

Judge Mary Kay Becker, condoned elder abuse by affirming perjury entered into evidence by Judge James A. Doerty. She ignored moral and ethical standards by affirming misconduct and denial of due process of law. She effectively became an accessory after the fact by condoning perjury and a conspiracy to cover up crimes. She justified both lawyer and judicial misconduct despite canons that require her to take disciplinary action. She arbitrarily ratified unlawful decisions. By that, she committed judicial misconduct. [*The Scab Family*]

Doerty handed down an indeterminate jail sentence with solitary confinement without benefit of legal counsel and abrogated court rules for discovery. He tried to cover up involvement in elder abuse and alleged homicide by Lynn, wife of Judge Anthony P. Wartnik, Washington Superior Court.

Does the electorate really want or need Jingo Mary Kay Becker, Court of Appeals, to sit on Washington Supreme Court after her recent cover up of judicial misconduct by James A. Doerty, Washington Superior Court, and elder abuse by directors and administrative staff at Council House, Seattle?

Jingoes commit all sorts of crimes using flag-waiving patriotism and judicial misconduct. They adopt kafkaesque principles - principles that include surreal distortion which has no place in a democracy.

Washington judiciary has created another epoch of Victorian despond. Ironically, the writings of Franz Kafka and Oscar Wilde precisely describe current archaic practices and decisions. Seattle justices have found that kafkaesque wigs fit them and wear them with pride. [*Ode to King County Jail*]

Becker has embraced the gross corruption that Franz Kafka questions in *The Trial*: “. . . how is it possible for the higher ranks to prevent gross corruption in their agents? It is impossible. Even the highest judge in [Court of Appeals] cannot resist it.”¹ [*The Trial*]

By joining the higher ranks, Becker has condoned the same practices criticized by Kafka. Instead, of dispensing kafkaesque justice she has committed and covered up the crimes which Kafka describes.

Journalists have not generally recognized the kafkaesque frame-ups based upon misuse of anti-harassment laws that have become a *modus de jure*. A recent spate of cases across the US has allowed criminals to make an end run around defamation laws under which they could not prevail. Mary Kay Becker and James A. Doerty rank as leading exponents of this abrogation of due process of law. [*Supreme Court - Petition for Review*]

Becker, by affirmation of trial court decisions, has granted criminals impunity and allowed them to remain anonymous. She has inappropriately allowed use of anti-harassment laws to obtain

multiple no-contact orders. Her decision prevents journalists meeting with their sources and falsely claims that traditional journalism interviews classify as surveillance, invasion of privacy, and violent harassment. Her affirmation of trial court decisions insures that law breakers affiliated with judges can remain anonymous and beyond investigation.

Moreover, Becker has condoned terror that Council House directors and administrative staff continue to wreak upon senior citizens - they created a climate of fear among people who have nowhere to go to obtain relief. Becker approved their neo-fascist strategies and allowed them to remain anonymous. She presently ranks as Seattle's leading jingo.

The terms "by Jiminy" and "by Jingo" have become synonymous with outrageous judicial behavior in Washington courts. Justices arouse pseudo-patriotic emotions based in fanaticism and fantasy. Like most jingoes, they use, aggressive, domineering policy to meet their political goals.

Jingoes (bellicose nationalists) have a ready disposition to dispute or disagree by causing controversy and denying debate. Combative, they strive to overcome argument without compromise. They rigorously support self-interest and self-aggrandizement. They make contentious decisions without applying applicable laws. They have a prejudiced belief in the superiority of their own kind. They show how powerful people get what they want through deception, distortion, judicial compromise, and demonizing their adversaries.

Paraphrasing another self-aggrandizing, neo-fascist jingo: Becker can run [for office] but she cannot hide [from her judicial misconduct]. Paraphrasing another self-aggrandizing, neo-fascist jingo: Becker can run [for office] but she cannot hide [from her judicial misconduct]. Both jingoes confirm the adage that patriotism defines as the last refuge of a scoundrel - that jingoistic judges and politicians can commit crimes with impunity under the pretext of public service. [*Impunity*]

In Court of Appeals, Becker has assumed the powers and responsibilities reserved for the legislature. Civil rules do not allow arbitrary denial of all allegations in a complaint. This especially applies when a complainant declares a readiness to verify allegations on oath. Her procrastination principles deny or postpone due process of law and her kill-the-messenger techniques delay justice. She has adjudicated in a way that the law proscribes.

The electorate invariably makes allowances for exaggeration in campaign claims and promises by politicians. However, a more careful examination of claims made by judges seems appropriate. The electorate must hold them to a higher standard than run-of-the-mill politicians. A close examination of Becker's campaign claims exposed severe anomalies and credential distortion. Her campaign manager ignored questions about her background three times. This automatically aroused suspicion in light of her recent outrageous, politically motivated opinion covered in depth by other articles published on this web site. [*Supreme Court - Petition for Review*]

Mary Kay Becker claims that: "She was born in Aberdeen, Washington, and grew up at her family's ocean resort . . . on the Olympic Peninsula at Kalaloch, pumping gas and waiting tables

. . . " That part checks out - she came from an affluent background. Very little else makes sense. The much vaunted "pumping gas and waiting tables" statement gives the impression of a trailer kid from West Virginia struggling to make a living. It does not properly describe the daughter of an affluent resort owner fulfilling her family duty. Nor does it sit well when one learns that her parents could afford to send her to Stanford University instead of a state college. However, that political rhetoric only precedes more serious distortions.

Becker claimed to have graduated with honors from Stanford University with a "BA English with distinction" (1966). Stanford did not respond to a request for verification and validation - a procedure universally accepted in the academe. Instead, they referred inquirers to an agency that requires personal information and approval by students before validating academic claims.

Several universities have adopted this system in attempts to comply with federal privacy regulations. However, they normally release directory information that confirms or denies the existence of a degree. Unfortunately, this privacy (secrecy) and risk management by some universities has allowed many former students to exaggerate their credentials without fear of discovery.

Becker's campaign manager ignored three requests to:

Please validate the following claim to a degree by Mary Kay Becker. Furnish directory information about her major and written proof of the degree and the distinction that she claims: "Stanford University, graduating with distinction in 1966." Alternatively, provide date of birth and written authorization addressed to National Student Clearinghouse [allowing them] to release relevant information. Also her claim to have worked as a VISTA volunteer needs validation.

Becker claims that she has an honors degree as an English major from Stanford and an "identical" degree with a similar major from Western Washington University (WWU) granted four years later. Degrees from departments of education in state colleges rank at the lowest level in the academic pecking order. Why would anyone spend four years (and pay one of the highest tuition rates in the US) to obtain a prestigious Stanford degree then spend another four years obtaining an inferior degree with a similar major from a state college?

What occupied her time during four years in the late 1960s when she lived in the San Francisco Bay Area? Why did she spend another four years at a Washington state college to obtain an "identical" degree? Did she inhale?

A judge seeking a seat on the highest court in the state of Washington must answer these questions and substantiate her claims. Moreover, an education baccalaureate degree with a major in English does not classify as a teaching degree as Becker claims (except at an elementary level).

But, wait a minute, Becker claims to have left Stanford (1966), moved to Bellingham (1969), then graduated with a four-year degree from Western Washington University (1970). One does not need to employ a historian to fathom out chronological discrepancies.

WWU registrar responded to an inquiry by stating: “Mary Kathryn Becker graduated (08 Aug 70) with a BA in Education, English”. An assistant to the registrar would neither verify nor validate the “teaching degree” that Becker claims she holds. Becker seeks election to the highest court in the state but fails to dispel anomalies in her campaign statements then creates even more suspicion when she claims that she has a “teaching degree”.

University of Washington confirmed that: “Mary Kay Becker attended the University of Washington (UW) and received a Juris Doctor (JD) with Honors in Law (27 Aug 1982)”. Again Becker gives the impression of indigence by stating that she: “worked her way through law school at the University of Washington”. In fact, she concurrently received a lucrative taxpayer-funded salary as a Washington State legislator (1974-82) and probably did not pay tuition as a legislator’s perk.

Becker has no more academic qualifications than any run-of-the-mill practicing attorney. Juris Doctor (JD) degrees, formerly known as LL.B. (Bachelor of Laws), do not qualify as post-graduate degrees. US universities changed the nomenclature to confer equivalent professional status to that found in other American professions.

US law schools typically award a JD after successfully completing three years of law study. Law schools usually require a 4-year undergraduate degree for eligibility for law school programs but not essentially. Some state bar associations in the US require a JD from a law school accredited by the American Bar Association (ABA) before they grant membership and the privilege of practicing law.

LL.M. (Master of Laws) classifies as the post-graduate degree possessed by law professors and many judges. Neither Becker nor Doerty holds that credential. Unfortunately, practice of law is regulated at state level in the US which allows political machination. Self-regulation amounts to virtually no regulation and permits a cover up of lawyer and judicial misconduct. [*The Scab Family*].

Becker claims competence as a First Amendment advocate. Her recent decision belies that claim and shows an abysmal ignorance of constitutional and state law. She also claims that her: “broad range of professional and personal experience means independence and competence on the bench”. She has shown everything but independence and competence.

Instead, Becker has shown extreme bias by acting as a consummate politician with virtually no understanding of justice. A legislator turned judge, she has reserved the powers and responsibilities that she had as a legislator and used them in addition to those granted to her as a judge. She has, in a consort with other judges, redefined legal interpretation and construction by merging them.

In a similar way, Becker has merged ethics and morals for political expediency. Consequently, she functions more as an out-of-control oligarch (sleazy politician) and plays for a team that draws its players from the Seattle jurisprudential cesspool. [*Bimbo Limbo*] [*Bimbo Bingo*]

Becker claims that her: “decision to run for Supreme Court presents voters with the opportunity to elect a justice with proven ability as an appellate judge, a record of integrity in high office.” She claims that her: “experience provides the broad perspective a Supreme Court justice needs for making the serious decisions that affect us all”. Her record shows the opposite, moreover, she does not possess the academic qualifications to achieve those goals.

Becker legislates from the bench in partisan fashion. In the primary election, Jim Johnson claimed to have more Supreme Court experience than all of his opponents combined and that he ranks as a constitutional law expert. He opposes Becker in the coming election and has recognized Becker’s failings by promising to “not legislate from the bench”.

Johnson received 214,168 votes (22.39%) compared with Becker 210,818 votes (22.04%) (04-1018-1151 PST) in the primary election. It seems that the electorate need exert very little effort to stop Becker from gaining election to the supreme court and to protect people who appear before her from future bias and abuse. [*Secretary of State*]

Lawyers have described Becker as politically expedient and intellectually dishonest. Others declared disgust with her appellate decisions. A woman recently implied victimization. She wrote:

Becker is a liberal woman who does not care about the law! . . . A lazy opinionated woman, who uses the judge's bench to promote her own beliefs instead of following the law.

In July 2003, Becker and Schindler and Kennedy [sic], refused to read a lengthy brief that was complicated - so instead they marked the case affirmed as is in all 12 points. The attorneys involved in the case were stunned, and felt betrayed by the judicial system and especially Becker who was supposed to be smart. In this one case - Becker took 24 million dollars from an educational fund and gave it to greedy and horribly dysfunctional couple who spend their lives cheating people. But Becker used her liberal power to hurt the "rich Guy" or so she thought.

Becker served in the Washington State Legislature for years as a very liberal Democrat and then pretends to be non partisan on the bench. She hates the business world, envies successful capitalists and does her best to take from the rich and give to the lazy as do most liberals.²

Becker’s campaign manager ignored a prepublication opportunity to respond to Lanterman’s statement,

Becker claims to have worked effectively to improve access to justice for everyone yet she has condoned SLAPP action and prior restraint. She says that she: “earned trust and respect as a legislator leading the way in sentencing reform” yet she condones unlawful jailing of journalists and elder abuse. She says that: “colleagues consistently choose her for leadership positions

because of her common sense and hard work” yet the record shows that her colleagues follow this belligerent broad like bleating sheep. [*Court of Appeals - Opinion*] [*Prior Restraint*]

Becker’s disingenuousness becomes even more apparent from her answers to questions put by Seattle Post-Intelligencer and League of Women Voters, *Voter’s Guide*. Her answers rank as either naïve, disingenuous, or blatantly hypocritical.

Q. What do you perceive as the greatest obstacles to justice, if any?

A. The expense of going to court is a factor for almost everyone. Individuals who are poor face the greatest obstacles. Washington’s progressive laws and capable judges are of no use to individuals who can’t get into court or who, in some cases, do not even know that legal remedies exist.

Nmesis. Becker condones use of Strategic Lawsuits Against Public Participation in Government (SLAPP) that deprive litigants of due process of law. The trial court, in a consort with Court of Appeals, has repeatedly manipulated *in forma pauperis* (indigent funding) to deny appellate hearings. [*Prior Restraint*]

Q. What is your vision for the future of our judicial system? What changes would you advocate and why?

A. Judges can promote diversity in the bar, the courts and the judiciary by encouraging young lawyers, hiring a diverse work force, and communicating with the public so as to be well informed about perceptions of problems with the courts.

Nmesis. Becker employed a young lawyer who had an unprofessional social relationship with her client and committed subornation, barratry,³ and other lawyer misconduct. That lawyer had a specific interest in the outcome of a case on appeal. Becker allowed her to attend oral argument in a case which resulted from her professional misconduct and has effectively granted her impunity and anonymity by affirmation. [*The Scab Family*]

Q. Do you believe the current system for disciplining lawyers and judges is effective? Why or why not?

A. I do believe it is effective. I served for several years as an alternate member of the State Commission on Judicial Conduct. The lay members of this commission are in the majority and add very useful perspectives in discussions about charges of judicial misconduct. The commissioners and their counterparts in the bar association take their jobs seriously and recognize the obligation of public accountability. While there will always be occasional controversy about a result in a particular case, in general I believe the investigations are appropriately thorough and the hearings are fair.

Nmesis. Becker became party to elder abuse by affirming lies that Council House placed on, and a trial court judge dredged from, the world wide web. That judge knowingly entered suborned testimony into the record and disallowed rebuttal. He created multiple paradoxes through not

following court rules for discovery and made unsubstantiated statements which amount to nothing more than harassment. By that, he repeatedly contravened rules of judicial procedure. Becker affirmed the suborned testimony and validated *ad hominem* attacks also unfounded accusations. She even repeated *ad hominem* in court during appellate oral argument. [*Bimbo Bingo*]

Neither *Seattle Post-Intelligencer* nor *League of Women Voters* has directly questioned the people affected by Becker's misconduct. This lack of an energized fourth estate gives abusers an advantage when the three branches of government neglect to insure due process of law. The case would probably not have reached the appellate court if journalists had properly investigated the facts instead of acting as court poodles.

Publishers, in particular, Roger Oglesby, *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*, and Lucy A. Dalglish, *The News Media and the Law* (RCFP), did not control renegade reporters, instead, they supported them by publishing malicious libel which echoed worldwide. They have yet to mitigate the damage.

Doerty assumed guilt of which his victim remained innocent then arrested and imprisoned him without probable cause. Extensive interviews with several jail inmates confirm that this ranks as normal practice in King County. A Seattle attorney aptly said in a moment of dudgeon: "This matter has now elevated beyond even First Amendment outrage it began as. This is a petty tyrant judge running amok with power and possibly trying to cover his tracks."

Several Seattle attorneys who have appeared before Doerty have described his delusion. They have variously described him as "running amok", "out- of-control", "unstable", "vicious", and "evil". Another Seattle lawyer, who claims to have appeared before him many times, says: "He does not strike one as having both oars in the water", yet Becker affirms his behavior. Becker apparently suffers from the same delusions as Doerty gauging by her kafkaesque opinion.

The following paragraphs paraphrase unsubstantiated statements placed on the record by Doerty and affirmed by Becker. Her affirmation opened the door to use of similar rhetoric:

This article is about a Bimbo named Mary Kay Becker - a mean, belligerent, old bitch from Bellingham who sits on the Washington Court of Appeals, Seattle.

She becomes vicious and threatening when she doesn't get her own way. She acts like a delusional wh-re who believes in her own fantasies about herself and her opinions. Full of conspiracy theories she exhibits a damaged personality.

She may have some difficulty modulating her behavior due to years of chronic, severe alcoholism that caused organic brain damage. She may also have had a drug problem during the 1960s.

Not being truly American, she has difficulty in understanding the basic principles of a federal republic. Her supreme court election campaign amounts to nothing more than the ranting of an anti-Semitic, misanthropic, and homophobic, self-aggrandizing jingo.

When she disagrees with anyone, she goes after them with a vengeance. No such thing exists in this world as disagreement with Mary Kay Becker. [*Bimbo Bingo*]

When one closely examines Becker's credentials and political affiliations one discovers misrepresentation and usurped, undeserved authority. The electorate has virtually no idea of the bizarre circumstances that exist, and the cultist behavior that they support, by paying exorbitant salaries to some judges. They do not make a connection between the more than \$100,000.00 annual salary paid to judges and the self-interest that it satisfies. The public remains unaware of the behavior supported by lifetime expenditure on taxes to which they commit themselves. They take no action and corruption continues unabated.

The self-evaluative judicial processes with contingent conspiracies of silence, and mutual condonation of wrongdoing, form a basis for the corruption itself. Such self-evaluative processes only give the appearance of propriety: they disclose nothing and perpetuate the problem. Must one overlook the abuse of a system by the few to give an appearance of propriety? Or, should one reveal what one knows in an endeavor to correct the inherent problem and give others the opportunity to avoid similar experiences? Hundreds of people responded negatively to the Doerty decision that Becker affirmed and an international furor still rages among journalists. [*Jiminy's Journal*]

Constitution of the United States, an instrument of government and supreme law, prescribes the nature, functions, and limits of government. It incorporates amendments that control a system of fundamental laws and principles that have embodied rights and marked fair legal process since 1789. Yet, Becker and Doerty, have consistently denied due process of law by abrogating constitutional rights. In particular, Doerty denied the right to: timely notice; prepare a defense; confront accusers; cross-examine witnesses; legal counsel; impartial and unbiased hearings; then Becker affirmed all his findings by general denial.

Becker affirmed Doerty's findings despite his constructive recusal in disgrace after he became internationally notorious. Both decisions now await review by Washington Supreme Court. Doerty wrote bigoted, subjective, contradictory opinions after reading articles on the Internet and prior to a hearing. He published them without a shred of evidence to support his contentions and denied refutation. Becker affirmed them anyway. These judges have provoked outrage and significant questions from journalists worldwide about rights to free speech and improper use of anti-harassment orders for prior restraint. [*Washington Supreme Court*] [*Court of Appeals*]

Becker follows a procrastination principle that denies or postpones due process of law. Doerty uses kill-the-messenger techniques that delay justice. They both abuse law meant to rectify unlawful practices and indulge in a pattern or practice of unethical behavior that the law proscribes. The public failed abysmally in its attempt to establish an honest judiciary when it elected Becker and Doerty to the bench.

Doerty, exceeded his level of incompetence after four months as a judge. He can never receive promotion to a higher level. Instead, through a lateral arabesque, colleagues moved him to another position with a longer title and less visibility. [*Lateral Arabesque*]

In the state court hierarchy, most judges tend to rise to a level of incompetence. This disturbs the electorate which knows that all state employees tend to rise to a level of incompetence. If they had competence then they would not work for the state. Instead, they would obtain gainful and lucrative employment in the practice of law.

Washington state retains several incompetent judges at each level who cannot carry out their duties satisfactorily. Promotion from one level of incompetence to another does not affect the principle but encourages pseudo-promotion or percussive sublimation - noisy status modification to a socially acceptable condition using political correctness.

Consequently, judges advance to their level of incompetence then gain promotion to a higher level of incompetence.⁴ In the case of Becker, Commission for Judicial Conduct (CJC) should remove her from the bench altogether for multiple counts of judicial misconduct probably brought about by a cover up of gross incompetence (or as Lanterman claims - laziness).

Becker has neither academic qualifications nor experience to fit her for the supreme court. If the electorate elevates her to that higher level of incompetence then it only has itself to blame for the outcome.

Washington Supreme Court must reverse lower court decisions that provide special privileges to Council House directors by granting them impunity and anonymity while denying journalists their rights under the First Amendment to the Constitution. This will give responsible authorities access to information which will allow them to prosecute elder abusers for their crimes.

Nmesis.

1. Franz Kafka, *The Trial*, published posthumously (1925).

2. Janet Lanterman. The Editor has withheld Lanterman's email address to stop Felipe J-cqu-s, self-appointed President, Council House Residents' Association, in a consort with Stephen M-tch-ll, Executive Director, Council House, from harvesting the address. They have repeatedly used harvested email addresses to distribute hate mail and propaganda also to harass *Contra Cabal* correspondents. Readers wishing to respond to anything published in *Contra Cabal* should email the editor with a request to forward the message to the author. (Email 04-1011-1801).

3. RCW 9.12.010 Barratry. Every person who brings on his or her own behalf, or instigates, incites, or encourages another to bring, any false suit at law or in equity in any court of this state, with intent thereby to distress or harass a defendant in the suit, or who serves or sends any paper or document purporting to be or resembling a judicial process, that is not in fact a judicial process, is guilty of a misdemeanor; and in case the person offending is an attorney, he or she may, in addition thereto be disbarred from practicing law within this state.

4. Dr. Laurence J. Peter and Raymond Hull, *The Peter Principle: Why Things always go Wrong*, NY: New York (William Morrow & Company, Inc.) 1969.

© Copyright 2004 by Paul Trummel
All Rights Reserved: 17 Oct 04/08:40 PST
Edition: #806-34-20/04-1024-0744
Feedback: Webspinner@ContraCabal.org