitted.
2. Except as specifically admitted below, Paragraphs 3 through 9 of part II. Facts, are denied.
3. Paragraph 10 of part III. Prior CJC Disciplinary Action is admitted.
4. Paragraph 1 of part IV. Statement of Allegations is admitted.
5. Paragraphs 2 and 3 of part V. Probable Cause are denied.

A. ALLEGATION OF FALSE TESTIMONY

In response to the allegation that he testified falsely in the prior Commission proceedings Judge Anderson acknowledges that he testified in those proceedings but denies that he testified falsely. The issue of the rental payments had not been an issue in the those proceedings. The payments only came up as an aside during the review of an accounting sheet on an entirely different issue. Judge Anderson had never been asked about this before by the Commission and he had not been asked to review the documents in connection with the rent.

ANSWER
Page 1

1 When asked about the rent he specifically couched his answers in indefinite terms such as
2 what his understanding was and to the best of his knowledge.
3

4 Judge Anderson testified to the best of his knowledge at the time he was asked the
5 questions. The Commission has no evidence and can produce no evidence that he
6 intentionally told an untruth as opposed to simply being mistaken. Allegations of perjury
7 cannot be proven by circumstantial evidence nor by inference. There must be direct evidence
8 that he knowingly and intentionally testified falsely about these minor events which had
9 occurred many years before. There is no such evidence because he did not do so.
10

11 The allegation of false testimony is not true and should be dismissed.

12 B. ALLEGATION OF ALLEGED BACKDATED LEASE ADDENDUM

13 The Commission baldly asserts that a rental increase for Pacific Lanes was
14 accomplished through a document entitled "Addendum to the Lease." This is not correct. The
15 rental increase was accomplished by the accountants telling Judge Anderson that the \$12,000
16 was the right amount to charge for the rent. The "Addendum" was nothing more than the
17 documentation of the increase.
18

19 As to the so-called "backdating" of the "Addendum" - there is no proof, and the
20 Commission is aware there is no proof, that Judge Anderson ever knowingly participated in or
21 directed any such action.
22

23 As the Commission acknowledges, the document was prepared by a legal assistant.
24 Judge Anderson believes that the accountant told him that the rent needed to be increased and
25 that consistent with his usual practice he made some sort of informal notation to that effect in
26 the file or corporate minute book. At some point the records were being formally prepared and
27 the "Addendum" was prepared by the legal assistant to that effect. The dates on the
28

1 "Addendum" was almost certainly a product of the legal assistant looking at the date on the
2 informal notation about the rental increase and using that as the operative date for the
3 increase. Judge Anderson signed the document presented to him. The handwriting on the
4 document showing dates is not his and it is highly likely that the dates were not even noted on
5 the addendum at the time he signed it.
6

7 The Commission's position on this is that Judge Anderson intentionally signed a
8 "backdated" document so as to achieve some sort of tax advantage for the Pacific Lanes.
9 Judge Anderson had no personal interest in Pacific Lanes and it made no difference to his
10 compensation as to whether or not the alleged tax advantage was obtained or not. The
11 Commission is well aware that no actual cash exchanged hands between Pacific Lanes and
12 Hoffman-Stevenson (although Judge Anderson was not aware of this until the time of the
13 prior Commission hearings). If it had been agreed, as Judge Anderson believes it was, that the
14 rental rate would be increased then when the notation was actually made in the books was not
15 crucial. It would be entirely consistent with reasonable business practices for the agreement to
16 raise the rents to have been made in 1989 but for the paperwork reflecting that change to not
17 been formally prepared until the tax advisors were preparing the tax returns which would have
18 been in about March, 1990.
19
20
21

22 Judge Anderson is not and never has been sophisticated about tax and accounting
23 matters. He looked to and relied upon professionals for these services. He relied upon them to
24 properly prepare the accounting records and he relied upon them to properly prepare the tax
25 returns. If there are errors or mistakes in these records and returns Judge Anderson is not
26 aware of them, did not direct them to be made and did not have anything to be gained by
27 having them made.
28

ANSWER
Page 3

1 The allegation of improperly having backdated a lease addendum is not true and
2
3 should be dismissed.

4 C. ALLEGATION OF FALSE POLICE REPORT

5 The Commission also asserts that Judge Anderson caused a false police report to be
6
7 filed with the Tacoma Police Department. First, it must be noted that the Commission is less
8
9 than candid in its charges about why the charges were dismissed against Mr. Santos. They
10
11 assert they were dismissed "in the interest of justice." In fact the charges were dismissed only
12
13 because his girlfriend provided a last minute alibi.

14 This matter involves the Anna Allotta Estate. Anna Allotta had two sons - Tiny and
15
16 Sam. Sam had a daughter, Jennifer. At the relevant times, Jennifer had a boyfriend - Mr.
17
18 Santos.

19 Judge Anderson met Anna Allotta initially when he and Sam Allotta had first become
20
21 acquaintances in the 1960's. He knew her and occasionally saw her over the years. Judge
22
23 Anderson does not remember the circumstances but in 1988 he was asked to prepare a will for
24
25 her. He does remember meeting with her at least once, alone at his office. He prepared the will
26
27 but feels that it is very likely that the unsigned original was delivered to someone to take to
28
29 Anna to be signed and witnessed.

30 It was apparently signed and witnessed on June 29, 1988. The witnesses were Jennifer
31
32 Allotta and Santos. (It is also possible that Jennifer and Santos signed the will after Anna's
33
34 death because it looked like Jennifer was going to get some of her grandmother's estate.)
35
36 Judge Anderson believes that he was not present for the signing as he is unlikely to have had
37
38 Jennifer as a witness since she was a partial beneficiary. He also was aware that Sam would
39
40 not have liked having his mother's will witnessed by Santos.

ANSWER

Page 4

1 The will named Sam Allotta as personal representative and Judge Anderson as
2 alternate personal representative. The will provided for some specific bequests to Jennifer and
3 other family members but the majority of the assets were divided into two separate equal
4 trusts, one for Tiny Allotta and one for Sam Allotta. The trust established for Tiny was a
5 special needs trust. The trust established for Sam provided that upon Sam's death any
6 remaining portion of Sam's trust would be distributed to the special needs trust for Tiny.
7
8 Judge Anderson was to be the trustee for the trusts.
9

10 On July 2, 1988, within days of when she apparently signed her will, Anna died. Sam,
11 the personal representative, did not open an estate. Judge Anderson recalls asking Sam more
12 than once about the will and being told that it could not be found. Sam was somewhat evasive
13 about the whole thing. The reason for this would become apparent later when Judge Anderson
14 opened Anna's estate after Sam died. It is clear that Sam treated Anna's estate's assets as his
15 personal assets. He would have been restrained from doing so if the trusts envisioned by the
16 will had been set up. It should be noted, however, that he also took very good care of Tiny.
17

18 Sam moved into Anna's house and took over caring for Tiny with the help of family
19 members including Nick and Diana Iacobazzi. Diana Iacobazzi is Anna's sister.
20

21 Sam died on September 25, 1989. The Iacobazzis immediately moved Tiny into their
22 home. Anna's will was located in the house and was delivered to Judge Anderson. Pursuant to
23 its provisions probate proceedings on Anna's estate were filed on October 10, 1989. Prior to
24 that Judge Anderson took steps to marshal and secure the property of the estate and to make
25 sure that Tiny was okay.
26

27 These events occurred over nine years ago but as best as Judge Anderson can recall the
28 following occurred. At some point Nick Iacobazzi (Iacobazzi) told Judge Anderson that very

ANSWER

Page 5

1 shortly after Sam's death he had seen Santos at the house and that Santos had run from the
2 house when he saw Iacobazzi. Judge Anderson recalls wondering how Santos could have
3 gotten in the house since Iacobazzi was supposed to have the only keys. Judge Anderson and
4 Iacobazzi visited the house together. At that point either Judge Anderson noticed or Iacobazzi
5 pointed out that a window had been pried open and they discussed that this must have been
6 how Santos got in the house.
7

8
9 Some items that Judge Anderson expected to be in the house were missing,
10 specifically a Rolex watch and an unusual ring. Jennifer told Judge Anderson that Santos had
11 taken items from the house. Arrangements were made for Judge Anderson to pick up the
12 items. Judge Anderson then met with Santos and Santos told him that he had taken the items
13 from the house. Santos delivered a shotgun, a jar of coins and three watches.
14

15 Judge Anderson did not know whether Santos had stolen the items but it certainly
16 looked like it to him. What he did know was that there was a pried open window in the house,
17 items were missing from the house, that Iacobazzi had told him that he had seen Santos run
18 from the house, that Jennifer told him that Santos had taken items from the house, that Santos
19 had said he had taken items from the house and had delivered items from the house to Judge
20 Anderson. Judge Anderson reported what he knew and had been told to the police because it
21 was the right thing to do, because other valuable items were also missing and because there
22 would need to be a police report in the event an insurance claim needed to be filed.
23

24 Judge Anderson gave his oral report to the police, apparently on October 12, 1989. He
25 does not recall being shown the police report and it does not appear that he was asked to sign
26 it. The report is the police officer's interpretation of what Judge Anderson was saying,
27 contains at least one clear error and has information not provided by Judge Anderson. The
28

1 report incorrectly reports that Judge Anderson was executor for Sam's estate. Judge Anderson
2 would have had no way of knowing that Santos had an extensive criminal history, had been
3 arrested on October 10, 1989, two days before the report, and was a convicted felon on 10
4 years suspended sentence for burglary.
5

6 The police apparently turned the matter over to the prosecuting attorney. Charges were
7 filed October 31, 1989. Amended Charges were filed November 16, 1989. Amended Charges
8 were again filed on February 8, 1990. The case was set for trial on March 12, 1990.
9

10 On the day of trial, almost four and one-half months after the charges were first filed,
11 Jennifer appeared and testified on behalf of her boyfriend and the father of her children. If
12 convicted Santos, having had at least one prior conviction for burglary, faced extremely
13 serious consequences. In a pattern familiar in criminal and domestic violence matters, she
14 provided Santos with a defense. Jennifer asserted that she had been with Santos in the house
15 and had given Santos permission to remove the items. As a result the charges were dismissed.
16 The Commission has a copy of the transcript of the dismissal hearing and is well aware of this
17 history.
18

19 Judge Anderson did not file or cause to be filed a false police report, all he did was tell
20 the police what he had been told including that Mr. Santos did indeed have in his possession
21 items which had been removed from the house.
22

23 Judge Anderson has been prejudiced by the passage of well over nine years since these
24 events took place. He no longer knows exactly what he told the police. He does not believe
25 that he ever saw the police report until it surfaced in this matter. It is probably generally
26 accurate as to what he told the police but it is no longer possible to determine if the use of
27 vocabulary selected by the police officer to characterize the events are the words of the police
28

ANSWER
Page 7

1 officer or the words of Judge Anderson. Judge Anderson does know that he has never filed a
2 false police report - all he did was tell the police what he understood to have happened. At that
3 point it was in the police and prosecutor's hands.
4

5 Santos admits that he had been to the house and that he took items. The only question
6 is whether he did so with or without permission. Santos is totally without any credibility, he is
7 a convicted felon who had to do everything he could to avoid another burglary conviction. He
8 apparently hates Judge Anderson. He is a con man who has suddenly developed an heretofore
9 non-apparent interest in Tiny's welfare. We believe that he has hopes of preying on Tiny in
10 the event Tiny should come into additional funds.
11

12 His defense that he had permission to be in the house is not credible. Santos was
13 apparently on a suspended sentence for burglary at the time he was charged with burglarizing
14 Anna's house. If he had really had Jennifer's permission to be there does it make any sense at
15 all that he would wait until the day of trial several months later to make such assertion? What
16 any innocent person would have done when served with a criminal complaint is to have
17 immediately said - "Wait a minute, this is all wrong. I had permission to be in the house and
18 here is the person who gave me that permission." But, of course, that did not happen. Far and
19 away, the most likely scenario is that Jennifer had not given him permission and was not
20 willing to lie for him until he put pressure on her shortly before trial. The complaint against
21 Santos had been amended in February, 1989 from RCW 9A.52.030(1) - Second degree
22 burglary, a class B felony - to RCW 9A.52.020(1)(a) - Burglary in the first degree armed with
23 a deadly weapon, a class A felony. The stakes had increased considerably for Santos. Only
24 after this did Jennifer appear on the scene and say she had given him permission to be in the
25 house.
26
27
28

1 Santos obviously played to Jennifer's affection for him and we believe would have
2 pointed out that if he took the fall on another conviction he was going to be gone for a very
3 long time. She would lose him personally as well lose support for their children.
4

5 The problem with lies are that they are hard to keep straight, particularly when they are
6 based on a conspiracy between two people. The Commission's case is based in large part upon
7 declarations prepared by Attorney Douglas Schafer, a public and vocal critic of Judge
8 Anderson.
9

10 When the Schafer declarations were prepared neither he nor Santos had the transcript
11 of what Jennifer had said at the hearing in 1990. At that hearing she expressly stated that she
12 went with Santos to the house. Yet in 1998 Santos makes it clear in his declaration that he
13 went to Anna's home by himself, albeit while asserting that he had Jennifer's permission to do
14 so. If in fact he had gone with Jennifer he would have stated that in his declaration in order to
15 give himself the maximum amount of "credibility." But he had not gone with Jennifer nor did
16 he have her permission. He went by himself and went into the house and stole the items.
17 When trying, years later, to remember what happened, what he remembered was much closer
18 to the truth about going to house then the story he and Jennifer had cooked up years before to
19 get the charges dismissed.
20
21

22 Jennifer adopts Santos' declaration. This is unconvincing and is at odds with her prior
23 statements on the record. Furthermore, we believe Schafer has told her that she can get money
24 from Judge Anderson.
25

26 The remaining "proof" relied upon by the Commission is Nick Iacobazzi's declaration.
27 Mr. Iacobazzi is a decent person who has always had Tiny's best interests at heart. His
28 declaration seeks to reconstruct years after they happened conversations he had with Judge

1 Anderson but that declaration has been filtered and influenced by Schafer. Schafer will do
2 anything he can to get Judge Anderson. He recently wrote to another lawyer in connection
3 with the Hoffman estate:
4

5 Forgive me if I get too emotional about such antiquated concepts as "truth,"
6 "justice," and "morality," but I think about "the Judge" every day, and being
7 able to periodically vent in this manner perhaps keeps me from acting out my
8 "vigilante justice" fantasies. It is possible to get somewhat unstable when the
9 trusted public institutions (the judiciary and its disciplinary system, the bar and
10 its disciplinary system, law enforcement and prosecutorial officials, public
11 interest journalists) that one has believed in for decades have been shown to be
12 virtually worthless - with no one else seeming to notice or to care.

13 This demonstrates, in Schafer's own words, the level of desperation he feels in his quest to
14 ruin Judge Anderson.
15

16 There is further reason to look at anything generated by Schafer with suspicion. An
17 attorney for the Bar Association, in a recent report about Schafer to other bar officials,
18 summarizes the history of Schafer's "investigation" of Judge Anderson, noting that it began
19 after rulings made by Judge Anderson which were adverse to Schafer's personal interests. The
20 report notes the Schafer's motives for taking certain actions were to "expose" Judge Anderson
21 and notes the following:

22 We believe that a clear preponderance of the evidence establishes that lawyer
23 Schafer was untruthful to third persons in the course of representing his client,
24 in violation of his ethical duty. The circumstances surrounding the
25 investigation suggest that the falsehoods were knowingly offered and not the
26 result of mistake or simple negligence.

27 Why is this relevant at this these CJC proceedings? They are relevant because Schafer
28 has substantially and permanently polluted the waters in regards to already ancient memories
of what happened back in 1989. Unless he tape recorded his conversations with Iacobazzi and
others we will never be able to know how much of the recollections are "true" recollections

1 and how many are the product of Schafer's attempt to get "vigilante justice" or are the product
2 of intentional falsehoods made to "expose" Judge Anderson.
3

4 Iacobazzi says that he never saw Santos alone in the house yet we know that Santos,
5 by his own statements, was alone at the house on at least one occasion. We suggest that it is
6 highly plausible that Santos was alone at the house and was leaving when Iacobazzi was
7 arriving. Iacobazzi probably saw Santos getting into his car and leaving. The police report
8 does not say that Iacobazzi was supposed to have seen Santos stealing anything nor that he
9 saw Santos taking anything. It seems very likely that Santos was at the house getting things
10 and that Iacobazzi saw Santos leaving and that Iacobazzi told Judge Anderson this. However,
11 since Iacobazzi did not see Santos taking anything it would have been a passing moment and
12 not one which he is likely to have remembered years later. If he had told Judge Anderson that
13 he saw Santos stealing items he might very well have remembered this but if the police report
14 is to be believed he did not do so.
15
16

17 Iacobazzi says he was unaware of the prosecution against Santos. If this is a correct
18 memory, then it is even more likely that his memory of whether or not he saw Santos
19 momentarily at the house is unreliable. Is it really very likely that years later he recalls with
20 the precision represented in his Schafer drafted declaration whether or not he saw Santos
21 leaving the house and told Judge Anderson this? What is far more likely is that his declaration
22 is the product of his having been "assisted" by others who had a preconceived position they
23 wanted him to adopt and that he was lead to the position taken in his declaration rather than
24 being the true product of an actual memory.
25
26

27 The allegation in this matter is that Judge Anderson is supposed to have decided that
28 Santos was not good for Jennifer and so to have set out on a conspiracy to arrange for Santos

1 to be arrested and charged with a crime. In order to further his alleged scheme to separate
2 Jennifer, a person he hardly knew, from her boyfriend and the father of her children, Judge
3 Anderson is supposed to have gone to the police and trumped up charges. In these trumped up
4 charges he is supposed to have made false representations about what persons had said to him.
5 These were persons who were a simple phone call away from the police and prosecutors. If
6 Judge Anderson had wanted to "get" Santos wouldn't it make much more sense for him to tell
7 a lie that he saw Santos running from the house rather than to make up a lie that would rely
8 upon another to confirm?
9

11 This entire allegation is bogus and is based on the vindictive actions of Santos and
12 Schafer. The police report is the unreliable hearsay of a police officer's understanding of what
13 Judge Anderson was telling him. There is nothing which establishes that it is an intrinsically
14 reliable document and it is factually wrong in at least one instance. The police have also added
15 their own information to the report, including the information that Santos had been picked up
16 for burglary 2 days before the report. There is no way of knowing, at this late date, if the
17 police officer heard Judge Anderson correctly or simply translated what he heard into his own
18 version of the story. Jennifer and Santos are completely unreliable. Jacobazzi is a nice person
19 who is being asked to remember extremely minor events from years ago. He is being used by
20 Santos and Schafer in their personal vendettas against Judge Anderson. It is being suggested
21 that Judge Anderson, out of a desire to somehow separate Santos from a person Judge
22 Anderson barely knew, had the time and inclination to make false statements, the truth of
23 which could clearly be confirmed. The supposed motive is ridiculous.
24

25 The allegations concerning a false police report are not true and should be dismissed.
26
27
28

1 D. ALLEGATION OF A BACKDATED ESTATE INVENTORY

2
3 Finally, the Commission accuses Judge Anderson of filing a backdated inventory in
4 the Hoffman-Stevenson estate. It does not assert why he would do this. There is nothing in the
5 inventory itself which is not accurate nor does the Commission assert there was. The
6 Commission has interviewed the persons involved in this matter and is well aware that the
7 information concerning the alleged backdated inventory is incomplete and that it cannot
8 possibly meet the standard of proof required to show that Judge Anderson knowingly or
9 intentionally filed a backdated inventory.
10

11 This relates to matters in the 1989 - 1993 period. There is simply no way to know
12 exactly what happened but here is what we think happened: On or about September 26, 1989 a
13 preliminary estate inventory was prepared and on November 8, 1989 Judge Anderson signed
14 one. There are time records, which the Commission has but ignores in its charges, showing
15 the preparation of the preliminary inventory and showing that Judge Anderson was in the
16 office on November 8, 1989 working on estate accounting matters. The preliminary inventory
17 was probably notarized at that time.
18

19 We believe that on or about November 5, 1992, as the estate was being wrapped up,
20 someone went to look for the inventory. It was enough of a process that the assistant found it
21 noteworthy to put a reference in the time records of a "review of file to locate inventory."
22 Again the Commission has these time records but ignores them. The assistant probably could
23 not find the original which had been prepared three years before. At that point the assistant
24 would have gone to the computer and seen if the form was still on the computer. It probably
25 was and so printed out another one using the stationary of the firm as it existed in 1992. The
26
27
28

1 prior form would have had the November 8, 1989 date. The date on the form is part of the
2 typed document.
3

4 The document would then have been presented to Judge Anderson for signature. It is
5 highly unlikely that he would have paid any attention to a date typed in at the notary line of a
6 document presented to him by his legal assistant. He would simply have signed. It would then
7 have been notarized.
8

9 Judge Anderson did not direct, authorize or seek to have an improper 1989 date put on
10 the document. It would have made absolutely no difference as to what date was on the
11 inventory. There is no motive for him to "backdate" this document. There was no indication at
12 that time that there was any criticism of how that estate had been handled and even if there
13 had been the date on the inventory would have made no difference.
14

15 There is another possibility which is that if the original had been prepared and signed
16 on November 8, 1989 it is very likely that on that date Judge Anderson had indeed appeared
17 and signed it before Deleon. She is the one who ordinarily notarized his documents. If that is
18 so then the redone document is indeed correct and accurate. What stationary is used to set
19 forth the correct statement is irrelevant. It is also possible that the document is the original
20 from 1989 and that in November, 1989 a piece of stationary was used for the new firm which
21 was formally coming into existence on January 1, 1990. At some point they would have had
22 either samples or actual pieces of the new stationary. Mistakes do happen in an office and
23 possibly someone simply used the wrong piece of stationary in 1989. The time records in
24 1992 would then be for creating the inventory listing.
25
26
27
28

1 Any of these three options, or some other option, may have occurred. But in any case
2 there is no proof that Judge Anderson was aware of any of this and it is very unlikely that he
3 would have been.
4

5 A person who "falsely swears" must have express knowledge that it is false. There is
6 not negligent false swearing. The inventory is not false and the only thing that might be wrong
7 is the date on which it was signed. There is nothing to point to knowledge by Judge Anderson
8 as to what date was put into the notary field. Further, there is no evidence and none will be
9 found that Judge Anderson knowingly arranged to have an otherwise accurate document
10 backdated and then filed. There is no reason for him to do so.
11

12 This inventory was at the most an office mistake by the use of a form which already
13 existed in the computer and which was done by a staff person who was just trying to do a
14 good job. In all probability the original was finalized, generated and signed on November 8,
15 1989 and then lost. The "second" copy was then generated but which would still have been
16 accurate. There is nothing to show to the contrary.
17

18 It is incumbent upon the Commission to have more than speculation before a judge is
19 charged. That is all there is here - pure speculation as to what may have happened - based on
20 limited records from a very long time ago. There is no reason to attribute "evil" motives when
21 there is a valid explanation for what happened. This explanation is backed up with proof that
22 an inventory was prepared in September, 1989, that Judge Anderson was in the office on
23 November 8, 1989 working on estate matters and that shortly before the second copy of the
24 inventory was probably prepared that someone was spending time going through the file
25 searching for the inventory.
26
27
28

1 This allegation should be dismissed.

2
3 E. ADDITIONAL RESPONSE AND DEFENSES

4 1. These matters are barred by laches.

5 2. The Commission asserts that it did not have the relevant information at the time of the
6 prior proceedings against Judge Anderson although it had spent thousands of dollars
7 reviewing and copying virtually all the documents in the Hoffman Estate. It certainly did have
8 all information in regards to the Hoffman Estate prior to the first proceedings. All matters in
9 connection with that estate should have been finalized in that proceedings. It is a denial of due
10 process, equal protection and fundamental fairness to seek a "second bite at the apple" on
11 Judge Anderson in regards to the Hoffman Estate matters.

12
13 3. These proceedings were started against Judge Anderson after the Commission was aware
14 that he had been ordered removed from the bench by the State Supreme Court. Nonetheless,
15 the Commission felt the need to bring these proceedings. Such action is unnecessary and no
16 rationale has been presented as to why such action is needed under these circumstances. The
17 Commission's actions are counterproductive to the promotion of the integrity and standing of
18 the judiciary and can have no possible benefit since Judge Anderson has been ordered
19 removed from the bench. To have proceeded in the face of that order by the Supreme Court is
20 unbecoming of the Commission. These proceedings should be closed as unnecessary.
21
22

23 Dated this 30th day of August, 1999.

24
25
26 
27 Kurt M. Bulmer, WSBA No. 5559
28 Attorney for the Honorable Grant L. Anderson