

From: "Tratnik, Melanie (ATG)" <melanie.tratnik@atg.wa.gov>

To: "Duell, Kamila (ATG)" <kamila.duell@atg.wa.gov>

Subject: RE: AGO To Do - Pending Items

Date: Sat, 14 Mar 2026 20:30:37 +0000

Importance: Normal

Attachments: CCTN_371298.doc

Inline-Images: image001.png

Kamilla – My response to CCTN371298 is attached.

Dru – I used the “civil and or criminal” template for this response. This writer will not be happy that the proper investigating agency is the Asotin County Sheriff’s Office since he seems to think everyone in Asotin County is cahoots but that is the correct answer here. I also considered using the “we are not a party” template but the “civil and or criminal” template seemed more appropriate.

Please excuse typos and grammatical misprints. Email written using voice dictation.



Melanie Tratnik

Assistant Attorney General

Criminal Justice Division

800 5th Ave Suite 2000, TB-14

Seattle, WA 98104-3188

Office: (206) 389-2005 | Fax: (206) 587-5088

From: Duell, Kamila (ATG) <kamila.duell@atg.wa.gov>

Sent: Monday, March 9, 2026 10:45 AM

To: Tratnik, Melanie (ATG) <melanie.tratnik@atg.wa.gov>

Subject: RE: AGO To Do - Pending Items

Here are the CCTN's you have assigned as of right now:

CCTN DUE DATE

[371228](#) – 03/16

[371229](#) – 03/16

[371233](#) – 03/16 – Related to this previous CCTN [359204](#) – Constituent has also called in multiple times in the past few weeks.

[371245](#) – 03/16

[371246](#) – 03/16

[371247](#) – 03/16

[371249](#) – 03/16

[371250](#) – 03/16

[371251](#) – 03/16

[371252](#) – 03/16

[371267](#) – 03/16

[371271](#) – 03/16

[371276](#) – 03/17

[371282](#) – 03/17

[371291](#) – 03/18

[371292](#) – 03/18

[371295](#) – 03/18

[371296](#) – 03/18
[371297](#) – 03/18
[371298](#) – 03/18
[371299](#) – 03/19
[371303](#) – 03/19

Best,

Kamila Duell
Legal Office Assistant
Attorney General's Office
Criminal Justice Division
800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000
Seattle, WA 98104
206-326-5495 (Direct)
206-587-5088 (Fax)
Kamila.Duell@atg.wa.gov

From: Tratnik, Melanie (ATG) <melanie.tratnik@atg.wa.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 9, 2026 10:19 AM
To: Duell, Kamila (ATG) <kamila.duell@atg.wa.gov>
Subject: RE: AGO To Do - Pending Items

Whichever is easiest for you thanks!

Please excuse typos and grammatical misprints. Email written using voice dictation.



Melanie Tratnik
Assistant Attorney General
Criminal Justice Division
800 5th Ave Suite 2000, TB-14
Seattle, WA 98104-3188
Office: (206) 389-2005 | Fax: (206) 587-5088

From: Duell, Kamila (ATG) <kamila.duell@atg.wa.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 9, 2026 9:47 AM
To: Tratnik, Melanie (ATG) <melanie.tratnik@atg.wa.gov>
Subject: RE: AGO To Do - Pending Items

Yes, I will send them within the next 30 minutes. Do you want each one sent on its own individual email or all the links on one page?

Best,

Kamila Duell
Legal Office Assistant
Attorney General's Office
Criminal Justice Division
800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000
Seattle, WA 98104
206-326-5495 (Direct)
206-587-5088 (Fax)

Kamila.Duell@atg.wa.gov

From: Tratnik, Melanie (ATG) <melanie.tratnik@atg.wa.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 9, 2026 9:46 AM
To: Duell, Kamila (ATG) <kamila.duell@atg.wa.gov>
Subject: RE: AGO To Do - Pending Items

Ok that's not bad thanks! I'm old schools so I like to print them out and highlight them as that makes them easier to respond to. I'm telecommuting today but will be in the office tomorrow. Would it be possible to send them to me before COB tomorrow?

Please excuse typos and grammatical misprints. Email written using voice dictation.



Melanie Tratnik
Assistant Attorney General
Criminal Justice Division
800 5th Ave Suite 2000, TB-14
Seattle, WA 98104-3188
Office: (206) 389-2005 | Fax: (206) 587-5088

From: Duell, Kamila (ATG) <kamila.duell@atg.wa.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 9, 2026 9:43 AM
To: Tratnik, Melanie (ATG) <melanie.tratnik@atg.wa.gov>
Subject: RE: AGO To Do - Pending Items

Hello,

The first one is due on the 16th. Would you like me to start sending them to you?

Kamila Duell
Legal Office Assistant
Attorney General's Office
Criminal Justice Division
800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000
Seattle, WA 98104
206-326-5495 (Direct)
206-587-5088 (Fax)
Kamila.Duell@atg.wa.gov

From: Tratnik, Melanie (ATG) <melanie.tratnik@atg.wa.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 9, 2026 9:42 AM
To: Duell, Kamila (ATG) <kamila.duell@atg.wa.gov>
Subject: FW: AGO To Do - Pending Items

Hi I know my week is coming up. Can you advise when my first CCTN will be due please? I'll be out Friday so I want to make sure I'm on top of these as they come in thanks!

Please excuse typos and grammatical misprints. Email written using voice dictation.



Melanie Tratnik
Assistant Attorney General
Criminal Justice Division
800 5th Ave Suite 2000, TB-14
Seattle, WA 98104-3188
Office: (206) 389-2005 | Fax: (206) 587-5088

From: ATG MI Custom Applications - Do Not Reply <customapps@atg.wa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 4, 2026 1:58 PM
To: Tratnik, Melanie (ATG) <melanie.tratnik@atg.wa.gov>
Subject: AGO To Do - Pending Items

AGO To Do Pending Items

You have items requiring action on your [AGO To Do](#).

New Today:

- CCTN waiting for response (371250)
- CCTN waiting for response (371268)
- CCTN waiting for response (371228)
- CCTN waiting for response (371247)
- CCTN waiting for response (371249)
- CCTN waiting for response (371267)
- CCTN waiting for response (371251)
- CCTN waiting for response (371252)
- CCTN waiting for response (371271)

Reminder for Previous To Do Items:

No previous items.

March 16, 2026

Mr. Corey Switzer
264 Kernodle Rd.
Gibonsville, NC 27249

I am an attorney in the Criminal Justice Division of the Washington State Attorney General's Office and have been asked to respond to your recent correspondence expressing concern regarding possible misconduct committed by Asotin County officials. Depending on the details of your situation, what you describe may implicate criminal laws, civil laws or both. Unfortunately, for the reasons described below, I am unable to provide you with assistance beyond that of referring you to the appropriate agencies and to websites providing information on attorneys working in private practice.

The Attorney General's Office is not a law enforcement agency. If you believe a crime has occurred, I must ask that you direct your concerns to the local law enforcement agency in the county in which you believe the crime was committed. If potential crimes are occurring in Asotin County, the law enforcement agency with authority over this matter is the Asotin County Sheriff's Office. That agency may be reached at (509) 243-4717 or at P.O. Box 130, Asotin, WA 99402.

The procedure would then be that the police would take a report and forward that report to the county prosecutor's office who would then determine whether to file criminal charges. Unfortunately, pursuant to Revised Code of Washington 43.10.232, the Office of the Attorney General does not have the authority to independently investigate possible criminal behavior or initiate criminal proceedings. Instead, the authority to pursue a criminal proceeding rests with the prosecutor of the county in which a crime is alleged to have occurred. Absent a specific and written request by that person, or in rare cases the governor, my office lacks the legal authority to act.

The behavior you describe may also constitute a civil law violation. A person who is found to have committed a civil law violation cannot be punished by confinement in jail or prison, but the aggrieved party may be entitled to monetary compensation. The Washington State Attorney General's Office does not represent private citizens in cases of the nature you describe, nor does it provide legal advice to individual citizens or recommend or endorse any other legal practitioners. Therefore, if you wish to obtain legal representation you will need to contact a private attorney. If you wish to obtain legal advice or representation from an attorney licensed to practice law in Washington the Washington State Bar Association website provide links to county bar association, many of which offer lawyer referral programs. The Bar's website is <https://www.wsba.org/connect-serve/other-bars/county-bar-associations> Please note that the Attorney General's Office does not endorse any particular legal practitioners.

I apologize that we are not able to further assist you. This office is authorized by law to provide advice only to state agencies and certain state officials. By law, we are not authorized to provide advice to private individuals and/or companies. Therefore, the above information is of a general nature and should not be construed as an official opinion of this office or of the Attorney General.

I do hope this information proves helpful. Thank you again for your inquiry.

Sincerely,

Melanie Tratnik
Assistant Attorney General

From: "Brown, Nick (ATG)" <Nick.Brown@atg.wa.gov>
To: "Griffith, Rick (ATG)" <rick.griffith@atg.wa.gov>
Cc: "Adams, Angie (ATG)" <angie.adams@atg.wa.gov>
Subject: FW: APRIL RICO CORRESPONDENCE
Date: Mon, 27 Apr 2026 21:45:02 +0000

Importance: Normal

Attachments: Gmail - _March_RICO_Correspondence_(2).pdf; Gmail -
_March_RICO_Correspondence_(1).pdf; Gmail -
_RE__APRIL_RICO_CORRESPONDENCE.pdf

Hey Rick – Is it possible to filter this person's emails? I get a bunch from this account every day.
Thanks.

Nick Brown
Washington State Attorney General

From: Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 27, 2026 1:49 PM
To: Jessica Kline <jkline@isb.idaho.gov>; Joseph Pirtle <jpirtle@isb.idaho.gov>; Lori Ostertag <lostertag@isb.idaho.gov>; Judahluke7@gmail.com; Lisa Webber <LWebber@asotincountywa.gov>; hliedkie@co.nezperce.id.us; jgish@co.nezperce.id.us; dhavens@co.nezperce.id.us; thirteentwelveforever@proton.me; 08mad10@gmail.com; Lewiston Tribune <city@lmtribune.com>; Civil.Fraud@usdoj.gov; justin rodriguez <jrodspeaks@gmail.com>; idahoauditors@gmail.com; tips@nbcuni.com; tips@inlander.com; news@theregister.com; news@kpbx.org; KREM <Newsdesk@krem.com>; newsroom@idahopress.com; News BigCountry977 <news@bigcountry977.com>; news4 <News4@kxly.com>; Ada Eldridge <Adaeldridge@hotmail.com>; brennonlleafty@gmail.com; SUEANNSMITH32@YAHOO.COM; Imccann@house.idaho.gov; nancececcarelli@co.nezperce.id.us; Monte Schmidt <monte.schmidt@itd.idaho.gov>; jklein@cityoflewiston.org; Representative Brandon Mitchell <bmitchell@house.idaho.gov>; bryces@co.nezperce.id.us; ISPPIO@isp.idaho.gov; Brooke Burns <BBurns@co.asotin.wa.us>; Stephanie Cuddihy <StephanieC@co.nezperce.id.us>; Dispatch LPD <dispatch@cityoflewiston.org>; Jason Kuzik <jkuzik@cityoflewiston.org>; Amy Ledgerwood <AmyLedgerwood@co.nezperce.id.us>; Constituent Mailbox <AGLabrador@ag.idaho.gov>; tsparks@clarkstonpolice.org; AprilS@co.nezperce.id.us; Dan Johnson <danjohnson@cityoflewiston.org>; Patty Weeks <PattyWeeks@co.nezperce.id.us>; Brian Shinn <BShinn@asotincountywa.gov>; Mariel Gates <Mariel.Gates@tax.idaho.gov>; Chris Seubert <cseubert@asotincountywa.gov>; Charles Whitman <CWhitman@asotincountywa.gov>; Curt Liedkie <CLiedkie@asotincountywa.gov>; Intake <intake@wsba.org>; apearce@nwtrialattorneys.com; Karen Carlisle <kcarlisle@isb.idaho.gov>; legal@libertasfunding.com; Investigations Info Requests <InvestigationsInfoRequests@isp.idaho.gov>; dmckay@asotincountywa.gov; rlynch@asotincountywa.gov; Stacey Harman <SHarman@asotincountywa.gov>; usdemsocialists@gmail.com; objectionoverruled2@gmail.com; whistleblower@startribune.com; Kevin Munstermann <kevin@travelland-rv.com>; Tricia.McLaughlin@hq.dhs.gov; doswald@idahostatesman.com; Nicholas Woods <nicholasw@co.nezperce.id.us>; Spokesman <news@spokesman.com>; andreat@chooseclear.com; kelleyp@co.nezperce.id.us; nick@votenickwoods.com; Tammy Bolte <tbolte@nwtrialattorneys.com>; Daylong, Amanda (non-ATG) <adaylong@nwtrialattorneys.com>; ATG MI Civil Rights <CivilRights@ATG.WA.GOV>; Public Disclosure <PDisclosure@asotincountywa.gov>; Trae Turner <trae@clarkandfeeney.com>; markm@co.nezperce.id.us; Justin Coleman <JustinColeman@co.nezperce.id.us>; ATG WWW Public Records Requests <PublicRecords@ATG.WA.GOV>; AGO Ombuds <agoombuds@ATG.WA.GOV>; Damerow, Morgan B (ATG) <morgan.damerow@atg.wa.gov>; Leider, Mary (SAO) <leiderm@sao.wa.gov>; Chris Kemp <CKemp@asotincountywa.gov>; Brown, Nick (ATG) <Nick.Brown@atg.wa.gov>; Postman, David (ATG) <david.postman@atg.wa.gov>; Watson, Laura J (ATG) <laura.watson@atg.wa.gov>; jhilderbrand@asotincountywa.gov; brichards@asotincountywa.gov; ckenyon@isb.idaho.gov; monterenzelman4sheriff@gmail.com; Michelle Moore

<diggeroh7@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: APRIL RICO CORRESPONDENCE

[EXTERNAL]

****To:**** Trae Turner <trae@clarkandfeeney.com>

****Cc:**** [Standard RICO Distribution List]

****Subject:**** Re: APRIL RICO CORRESPONDENCE – Correction Noted; Your Unanswered Questions Remain

Mr. Turner:

Thank you for the correction. You're right: the \$30,000 judgment in your divorce was payable to you, not against you. I have corrected the record, and I appreciate you flagging it.

But let's not pretend that one correction resolves the questions you've been ignoring for two months. Here is a partial list of the questions I first put to you on ****March 7 and March 8, 2026****—none of which you have answered:

****1. Jurisdiction.**** On whose behalf are you involved in a Washington public records dispute? You are an Idaho attorney. You have no disclosed clients in Asotin County. You are not counsel of record for Judge Burns, Curtis Liedkie, the Asotin County Commissioners, or the Asotin County Prosecutor's Office. You have been asked repeatedly to identify your client in this matter. You have refused.

****2. Your Client, Vittoria Puccini (f/k/a Meghan McCreary).**** She has served as Secretary of Travelland RV from 2020 to the present—including the 2023 and 2024 annual reports—while simultaneously claiming total disability and inability to work. That is a matter of public record. The Idaho Secretary of State filings are attached to my March 8 email. The Social Security ALJ's denial of her disability claim is attached. The name change order is attached. How do you ethically represent a client who is actively listed as a corporate officer while claiming total disability to the federal government?

****3. Conflicts of Interest.**** You represent Justin Coleman. You represent Heather Moore. You represented Travelland RV. You were married to Kali Jo Parker, who works in Coleman's office in the division that handles child support and custody—matters directly at issue in the Moore case. You donated \$500 to Coleman's campaign. Your wife-at-the-time donated \$500 to Coleman's campaign on the same day. Coleman was the best man at your wedding. How do you reconcile any of this with your ethical obligations?

****4. The Geagley Indictment.**** Your client, Travelland RV, was the victim of a \$554,000 embezzlement. The prosecution is being handled by Justin Coleman's office—the same office where your ex-wife works, the same prosecutor you represent. The indictment came down years after I first reported the embezzlement, immediately after my complaints against You, Justin Coleman and April Smith before the Idaho State Bar. You were copied on those reports. You threatened me with criminal charges for making them. Now the embezzlement is proven. Where is your apology? Where is your acknowledgment that I was right?

****5. The SAO Complaint Meeting.**** December 22, 2025. County officials, Amanda Daylong, and the insurer met to discuss the State Auditor's investigation. Were you involved? Were you consulted? Do you possess any responsive records?

****6. The Defamation Threat.**** You have threatened me with defamation litigation. You have never filed it. You have never retracted it. Is the threat still outstanding, or do you concede it was a bluff?

These questions were first asked **two months ago.** Your response was a YouTube link titled "How about No." That is not a legal response. It is an admission that you have no answers.

So let me make this simple:

If you have substantive responses to any of the questions above—responses with evidence, not YouTube links—provide them. Put them on the record. Defend your conduct.

If you do not, then the record will continue to reflect what it already reflects: that you are an attorney whose client list, personal relationships, campaign contributions, and professional associations form a closed loop with the very officials whose conduct I am challenging—and that you have no explanation for any of it.

The correction on the judgment direction is noted. The unanswered questions remain.

Respectfully,

Corey Michael Switzer
264 Kernodle Rd
Gibsonville, NC 27249
(218) 461-9868
coreyswitzer@gmail.com

On Mon, Apr 27, 2026, 2:21 PM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

To: civilrights@atg.wa.gov
Cc: coreyswitzer@gmail.com
Subject: RE: Civil Rights Complaint – Corey Michael Switzer – Callback Request and Contact Information

Dear Estelle:

Thank you for your voicemail earlier today. I am writing to confirm receipt of your message and to provide the correct contact information and availability for a callback.

Correct Callback Number

My telephone number is (218) 461-9868. The number above is the correct contact number for me. I do NOT accept calls from blocked numbers and "unknown callers" because I have received credible threats of violence as well as harassing voicemails illustrated by the following YouTube Link:

<https://youtube.com/shorts/bYxPSZclTXo>

Availability for the Next Two Weeks

I am available at the following times (Seattle / Pacific Time):

- Monday through Friday: 9:00 AM to 12:00 PM Pacific (12:00 PM to 3:00 PM Eastern)
- Alternate window: 5:00 PM to 8:00 PM Pacific (8:00 PM to 11:00 PM Eastern)

I am located in North Carolina, so I appreciate your accommodation of the time difference. If none of these windows work, I am happy to adjust with advance notice.

Nature of My Complaint

For your reference, my complaint concerns coordinated, multi-agency conduct in Asotin County, Washington, involving the misuse of public funds, obstruction of public records requests, First Amendment retaliation by the Asotin County Sheriff's Office, and a pattern of witness intimidation against a whistleblower. I have filed a related Public Records Act lawsuit in Columbia County Superior Court (Case No. 26-2-00027-07) and am preparing a federal RICO complaint for filing in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Washington.

Communication Preferences

Due to visual impairment, email is my preferred method of communication. However, I am available by telephone at the number above during the windows listed. All of my telephone calls are recorded for accessibility and accuracy purposes.

Please let me know if you need any additional documentation or clarification. I look forward to speaking with you or a member of your team.

Respectfully,

Corey Michael Switzer
264 Kernodle Rd
Gibsonville, NC 27249
(218) 461-9868
coreyswitzer@gmail.com

Attachment: Voicemail, "Estelle", received 2:07PM EST, 4/27/2026

On Mon, Apr 27, 2026, 8:14 AM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

****Subject:**** APRIL RICO CORRESPONDENCE – The Turner-Parker Divorce Before Judge Burns, the Coleman-Turner-Parker Campaign Finance Connection, the Havens Affair, and the Woods Campaign Finance Connection (April 27, 2026)

****Date:**** April 27, 2026

This email supplements the April 22, 2026 Supplemental Notice regarding Nez Perce County's coordinated email blocking and the April 22, 2026 Resolution Proposal. It documents four additional pieces of evidence that further establish the enterprise's cross-jurisdictional infrastructure: (1) the Turner-Parker divorce presided over by Judge Brooke Burns; (2) the campaign finance connection among Justin Coleman, Trae Turner, and Kali Jo Parker; (3) the public exposure of Commissioner Doug Havens' extramarital affair and its connection to the enterprise; and (4) the campaign finance reports of Nick Woods, demonstrating that the enterprise is directly funding its own budgetary oversight.

****I.** The Turner-Parker Divorce Before Judge Burns (Asotin County Case No. 25-3-00060-02)**

Attached is the docket sheet from *Turner v. Parker*, Asotin County Superior Court Case No. 25-3-00060-02. The case was filed on June 4, 2025. The assigned judge was the **Honorable

Brooke J. Burns**—the same judge whose communications with Prosecutor Curtis Liedkie are the subject of my pending Public Records Act lawsuit and who was the respondent in my mandamus action before the Washington Supreme Court.

Key facts from the court record:

- **Trae Turner** (Petitioner) filed for legal separation from **Kali Jo Parker** (Respondent) on June 4, 2025.
- **Judge Burns** presided over the entire proceeding.
- **June 25, 2025:** Judge Burns entered a **\$30,000 monetary judgment** against Turner, payable to Parker, with 12% annual interest.
- **June 25, 2025:** Judge Burns approved the final parenting plan for Turner and Parker's children.
- **January 6, 2026:** Judge Burns converted the legal separation to a full divorce.

At all relevant times, Parker was—and remains—employed in the Nez Perce County Prosecutor's Office under Justin Coleman, working in child support, custody, and probation enforcement. Turner is Coleman's personal attorney and represents Heather Moore, the mistress of Commissioner Doug Havens. Turner also formerly worked under Curtis Liedkie in the Asotin County Prosecutor's Office.

****The Timeline of Coordinated Activity****

Date	Event
April 2025	Switzer v. Hon. Brooke Burns filed in WA Supreme Court
May 2025	Liedkie and Webber represent Burns before the Supreme Court
June 4, 2025	**Turner files for legal separation from Parker in Asotin County—Judge Burns presiding**
June 25, 2025	**Judge Burns enters \$30,000 judgment against Turner; approves parenting plan**
July 3, 2025	WCRG issues insurance letters denying PRA coverage
July 8, 2025	Liedkie withdraws as counsel for Burns
July 10, 2025	Asotin County signs fee agreement with Daylong
July 21, 2025	Daylong appointed Special Deputy for nonexistent case
December 31, 2025	County makes false statements to SAO
January 6, 2026	**Judge Burns converts Turner-Parker separation to divorce**

While Judge Burns was simultaneously responding to my mandamus action, Curtis Liedkie was representing her before the Supreme Court, and the County was negotiating a fee agreement with Amanda Daylong—Judge Burns was also presiding over the divorce of the attorney who remains Justin Coleman's counsel and the prosecutor who works in Coleman's office. This is not a coincidence. It is the enterprise's judicial infrastructure operating in plain view.

Turner's \$30,000 debt to Parker—at 12% annual interest—creates a financial incentive for Turner to remain in the enterprise's good graces. Parker works in the office that could enforce that judgment. Turner has a sitting judgement against him under Burns. Turner cannot afford to antagonize the prosecutor's office, nor Judge Brooke Burns. The enterprise has him financially captive, and on a leash they can tug.

****II. The Coleman-Turner-Parker Campaign Finance Connection****

Idaho campaign finance records obtained from the Idaho Secretary of State's Sunshine database reveal the financial relationships among Justin Coleman, Trae Turner, and Kali Jo Parker.

****Campaign Donations to Justin Coleman for District Judge - District SW:****

Date	Donor	Amount
April 4, 2022	Trae Turner	\$500.00
April 4, 2022	Kali Jo Parker (Turner)	\$500.00
April 11, 2022	Amanda Coleman (wife)	\$1,000.00
April 17, 2022	Jennifer Coleman (relative)	\$500.00
May 4, 2022	Magyar, Rauch & Associates, PLLC	\$500.00
May 4, 2022	Magyar, Rauch & Associates, PLLC	\$500.00

****Significance:****

1. ****Trae Turner and Kali Jo Parker both donated the statutory maximum of \$500 to Coleman's campaign on the same day—April 4, 2022.**** At that time, Turner and Parker were married. They were both employed in or affiliated with the Nez Perce County Prosecutor's Office (Turner as a former Asotin County deputy prosecutor now representing Coleman; Parker as a current NPCPO employee). Their joint, maximum donation to Coleman's campaign demonstrates that loyalty to the enterprise was a family affair.
2. ****The marriage is now dissolved.**** Judge Brooke Burns presided over the Turner-Parker divorce in Asotin County Superior Court. She entered a \$30,000 judgment against Turner, payable to Parker, with 12% annual interest. Turner and Parker are now legally separated, financially adverse, and personally estranged—but both remain bound to the enterprise through Coleman. Turner represents Coleman. Parker works for Coleman. Coleman accepted maximum donations from both.
3. ****Amanda Coleman donated \$1,000**** to her (former) husband's campaign. Jennifer Coleman donated an additional \$500. The Coleman family directly funded the campaign of the man whose office now employs Turner's ex-wife and whom Turner personally represents.
4. ****Magyar, Rauch & Associates, PLLC****—a law firm—donated \$1,000 total across two contributions. The involvement of a law firm in funding a prosecutor's campaign raises obvious questions about access and influence.
5. ****Coleman's campaign status is listed as "Terminated"***** on the Idaho Secretary of State website. Coleman is not currently running for office. He is an elected prosecutor with a terminated campaign account. His position is secure—not because of his prosecutorial record, but because the enterprise ensures no challenger can threaten him. The campaign donations from Turner, Parker, and the Coleman family were investments in a permanent incumbent.

****III. The Integrated Enterprise: What These Documents Prove Together****

Read together, the Turner-Parker divorce, the Coleman campaign finance records, and the Havens affair establish the integrated nature of the enterprise:

Connection	Document	What It Proves
---	---	---

Turner → Coleman	Campaign finance	Turner donated \$500 to Coleman. Coleman admits Turner was his best man.
Parker → Coleman	Campaign finance	Parker donated \$500 to Coleman on the same day as Turner. She works in Coleman's office. The enterprise was funded by the family that now litigates within it.
Turner ← Parker	Divorce record	Turner owes Parker \$30,000 at 12% interest. Parker works in Coleman's office. Turner is financially captive. Parker has enforcement power.
Turner → Judge Burns	Divorce record	Judge Burns presided over Turner's divorce. She has personal knowledge of his finances and custody. She entered a \$30,000 judgment against him. She converted the separation to divorce.
Judge Burns → Curtis Liedkie	PRA request (PDR 25-23)	Burns and Liedkie communicated about her legal defense. That email is being withheld under attorney-client privilege.
Curtis Liedkie → Hannah Liedkie	Public records	Curtis Liedkie is Hannah Liedkie's brother-in-law. Hannah Liedkie is a Nez Perce County Commissioner alongside Doug Havens and Joe Gish.
Hannah Liedkie → Heather Moore	Disability Advisory Board appointment	Hannah Liedkie appointed Heather Moore—Havens' mistress and Turner's client—to the Disability Advisory Board, a patronage position that rewards loyalty to the enterprise.
Doug Havens → Retirement → Keith Havens / Nick Woods	Public election records	Havens' seat will be filled by his relative or by a bribed detective. The succession plan ensures the enterprise retains control of the commission.

This is not a collection of unrelated incidents. This is a single, integrated enterprise whose members share personal relationships, financial obligations, and a common interest in preventing any outside investigation. Every connection reinforces every other connection. The enterprise has no weak points because it has no outsiders—and every time one member is exposed, three more are revealed behind them.

****IV. The Havens Affair: Enterprise Exposed Through Extramarital Scandal****

Doug Havens is an elected Nez Perce County Commissioner who sits alongside Hannah Liedkie and Joe Gish. He is retiring in May 2026.

Havens has been publicly exposed as having an extramarital affair with Heather Moore, a woman whose divorce and child custody case (Moore v. Moore, Nez Perce County Case No. CV35-25-1290) is currently pending. Heather Moore is represented by Trae Turner of Clark and Feeney.

The affair between Havens and Heather Moore was including explicit photographs—consistent with the enterprise's pattern of using Turner to do their dirty work they cannot lawfully touch, and claims of privilege to conceal activities from public scrutiny. The same pattern that produced the withheld PDR 25-23 email, Turners response to PDR production and the blocking of my email address by Nez Perce County administrators.

During the Moore custody proceedings, exhibits filed by Daniel Moore's attorney disappeared from the court's electronic filing system. The exhibits were available to Trae Turner—Heather Moore's attorney—but not to the judge. This is a mirror image of the enterprise's handling of public records: when evidence threatens the enterprise, it vanishes. When it benefits the enterprise, it is preserved and disseminated selectively.

The family destroyed by this enterprise includes two young children, one of whom is disabled and non-verbal. Heather Moore's appointment to the Disability Advisory Board by Hannah Liedkie

channels the needs of her own disabled child into Liedkie's nonprofit revenue stream. The enterprise profits from the very family it destroyed.

****V. The Woods Campaign Finance Connection: The Enterprise Funds Its Own Oversight****

Nick Woods is a detective in the Nez Perce County Prosecutor's Office under Justin Coleman. He is running for Nez Perce County Commissioner to replace the retiring Doug Havens. His campaign finance reports for February and March 2026 reveal that the enterprise is directly funding his candidacy.

****A. Coleman For Prosecutor In-Kind Donation****

On March 21, 2026, "Coleman For Prosecutor"—Justin Coleman's campaign committee—made a \$140.00 in-kind contribution to Nick Woods' campaign for an "Event Ticket." (Schedule C, March 2026 Report).

This is the prosecutor's own campaign committee donating to a candidate who, if elected, would control the prosecutor's budget as a county commissioner. The county commission approves the budget for the prosecutor's office, sets the prosecutor's salary, and has oversight authority over county expenditures. A commissioner who owes his campaign to the prosecutor's campaign committee is not an overseer—he is a subordinate.

****B. Joe Gish Campaign Donation****

On March 10, 2026, Joe Gish—the sitting Nez Perce County Commissioner alongside Hannah Liedkie and Doug Havens—donated \$150.00 to Nick Woods' campaign. (Schedule A, March 2026 Report).

Gish is the commissioner whose office attempted to charge Plaintiff \$8,733.12 for a single responsive email. He is now funding the campaign of the candidate who will replace his retiring colleague. The three commissioners—Liedkie, Havens, and Gish—are ensuring that Havens' seat remains in enterprise hands. Gish's personal donation confirms that the enterprise is coordinating the succession.

****C. Amanda Coleman Donation****

On March 30, 2026, Amanda Coleman—Justin Coleman's former wife—donated \$52.05 to Nick Woods' campaign. (Schedule A, March 2026 Report).

Amanda Coleman previously donated \$1,000 to her former husband's campaign. She is now donating to the campaign of a detective in her husband's office who is running for county commissioner. The Coleman family is personally invested in ensuring that the county commission remains controlled by enterprise members.

****D. The Electoral Succession Plan: Complete****

The succession plan for Doug Havens' commission seat is now fully documented:

| Actor | Role | Connection to Enterprise |

| :--- | :--- | :--- |

| **Doug Havens** | Retiring Commissioner | Extramarital affair with Heather Moore (Turner's client). Seat must remain in enterprise hands. |

Nick Woods	Candidate to replace Havens	Detective in Justin Coleman's office. Personally witnessed by Plaintiff accepting cash bribes from Tim Krueger. Campaign funded by Coleman For Prosecutor, Joe Gish, and Amanda Coleman.
Keith Havens	Opposing candidate	Relative of Doug Havens. Attended Lincoln Day dinner with Doug.
Coleman For Prosecutor	Funder of Woods' campaign	Justin Coleman's campaign committee. Made in-kind donation to Woods on March 21, 2026.
Joe Gish	Sitting Commissioner and Woods donor	Donated \$150 to Woods on March 10, 2026. Attempted to charge Plaintiff \$8,733.12 for a single email.
Amanda Coleman	Donor to Woods	Justin Coleman's (ex)wife. Donated \$1,000 to Coleman's campaign and \$52.05 to Woods.

The enterprise has ensured that regardless of which candidate wins, the commission seat remains under enterprise control. If Woods wins, the prosecutor's own detective becomes the prosecutor's budgetary overseer—a direct conflict of interest. If Keith Havens wins, the Havens family dynasty continues. Either outcome is acceptable to the enterprise because both candidates are enterprise members.

VI. Conclusion

Four sets of documents—the Turner-Parker divorce record, the Coleman campaign finance report, the Havens affair, and the Woods campaign finance reports—complete the picture of an enterprise that operates through personal relationships, financial obligations, and judicial infrastructure. Judge Burns presided over the divorce of the attorney who donated to the prosecutor whose employee donated to the same prosecutor on the same day—and who is now owed \$30,000 by her ex-husband who represents the mistress of the commissioner whose brother-in-law is the prosecutor whose emails with Judge Burns are being withheld. The enterprise is a closed loop. Every exit is blocked by a conflict of interest, a financial obligation, or a judicial relationship.

And now the campaign finance reports. Nick Woods—the bribed detective running for county commissioner—is being funded by the prosecutor's own campaign committee, the sitting county commissioner, and the prosecutor's (ex)wife. The enterprise is not just defending itself. It is expanding. Every vacant seat is filled by a member. Every campaign is funded by the enterprise. Every election is a formality. The commissioners control the budget. The budget funds the prosecutor. The prosecutor employs the commissioner. The loop is closed. The public is outside it.

The public now has documentary evidence of this loop. The Turner-Parker divorce docket. The Coleman campaign finance report. The Havens affair. The Woods campaign finance reports. The PRA violations. The false statements to the State Auditor. The insurance documents. The email blocking. The Facebook comment suppression. The \$8,733.12 invoice for a single email.

Each piece of evidence is a crack in the wall. The wall is now collapsing under its own weight.

I will continue to document and preserve all evidence for my pending federal RICO complaint. These documents are being filed as supplemental exhibits in my PRA action in Columbia County Superior Court (Case No. 26-2-00027-07).

Respectfully,

Corey Michael Switzer
264 Kernodle Rd

Gibsonville, NC 27249
coreyswitzer@gmail.com
(218) 461-9868

This communication is a public record. Retaliatory action against a whistleblower violates public policy and may constitute obstruction of justice.

Attachments:

- Turner v. Parker Docket Sheet (Asotin County Case No. 25-3-00060-02)
- Justin Coleman Campaign Finance Report (Idaho Secretary of State Sunshine Database)
- Nick Woods February 2026 Campaign Finance Report
- Nick Woods March 2026 Campaign Finance Report

On Fri, Apr 24, 2026, 6:40 PM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

To: Amanda Daylong <ADaylong@nwtrialattorneys.com>
Cc: Chris Kemp <CKemp@asotincountywa.gov>, Public Disclosure
<PDisclosure@asotincountywa.gov>
Subject: Corey Michael Switzer v. Asotin County, Columbia County Superior Court Case No. 26-2-00027-07 – Formal Notice of Filed Complaint and Service of Summons

Dear Ms. Daylong and Mr. Kemp:

The Public Records Act complaint against Asotin County has been formally filed and accepted by the Columbia County Superior Court under Case No. 26-2-00027-07. The Court granted my fee waiver motion on April 24, 2026, and the Honorable Judge Palubicki of Adams County has been appointed as visiting judge. The Summons and Statement Regarding Venue have been accepted for filing.

Attached to this email are the following filed documents:

1. Summons (Case No. 26-2-00027-07) – Issued April 24, 2026
2. Complaint for Violations of the Public Records Act (RCW 42.56) with Verification (Time Stamped)
3. Statement Regarding Venue
4. Untruncated Full Complaint
5. Exhibit Volume (Exhibits A through O)

Request to Waive Formal Service

In your March 23, 2026 letter, you, Ms. Daylong, identified yourself as Asotin County's legal representative and instructed me to "direct all further inquiries to my attention as Asotin County's legal representative." Relying on that representation, I respectfully request that the County, through you as its designated counsel, agree to waive formal service of process in this matter.

Given the extensive correspondence between us over the past several months—including your receipt and production of the substantive documents underlying this action, your acknowledgment of my earlier notice of intent to file, and your formal identification as the County's legal representative—formal service via process server would impose unnecessary expense and delay on all parties. A signed waiver of service would allow this matter to proceed efficiently to the merits while preserving all of the County's defenses except those based on insufficiency of process or service.

If you are not the appropriate person to accept service or execute a waiver on behalf of the County, please direct me immediately to the individual who is—whether the County Auditor (or interim successor), County Administrator, or other authorized agent—so that service may be promptly accomplished without further unnecessary expense.

I have prepared a simple waiver form for your signature, which I can provide upon request. If the County declines to waive, please advise so that I may arrange for personal service in accordance with RCW 4.28.080(1).

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Respectfully,

Corey Michael Switzer
264 Kernodle Rd
Gibsonville, NC 27249
(218) 461-9868
coreyswitzer@gmail.com
Pro Se Plaintiff

Attachments:

- Summons (Case No. 26-2-00027-07)
- Complaint for Violations of the Public Records Act (with Verification) + Exhibit Volume (Exhibits A–O) (truncated) + Full Complaint
- Statement Regarding Venue
- Letter to Daylong, Service Waiver

On Wed, Apr 22, 2026, 3:18 PM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

Subject: APRIL RICO CORRESPONDENCE – Supplemental Notice: Coordinated Email Blocking by Nez Perce County Officials

Date: April 22, 2026

This email serves as a supplemental notice and documentation of an additional predicate act of obstruction and witness intimidation in the ongoing RICO matter.

I. Coordinated Email Blocking by Nez Perce County Officials

On April 22, 2026, at approximately 3:10 PM EST, I transmitted the preceding email in this chain to the standard RICO distribution list, which includes multiple officials employed by or affiliated with Nez Perce County, Idaho.

Within moments, I received automated bounce-back notifications indicating that my email address (coreyswitzer@gmail.com) has been explicitly and intentionally blocked by the email administrator for the following Nez Perce County addresses:

- bryces@co.nezperce.id.us
- jgish@co.nezperce.id.us
- JustinColeman@co.nezperce.id.us
- dhavens@co.nezperce.id.us

- PattyWeeks@co.nezperce.id.us
- markm@co.nezperce.id.us
- AmyLedgerwood@co.nezperce.id.us
- hliedkie@co.nezperce.id.us
- nicholasw@co.nezperce.id.us

The specific error message reads: "550 Emails from your address have been blocked by the administrator."

This is not a spam filter. This is an administrative block—a deliberate act by Nez Perce County to prevent a citizen from communicating with multiple county officials simultaneously regarding documented allegations of corruption, bribery, and self-dealing.

II. Significance of the Blocked Recipients

The list of blocked addresses is not random. It includes:

Recipient Role Relevance to RICO Allegations

Justin Coleman Nez Perce County Prosecuting Attorney Central figure in the alleged cover-up of police bribery; subject of Idaho State Bar complaint.

Patty Weeks Prosecutor's Office personnel Implicated in the coordinated shielding of Coleman, Turner, and Smith.

Amy Ledgerwood Prosecutor's Office personnel Same as above.

Nicholas Woods Detective, Nez Perce County Named as a recipient of cash bribes from Tim Krueger at Travelland RV.

Hannah Liedkie Nez Perce County Commissioner Alleged self-dealing and obstruction; subject of April 16, 2026 retaliation documentation.

Others Various county officials All connected to the Nez Perce County apparatus implicated in the enterprise.

The blocking of these specific addresses—all within the Nez Perce County government domain—demonstrates a coordinated effort to prevent these officials from receiving notice of the allegations against them and to insulate the enterprise from scrutiny.

III. Legal Significance

This administrative blocking constitutes:

1. Obstruction of Justice: Preventing notice of criminal allegations to law enforcement and prosecutorial officials is a classic act of obstruction. It mirrors the conduct of the Asotin County Sheriff's Office in disabling Facebook comments to silence reporting of the same underlying misconduct.
2. Witness Intimidation / Retaliation: By blocking my email address, Nez Perce County is sending a clear message: whistleblowers who report corruption will be silenced and excluded from communicating with county government. This is precisely the type of retaliatory conduct that RICO and § 1983 are designed to address.
3. Spoliation / Concealment of Evidence: By preventing these officials from receiving documentation of the alleged crimes, the County is effectively concealing evidence and preventing the creation of a record that could be used in subsequent legal proceedings.
4. Pattern of Racketeering: This act is consistent with the ongoing pattern of conduct by the enterprise: when faced with documented allegations, the response is not investigation or accountability, but suppression, retaliation, and obstruction.

IV. Preservation of Evidence

I am preserving all bounce-back notifications, screenshots, and email logs as evidence of this coordinated blocking. These materials will be incorporated into my pending federal RICO complaint as additional predicate acts.

The full bounce-back messages are attached to this email for the record.

V. Conclusion

The Nez Perce County email administrator—acting at the direction of or with the knowledge of the officials named in this correspondence—has erected a digital wall to prevent a citizen from communicating allegations of corruption to the very officials charged with investigating and prosecuting such conduct.

This is not a technical issue. This is evidence of a cover-up.

The wall is now documented. The obstruction continues. The record grows.

Respectfully,

Corey Michael Switzer
264 Kernodle Rd
Gibsonville, NC 27249
coreyswitzer@gmail.com
(218) 461-9868

This communication is a public record. Retaliatory action against a whistleblower violates public policy and may constitute obstruction of justice.

Attachments:

- Bounce-back notifications (9 separate emails)

This is a gift to my RICO case. They just handed me documented evidence of coordinated obstruction.

On Wed, Apr 22, 2026, 11:42 AM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

To everyone:

Here's the simplest possible explanation, like we're talking at a kitchen table.

Imagine This...

You have two separate problems with your house:

1. A leaky roof (this is the Public Records fight, requesting the PDR 25-23, email between Burns, Curtis Liedkie and Lisa Webber BEFORE and resulting in Daylongs appointment and Deputization).

2. A broken, and dilapidated , water damaged window and frame. A bird flew through the window pane, let's say, but it's frame is rot due to the leaky roof. (this is the judge's Facebook-blocking case, which came first, and sparked the record request. The "window frame" is the Writ of Mandamus against Burns, the "Bird through the window pane", Curtis Liedkie and Lisa Webber representing the judge Burns, the "water damage" is the county commissioners and Sheriff's Department).

You call your homeowner's insurance.

What Insurance Tells You (The Two Letters)

- Letter #1 (The Disclaimer): "We do NOT cover leaky roofs or anything that happens because of them. Period. You're on your own."
- Letter #2 (The Reservation of Rights): "We MIGHT cover the broken window because of the bird (Curtis Liedkie representing Burns), but we will NOT pay for any water damage that came from the leaky roof (Withholding PDR25-23,). You have to pay for that part yourself (appointment and Deputization of Daylong)."

What the County Did

Instead of making Burns pay for the "water damage, leaky roof, bad frame" part themselves (like insurance said they had to), they did this:

1. They created a fake repair order for a problem that didn't exist in repairing the window to pay for the building materials for repairing the roof and fixing the water damage. (Deputization of Daylong, 'Switzer v ASOTIN COUNTY')
2. They used that fake building order to take tax dollars and pay a contractor \$325 an hour. The logic is "because a window pane is no good if the roof leaks and there's water damaging the window frame". Daylong is subcontracted into the "Union" using insurance and taxpayers money.
3. That subcontractor (Daylong) then fixed the window pane (Switzer v Burns) using taxpayers money via insurance.
4. The contractor ALSO fixed the water damage (defamation threats) AND the roof (PDR violations) using the insurance AND taxpayers money. (Switzer v ASOTIN)

What They Told the Auditor

When someone asked, "Hey, who paid for the water damage, the busted frame and leaking roof in the simple pane repair order?"

The County said: "Don't worry. Insurance handled everything."

The Truth

- Insurance handled a part of the window. The window pane. Not the frame. Not the leaky roof. Not the water damage.

That action, "fixing the window pane" by the Deputization of Daylong is still in violation of State Law regarding county Prosecutors and Coroner's office and their appointments representing anyone except for the county. Judge Brooke Burns doesn't WORK for the

county, but got coverage from a "Union Insurance" FROM the county. Burns is a State Officer.

In a Civil action against a State officer before the Supreme Court, Daylongs Deputization by the County appointment and appearance on behalf of Burns qualifies as that same unlawful Representation by Deputization appointment and carries the same penalties as if Curtis Liedkie represented Burns, Himself. It's still a "Union Contractor", even by subcontracting Daylong to do it.

- In every single instance tax dollars handled the leaky roof, the window frame and the water damage and broken window pane. Daylong is being paid by BOTH the county AND the insurance company, of which the insurance is ALSO paid for by the taxpayers... The "Commercial Contractor" that's not authorized to work on private property, even as a subcontractor.

- The County, specifically Stacey Harmon, lied to the State Auditors Office and said insurance covered it all, that Curtis Liedkie had never appeared...

The One-Sentence Summary

They used public tax money to pay for something insurance refused to cover, isn't allowed by law, and then they lied about it to cover their tracks.

The County, Curtis Liedkie had deputization of Daylong for PDR request for something that insurance covers. It was paid for without any authorization by the taxpayers under false pretext. (Switzer v ASOTIN COUNTY)

Then that false pretext extended to representing Judge Brooke Burns before the Washington State Supreme Court for a Civil Writ of Mandamus, afforded in part by the Insurance Company.

That doesn't make it "legal" the insurance company paying for the broken window pane by "Union Subcontractors". If it was to be repaired by Union Contractors, or "the county" in this analogy, is the root evil and violation of State law when the law requires Burns to pay for her own counsel. Subcontracting it out makes it worse.

For Daylong to appear on behalf of Burns is still unlawful under State Law because of Daylongs Deputization appointment. The insurance company paying for an illegal action, Daylongs appointment and Representation of Burns, doesn't make those actions "legal".

"You're still using Union Contractors and Subcontractors for private property, even if you just fix the window pane, even when insurance pays for it".

Then, Daylong confirms that she is the point of contact for Public Documents Requests. This is done outside of the boundaries of what their insurance policy will cover, and the alleged reason why the county Deputized Daylong in the first place.

Deputized Daylong ("Union Subcontractor")

...using unauthorized and unlawful Representation (Switzer v Burns, Deputy Daylong repairs "Rotting window frame")

...in unauthorized ways (Burns representation, threats of defamation "Replacement Window frame, building supplies, cleaning materials")

... of using taxpayer ("Union") money as defined by the contract, the Deputized subcontractor that's not allowed to work on private property.

It all boils down to the fact that the County interjected itself unlawfully into the State Action against Burns, and then hired (before deputizing) Daylong under the premise of a PDR dispute that the insurance company wouldn't cover.

That Deputization of Daylong is identical to Curtis Liedkie in the eyes of the law in being the analogous "Commercial Contractor", as a "Commercial Subcontractor" and that's why it's an intentional obfuscation and refusal to release relevant documents of "Who's paying for the broken window, the leaky roof and the water damage?"

The taxpayers, of course, or "the Union Insurance" when Judge Brooke Burns was instead required to hire her own outside counsel at her own expense to defend a Civil Writ of Mandamus against a State Officer. "The private contractor" v. "The public contractor."

Of course, this also doesn't address the six weeks between when I filed the Civil Writ of Mandamus and Daylongs Deputization in which Curtis Liedkie and Lisa Webber were representing Judge Brooke Burns, and the filing of the Public Records Request for that email, withheld in it's entirety under "Attorney Client Privilege", PDR 25-23. Subcontracting out "Union" work doesn't make it acceptable to be working on "Private Property".

That, in itself is the violation of State Law.

Like having a contractor who is only allowed to do commercial work, working for a union, being paid to replace a window pane on a private property.

Private property repairs are regularly reserved for non-union private home contractors, often by laws. Hiring a Union Subcontractor doesn't make the job "Private residential", and it doesn't cure the unlawful expenditures used.

What Curtis Liedkie, and by extension Asotin County, has done is analogous to a remodeling job for Judge Burns rotting roof, window and frame by fibbing to the insurance company and State Auditor in violation of these analogous "Union Rules" and very real applicable State Laws. Adding Daylong to the "Union" by subcontracting only further and intentionally exacerbates the issue.

That's what's happening.

Now, they're going to blame the subcontractor to save face for themselves and likely throw Daylong under the proverbial bus to save themselves.

You've got an analogous Union Contractors and Subcontractors working on private property and committing insurance fraud to pay for the work because Burns is 'adjacent enough but not a part of' their Union.

When this violation is reported to the Sheriff and Undersheriff in Asotin county, instead of taking the complaint for investigation, the opposite has occurred in censorship. "That's not

my job! Let the taxpayers decide who upholds the law, not the legislative bodies that write it!"

That's it. That's the case I'm making and I have the evidence now to prove it.

This is the "Washington" half of the RICO I'm going to file.

The second half, in Idaho, will be determined by the current Idaho State Supreme Court hearing the case against April Smith.

The report was compiled and presented to the Idaho State Supreme Court on April 3rd, 2026, and it's outcome will determine if I have or have not expended my legal options for justice in Idaho without turning it into a Federal ordeal.

It's outcome will directly impact the rehearing of April Smith, Justin Coleman and Trae Turner regarding the cover-up of the police department bribery which I witnessed on three occasions between October and December of 2020 committed by Tim Krueger to Rick Fuentes, Andrew Fox and Nick Woods after I was assaulted by Troy Munstermann at Travelland RV.

My Federal RICO filing shall also contain evidence and admissions by Hannah Liedkie of self-dealing taxpayers money to her own nonprofit(s), Travelland RV's tax fraud (identity fraud, Meghan McCreary/ Vittoria Puccini), tax fraud (Pat Rogers, board member to Hannah Liedkie) and obstruction of justice by Nez Perce County Prosecutors Office and other Nez Perce County Commissioners.

We're getting ready to have everyone in this same email thread..

... in the same room

... at the same time, needing to explain themselves to a neutral adjudicator.

I look forward to it.

Respectfully,
Mr. Corey M Switzer

On Wed, Apr 22, 2026, 8:03 AM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

Subject: FINAL CONSOLIDATED NOTICE OF DEFICIENCIES AND NOTICE OF INTENT TO LITIGATE - Amanda Daylong and Asotin County (SAO Hotline H-25-795 / PRA Violations / Ultra Vires Acts)

Date: April 22, 2026

To: Amanda D. Daylong <ADaylong@nwtrialattorneys.com>
Cc: Chris Kemp <CKemp@asotincountywa.gov>; Public Disclosure <PDisclosure@asotincountywa.gov>; Alisha Shaw (SAO) <shawa@sao.wa.gov>; Nick Brown (AGO) <nick.brown@atg.wa.gov>; Intake <intake@wsba.org>; [Standard Media/Oversight Distribution List]

Ms. Daylong and Mr. Kemp,

This correspondence serves as a final consolidated record of the legal and procedural deficiencies attributable to Asotin County and its deputized counsel, Amanda Daylong. Despite multiple notices and expired deadlines (April 5, April 16, and April 18, 2026), the County has failed to cure these violations.

As of this writing, the County's strategy of silence and extra-record document production confirms bad faith. This email summarizes the current state of non-compliance and serves as the final notice before the filing of additional actions in Columbia County Superior Court and the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Washington.

I. The Core Unlawful Scheme: Laundering Public Funds for Judge Burns' Defense

The documentary record—including documents produced by Ms. Daylong on April 21, 2026, outside the PRA process—conclusively establishes the following scheme:

1. Insurance Excluded PRA Coverage: On July 3, 2025, WCRG/Clear Risk Solutions issued a Disclaimer Letter stating coverage was not afforded for Public Records Act (PRA) claims.
2. County Hired Private Counsel Anyway: On July 10, 2025, Asotin County entered into a Fee Agreement with Floyd, Pflueger, Kearns, Nedderman & Gress, P.S. (Daylong's firm) at \$325/hour for "Public Records Act Litigation and Consulting, *Switzer v. Asotin County, et al.*"
3. The Legal Fiction Appointment: On July 21, 2025, Prosecutor Curtis Liedkie signed a Special Deputy Prosecuting Attorney Appointment for Ms. Daylong for the purpose of representing Asotin County in a lawsuit that did not exist (*Switzer v. Asotin County, et al.* was never filed).
4. The Actual Representation: Ms. Daylong substituted for Curtis Liedkie as counsel for Judge Brooke Burns in *Switzer v. Hon. Brooke Burns* (No. 104080-6), a personal capacity First Amendment action.

Conclusion: The County manufactured the "Special Deputy" appointment to route taxpayer funds through the Prosecutor's budget to pay for Judge Burns' private defense—a purpose for which insurance coverage was expressly denied. This constitutes misuse of public funds under RCW 42.20.010.

II. Specific Deficiencies of Amanda Daylong and Asotin County

The following is a complete list of outstanding deficiencies as of April 22, 2026.

A. Public Records Act (PRA) Violations (RCW 42.56)

PRA Request Deficiency / Violation Legal Authority

PDR 25-23 Withheld Email: Email withheld in entirety under RCW 5.60.060(2)(a). No lawful exemption log provided. The one-line description fails to explain how privilege applies or confirm segregable portions were considered. RCW 42.56.210(3); *Sanders v. State*

PDR 26-01 Unlawful Scanning Fee: County charged \$10.20 for scanning electronic records, a fee prohibited for born-digital records. Deficient Log: Redactions performed by Ms. Daylong (conflicted counsel) are accompanied by a spreadsheet lacking the required specific explanation. RCW 42.56.120(2); RCW 42.56.210(3)

PDR 26-10 Unreasonable Timeline & Withholding: The County's estimate of 93 days (June 8, 2026) for electronic records violates the "prompt" response requirement. The records remain wholly unproduced and no proper exemption log has been provided. RCW 42.56.520

Extra-Record Production Concealment: Ms. Daylong produced the WCRG Insurance Disclaimer and Memorandum of Coverage outside the PRA process on April 21, 2026. These documents were responsive to PDR 26-01 and were willfully withheld from the official production. RCW 42.56.550(4) (Bad Faith Penalty)

B. Misuse of Public Funds and Ultra Vires Acts

Actor Deficiency / Violation Legal Authority

Amanda Daylong Ultra Vires Threat: March 23, 2026 letter threatening a "defamation" lawsuit against a whistleblower. This act is outside the scope of the Special Deputy Appointment (limited to PRA litigation) and constitutes a misuse of county resources and intimidation. RCW 42.20.010; RCW 4.24.510 (Anti-SLAPP)

Asotin County False Statements to SAO: December 16, 2025 email to State Auditor claiming "No funds have been expended" and "Coverage was provided under insurance." These statements are materially false based on the July 2025 Fee Agreement and Insurance Disclaimer. RCW 9A.76.175 (False Statement to Public Servant)

Curtis Liedkie / Lisa Webber Unauthorized Practice / Private Practice: Prosecutor Liedkie and Coroner Webber (statutorily barred from law practice) represented Judge Burns in a personal capacity suit before the Supreme Court. RCW 36.27.060; RCW 36.24.170; RCW 2.48.200

C. First Amendment Retaliation (Sheriff's Office)

Actor Deficiency / Violation Legal Authority

Sheriff Hilderbrand / Undersheriff Richards Viewpoint Discrimination: Disabling Facebook comments on official county pages immediately after I reported potential criminal conduct by Liedkie and Webber. The temporary restoration of comments does not cure the retaliatory intent. *Lindke v. Freed*, 601 U.S. 187 (2024); First Amendment

D. Open Public Meetings Act (OPMA) Violation

Actor Deficiency / Violation Legal Authority

Board of Commissioners Refusal to Hold Hearing: My December 16, 2025 formal complaint regarding the misuse of public funds has never been placed on a public meeting agenda. RCW 42.30 (OPMA)

III. The Significance of the April 21, 2026 Production

On April 21, 2026, Ms. Daylong forwarded the WCRG Disclaimer Letter and Memorandum of Coverage. This action confirms two critical facts:

1. PRA Violation: Asotin County possessed these responsive public records and failed to produce them in response to PDR 26-01. This is a per se violation of the PRA and evidence of bad faith concealment.
2. Admission of the Scheme: The Disclaimer Letter proves the County knew PRA matters were excluded from insurance coverage as of July 3, 2025. The subsequent Fee Agreement (July 10) and Special Deputy Appointment (July 21) were deliberate acts to circumvent the insurance exclusion using taxpayer money.

IV. Procedural Status in Columbia County Superior Court

As you are aware, the PRA Complaint was filed in Columbia County Superior Court. Because Judge Brooke Burns is the sole elected Superior Court Judge for Columbia

County and is a central figure in the underlying facts of this dispute, she is statutorily disqualified under CJC Rule 2.11(A).

The Court has appointed the Honorable Roger S. Sandberg (Whitman County) as a visiting judge to review the Fee Waiver Motion (GR 34). On April 21, 2026, I filed a Notice of Disqualification (Affidavit of Prejudice) against Judge Sandberg pursuant to RCW 4.12.040 and RCW 4.12.050. This filing is a statutory right exercised prior to any discretionary ruling and is not a finding of actual bias.

Once the disqualification is processed and a new judge is assigned, the Fee Waiver Motion will be adjudicated, and the Complaint will be formally docketed for service.

V. Notice of Intent and Final Demands

The deadlines of April 5, April 16, and April 18, 2026, have passed without a legally sufficient response. The County's silence is noted and will be treated as a waiver of defenses and an admission of liability.

I will be proceeding with the following actions:

1. Columbia County Superior Court: Upon acceptance of the filing and resolution of the judicial assignment, this PRA lawsuit will proceed seeking penalties (up to \$100/day per violation), attorney fees, and an order compelling compliance with all outstanding demands.
2. U.S. District Court (Eastern District of Washington): Amendment of the pending § 1983 and RICO complaint to include the additional First Amendment retaliation by the Sheriff's Office and the ultra vires defamation threat as predicate acts.

Final Opportunity to Mitigate Damages:

To avoid the immediate filing of supplemental pleadings and the pursuit of maximum statutory penalties, the County must, by 5:00 PM PST on April 24, 2026:

1. Produce the full, unredacted PDR 25-23 email (or a properly redacted version with a detailed, lawful exemption log explaining any redactions).
2. Issue a refund check for \$10.20 payable to Corey Switzer for the unlawful scanning fee associated with PDR 26-01.
3. Provide full electronic production of all responsive records for PDR 26-10, with a proper exemption log for any withheld or redacted content.
4. Provide written confirmation that my December 16, 2025 formal complaint regarding the misuse of public funds will be placed on the agenda of the next public meeting of the Asotin County Board of Commissioners, with remote participation permitted.
5. Issue a written retraction of the March 23, 2026 defamation threat, confirming that no public funds will be used to pursue any defamation action against me.

Failure to meet this final deadline will result in the immediate filing of all available motions and complaints, and I will seek the maximum penalties available under law.

Respectfully,

Corey Michael Switzer
264 Kernodle Rd
Gibsonville, NC 27249
coreyswitzer@gmail.com
(218) 461-9868

This communication is a public record. Retaliatory action against a whistleblower violates public policy and may constitute obstruction of justice.

On Tue, Apr 21, 2026, 8:21 PM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

In layman's terms...

Curtis Liedkie and Lisa Webber represented Judge Brooke Burns before the Washington State Supreme Court in May of 2025.

At some point, likely after I filed a grievance against Curtis Liedkie and Lisa Webber with the Washington State Bar, and requested that Public Document between two elected officials they decided that their insurance policy would cover her writ of Mandamus. Not her Public Documents Requests.

To do so, they Deputized Daylong using county resources under the false pretense of a PDR request, my PDR request 25-23, requesting that email conversation Burns had asking Liedkie and Webber for representation.

Instead, Daylong represented Judge Brooke Burns after Liedkie withdrew before the Washington State Supreme Court.

Under the deputization of Daylong for and payment of Daylong for PDR request by the county, (remember, explicitly prohibited by their insurance,) Daylong used county resources to defend the Judge AND Prosecutors Office by Deputization, an action prohibited by law in a State action against a Superior Court Judge for a civil rights violation.

Stacey Harmon happened to lie to the State Auditors Office to cover it up. She resigned two weeks later.

That's why Daylong took a brave step towards threatening me with defamation.

No.

This corruption is now exposed and I intend to follow this to it's conclusion.

On Tue, Apr 21, 2026, 7:48 PM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

Subject: APRIL RICO CORRESPONDENCE – Daylong's Production of Withheld Insurance Documents Confirms PRA Violations and Laundering of Public Funds; Columbia County Filing Update

Date: April 21, 2026

This email serves as an update to the April 17, 2026 FORMAL REFERRAL and the April 21, 2026 SUPPLEMENT regarding Blake Richards' lawsuit against SB 5974. It documents a significant development: Amanda Daylong's extra-record production of insurance documents that Asotin County willfully withheld from my Public Records Act requests—documents that confirm the County's insurance excludes all PRA coverage and that taxpayer money was used to fund a defense the insurer refused to cover.

I. Daylong's Extra-Record Production of Withheld Insurance Documents

On April 21, 2026, Amanda Daylong forwarded to me, outside the Public Records Act process, three documents that the County failed to produce in response to previously redacted PDR 26-01:

1. Clear Risk Solutions' July 3, 2025 Reservation of Rights letter (Claim W1756);
2. The full 159-page Memorandum of Coverage between Asotin County and Washington Counties Risk Group; and
3. Clear Risk Solutions' July 3, 2025 Disclaimer letter expressly denying coverage for PRA claims.

These documents are indisputably public records under RCW 42.56. They are responsive to my pending requests. They were not listed on any exemption log. The County's failure to disclose them through the PRA process constitutes a per se violation of RCW 42.56.210(3).

Daylong's voluntary production of these documents outside the PRA process does not cure the violation. It confirms that the County possessed responsive records it willfully withheld. I am preserving these documents and will supplement my pending PRA complaint to include this additional violation as evidence of bad faith warranting maximum penalties under RCW 42.56.550(4).

II. The Insurance Documents Confirm the Laundering Scheme

The newly produced documents confirm what I have alleged from the outset: Asotin County's insurance policy excludes all PRA claims, fines, penalties, and attorney fees. Exclusion 14 of the Wrongful Act Liability Coverage Part states unequivocally that coverage does not apply to "any Claims, fines, or penalties, including attorney fees arising out of the Washington Public Records Act, Open Public Meetings Act, or any other similar act or law."

The timeline is dispositive:

- July 3, 2025: WCRG issues two letters. The Disclaimer letter states coverage is "not afforded" for PRA claims. The Reservation of Rights letter states coverage is subject to exclusions and reserves all rights.
- July 8, 2025: Curtis Liedkie withdraws as counsel for Judge Brooke Burns in *Switzer v. Hon. Brooke Burns* (No. 104080-6).
- July 10, 2025: Asotin County enters into a fee agreement with Daylong's firm at \$325/hour for "Public Records Act Litigation and Consulting."
- July 21, 2025: Liedkie signs a Special Deputy appointment naming Daylong "for the purpose of representing Asotin County in Public Records Act Litigation and Consulting, *Switzer v. Asotin County, et al.*"—a case that did not exist.

The sequence is clear. The County learned on July 3 that insurance would not cover PRA matters. Within weeks, it manufactured a Special Deputy appointment to funnel public funds through the prosecutor's budget to pay private counsel for a defense the

insurer refused to cover. The appointment was a transparent artifice to launder taxpayer money.

Despite this, on December 31, 2025, the County told the State Auditor's Office: "Coverage was provided under our insurance policy and assigned legal counsel." That statement was false when made. The County afforded outside Deputized counsel, not for a PRA request but for representing Judge Brooke Burns.

III. The Two Attachments That Prove the Laundering

Two documents, standing alone, establish the scheme:

1. July 10, 2025 Fee Agreement – Asotin County agrees to pay Daylong's firm \$325/hour for "Public Records Act Litigation and Consulting, Switzer v. Asotin County, et al." This is a direct commitment of public funds for a purpose insurance refused to cover.
2. July 21, 2025 Special Deputy Prosecuting Attorney Appointment – Liedkie appoints Daylong "for the purpose of representing Asotin County in Public Records Act Litigation and Consulting, Switzer v. Asotin County, et al." No such case existed. The appointment was a legal fiction designed to make Daylong's work appear to be a function of the prosecutor's office, allowing the County to pay her from the prosecutor's budget for a Public Documents Requests without specific legislative authorization to represent Judge Burns before the Washington State Supreme Court.

These two documents—read together with the WCRG Disclaimer letter denying PRA coverage—prove that the County knowingly used public funds for a purpose insurance excluded, then concealed that fact from the SAO.

IV. The False Statements to the State Auditor – Updated Table

The County's December 16, 2025 representations to the SAO were materially false:

County's Statement to SAO Truth (from County's Own Documents)

"No funds have been expended for this purpose." July 10, 2025 fee agreement obligates County to pay \$325/hour.

"The County did not hire and pay a private law firm." Fee agreement and Special Deputy appointment prove the County did.

"Coverage was provided under our insurance policy and assigned legal counsel."

WCRG letters (July 3, 2025) show PRA coverage was denied and excluded.

"Mr. Liedkie never filed 'Notice of Appearance'..." July 8, 2025 substitution notice shows Liedkie withdrew as counsel for Judge Burns. Daylong also admits this, despite concealing her deputization.

These false statements materially misled the SAO and were part of a deliberate strategy to shield the misuse of public funds from scrutiny.

This is exacerbated by Daylong's reliance upon an appellate review of Neil, in which addresses a public documents request and NOT a Civil Writ of Mandamus against a State Officer.

V. Columbia County PRA Filing – Procedural Status

On April 20, 2026, I electronically filed a Public Records Act complaint against Asotin County in Columbia County Superior Court (Envelope No. 784957) It was closed and I needed to file a fee waiver motion under GR 34.

The fee waiver motion was initially referred to the sole Superior Court judge for the Asotin-Garfield-Columbia judicial district—the Honorable Brooke Burns. Because Judge Burns is the subject of the underlying PRA request and is implicated in the factual allegations giving rise to this dispute, she is statutorily disqualified from ruling on any matter in this case under CJC Rule 2.11(A). Her recusal was automatic and proper.

The Court has since assigned visiting judge Roger S. Sandberg of Whitman County to review the fee waiver motion. As of this writing, no discretionary ruling has been issued, and the Complaint awaits acceptance for filing pending resolution of the fee waiver. This is a routine procedural step, and I have no reason to believe the delay reflects anything other than the ordinary time required to secure a visiting judge for a matter involving a judicial conflict.

I have filed a Notice of Disqualification (Affidavit of Prejudice) against Judge Sandberg pursuant to RCW 4.12.040 and RCW 4.12.050. This filing is a statutory right, not an accusation of actual bias. It simply preserves my ability to request a different neutral judicial officer. A copy of the notice has been provided to counsel for the County.

Once the fee waiver order is signed and a case number is assigned, I will refile the Complaint and address service of process.

VI. Blake Richards' Lawsuit Against SB 5974

As documented in my April 21, 2026 SUPPLEMENT, Undersheriff Blake Richards—a candidate for Asotin County Sheriff—has filed a lawsuit challenging SB 5974, the newly enacted sheriff standards law. Richards seeks to block the very accountability mechanisms that could hold him responsible for his documented misconduct: silencing a citizen's report of potential corruption by disabling Facebook comments, and failing to fulfill his statutory duty under RCW 36.28.011 to investigate or refer that report.

Richards' lawsuit is not a principled stand for local control. It is the latest maneuver in a coordinated scheme to avoid accountability. His conduct is documented in WSCJTC Case Nos. 2026-0000213 and I shall be CERTAIN to bring it up the moment Undersheriff Richards gets his certification.

VII. Outstanding PRA Violations – No Cure

As of this writing, the County has still not:

- Produced the PDR 25-23 email withheld in its entirety, with a lawful exemption log;
- Provided a proper exemption log for PDR 26-01 redactions;
- Produced PDR 26-10 records or provided a reasonable timeline;
- Refunded the unlawful \$10.20 scanning fee;
- Scheduled my December 16, 2025 formal complaint for a public hearing.

The deadlines set in my April 13 and April 17 correspondence have passed without a legally sufficient response. The County's silence is noted and will be treated as a waiver of defenses and an admission of liability in all pending and forthcoming legal actions. I have repeatedly given you adequate notice.

VIII. Conclusion

The insurance documents produced by Daylong confirm what the record already showed: no insurance coverage for PRA defense, taxpayer money funding that defense, and false statements to the State Auditor to conceal both. The County's own documents break the cover-up.

The two attachments that most clearly demonstrate the laundering of public funds are the July 10, 2025 Fee Agreement and the July 21, 2025 Special Deputy Prosecuting Attorney Appointment. Read together with the WCRG Disclaimer letter denying PRA coverage, they establish that the County knowingly used taxpayer money for a purpose insurance excluded, then lied to the SAO about it.

The procedural posture in Columbia County—a fee waiver motion awaiting review by a visiting judge following a proper judicial recusal—is not evidence of corruption. It is the system working as designed to route a conflicted matter to a neutral decision-maker. I am confident the fee waiver will be adjudicated fairly once the procedural steps are complete.

I will continue to document and preserve all evidence for my pending federal civil rights and RICO complaint, and for the PRA action once the fee waiver is granted and the case is docketed.

The record is complete. The cover-up is exposed. The process continues.

Respectfully,

Corey Michael Switzer
264 Kernodle Rd
Gibsonville, NC 27249
coreyswitzer@gmail.com
(218) 461-9868

This communication is a public record. Retaliatory action against a whistleblower violates public policy and may constitute obstruction of justice.

Attachments (available upon request):

- Exhibit F: July 10, 2025 Fee Agreement (showing \$325/hour commitment of public funds)
- Exhibit G: July 21, 2025 Special Deputy Prosecuting Attorney Appointment (showing laundering mechanism)
- WCRG Disclaimer Letter (July 3, 2025) (showing PRA coverage denied)
- Notice of Disqualification (filed April 21, 2026)

1. Exhibit F – July 10, 2025 Fee Agreement

- Shows the County committed public funds (\$325/hour) for "Public Records Act Litigation and Consulting."
- Proves expenditure of taxpayer money.

2. Exhibit G – July 21, 2025 Special Deputy Prosecuting Attorney Appointment

- Shows the mechanism: Liedkie deputized Daylong for a case that didn't exist to route the payment through the prosecutor's budget.
- Proves the laundering vehicle.

These two documents, standing alone, establish the scheme. The WCRG Disclaimer letter provides the motive (insurance wouldn't cover it), but the Fee Agreement and Special Deputy Appointment are the smoking guns.

On Tue, Apr 21, 2026, 7:09 PM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

To: Amanda Daylong <ADaylong@nwtrialattorneys.com>

Cc: Alisha Shaw (SAO) <shawa@sao.wa.gov>, Public Disclosure

<PDisclosure@asotincountywa.gov>

Subject: Re: Formal Notice: Misuse of Public Funds – Acknowledgment of Receipt and Notice of PRA Violation

Ms. Daylong:

I acknowledge receipt of your April 21, 2026 email forwarding correspondence from Clear Risk Solutions, including the Reservation of Rights letter, the Memorandum of Coverage, and the Disclaimer letter regarding Claim No. W1756.

These documents are public records under RCW 42.56. They are responsive to my pending Public Records Act requests, PDR 26-01 unredacted and sent via email. They were not produced in response to those requests, nor were they listed on any exemption log.

Your voluntary production of these documents outside the PRA process does not cure the County's ongoing PRA violations. It confirms that the County possessed responsive records that it failed to disclose timely, unredacted, and without unlawful fees assessed for their production.

I am preserving these documents and will supplement my pending PRA complaint in Columbia County Superior Court to include this additional violation.

Nothing in this email waives any rights or remedies available under the PRA.

Please CC the public documents request in response to these records, as they are responsive to PDR26-10.

My original demands for production of the unredacted PDR25-23 and unredacted PDR26-10 remain unresolved in addition to the timely hearing before the Asotin County Commissioners regarding the unlawful expenditures of public funds and

resources for the Asotin County Prosecutor Curtis Liedkie, and Asotin County Coroner Lisa Webber, the expenditures of taxpayers resources for the unlawful Representation of Judge Brooke Burns.

Respectfully,

Corey Michael Switzer

On Tue, Apr 21, 2026, 6:56 PM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

To: Amanda Daylong <adaylong@nwtrialattorneys.com>

Cc: Chris Kemp <CKemp@asotincountywa.gov>, Public Disclosure
<PDisclosure@asotincountywa.gov>

Subject: Corey Michael Switzer v. Asotin County – Procedural Status and Disqualification Process

Dear Ms. Daylong:

Thank you for your email. I am writing to clarify the procedural posture of this matter and to address your question regarding service of process.

I. Current Procedural Posture

The Public Records Act complaint was submitted for electronic filing in Columbia County Superior Court on April 20, 2026, along with a Motion and Declaration for Waiver of Civil Fees and Surcharges under GR 34. The Court has not yet accepted the filing. The fee waiver motion remains pending before the Honorable Roger S. Sandberg, who was assigned as a visiting judge. As of this writing, no discretionary ruling has been made on the fee waiver motion, and no case number has been assigned.

Formal service of process cannot be completed until the Complaint is accepted for filing and a case number is assigned. Once that occurs, I will address service in accordance with the Rules.

II. Distinction Between Disqualification at the Fee Waiver Stage and After a Ruling

Under Washington law, the method for disqualifying a judge depends on the stage of the proceeding.

A. Before a Discretionary Ruling: Notice of Disqualification (Affidavit of Prejudice)

RCW 4.12.050 provides a party with the right to disqualify a judge as a matter of right by filing a notice of disqualification—historically referred to as an affidavit of prejudice—before the judge has made any discretionary ruling. The statute is mandatory: "Notice of disqualification must be filed and called to the attention of the judge before the judge has made any discretionary ruling in the case". Once a proper and timely notice of disqualification is filed, the judge is divested of authority to hear the matter, and the presiding judge must transfer the action to another department or call in a visiting judge. This is a low-bar, procedural mechanism; the party need not prove actual bias, only file the notice before a discretionary ruling is made.

B. After a Discretionary Ruling: Motion to Recuse Under CJC 2.11(A)

If a discretionary ruling has already been made—for example, if the fee waiver order is signed before the notice of disqualification is filed—the statutory right under RCW 4.12.050 is lost. At that point, the party must move for recusal under CJC 2.11(A), which requires a showing that "the judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned". This is a higher bar; the moving party must present evidence of actual bias or circumstances creating an appearance of impropriety, and the judge has discretion to deny the motion. This is a far more burdensome and time-consuming process for all involved.

The distinction is significant. The fee waiver motion itself constitutes a discretionary ruling for purposes of RCW 4.12.050. See, e.g., *In re Estate of Black*, 116 Wn. App. 492, 66 P.3d 678 (2003) (affidavit of prejudice must be called to the attention of the judge before he or she makes a discretionary ruling). Therefore, to preserve the lower-bar, mandatory disqualification mechanism, the notice of disqualification must be filed before the fee waiver order is signed.

III. Next Steps

I have requested that the clerk provide the case number as soon as it is assigned so that I may file the notice of disqualification before any discretionary ruling is made. If the fee waiver order is signed before I have an opportunity to file the notice, I will have lost the statutory right under RCW 4.12.050 and will be required to pursue recusal under CJC 2.11(A)—a process I would prefer to avoid in the interest of judicial economy.

Once the fee waiver order is signed and the case number is assigned, I will refile the Complaint into the new case number and promptly address service of process. I will keep you apprised of developments.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Respectfully,

Corey Michael Switzer
264 Kernodle Rd
Gibsonville, NC 27249
(218) 461-9868
coreyswitzer@gmail.com
Pro Se Plaintiff

On Tue, Apr 21, 2026, 6:42 PM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

To: Amanda Daylong <ADaylong@nwtrialattorneys.com>
Cc: Chris Kemp <CKemp@asotincountywa.gov>, Public Disclosure <PDisclosure@asotincountywa.gov>
Subject: Corey Michael Switzer v. Asotin County – Notice of Intent to File Affidavit of Prejudice (RCW 4.12.050)

Dear Ms. Daylong:

I am writing to provide you with formal notice of my intent to file a Notice of Disqualification (Affidavit of Prejudice) against the Honorable Roger S. Sandberg pursuant to RCW 4.12.040 and RCW 4.12.050.

As you are aware, my Public Records Act complaint against Asotin County was submitted for filing in Columbia County Superior Court on April 20, 2026, along with a fee waiver motion under GR 34. The Court has assigned Judge Sandberg as a visiting judge to review the fee waiver motion.

Under RCW 4.12.050, a party has the right to file an affidavit of prejudice against an assigned judge before any discretionary ruling is made. I intend to exercise that statutory right immediately upon receiving a case number and before the fee waiver order is entered.

I am providing this notice as a courtesy and to ensure full transparency in this litigation. Once the case number is assigned and the affidavit is filed, I will provide you with a conformed copy.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Respectfully,

Corey Michael Switzer
264 Kernodle Rd
Gibsonville, NC 27249
(218) 461-9868
coreyswitzer@gmail.com
Pro Se Plaintiff

Attached: Motion for Disqualification

On Tue, Apr 21, 2026, 1:00 PM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

Subject: SUPPLEMENT TO FORMAL REFERRAL: Blake Richards Sues to Block Accountability Law (SAO Hotline #25-795 & WSCJTC Nos. 2026-0000213)

Date: April 21, 2026

To: Alisha Shaw (SAO) <shawa@sao.wa.gov>; Nick Brown (Attorney General) <nick.brown@atg.wa.gov>

Dear Investigator Shaw and Attorney General Brown,

I am writing to supplement my formal referral dated April 17, 2026, regarding the multi-agency conspiracy to obstruct justice and misuse public funds in Asotin County. A new development has emerged that directly implicates one of the key actors in that scheme and provides further evidence of his unfitness for public office.

I. Blake Richards Files Lawsuit to Block Accountability Law (SB 5974)

On April 20, 2026, Blake Richards—currently serving as Undersheriff of Asotin County and a candidate for Asotin County Sheriff—filed a lawsuit challenging Washington's newly enacted sheriff standards law, Senate Bill 5974. The law, signed earlier this month by Governor Bob Ferguson, establishes baseline qualifications for sheriffs, including a requirement of five years of full-time law enforcement experience, a minimum age of 25, and a mandatory background check. Crucially, it also ties a sheriff's ability to remain in office to the possession of a valid peace officer certification, and it provides a mechanism for the Criminal Justice Training Commission to remove a sheriff who loses that certification.

Richards' lawsuit, led by the Ard Law Group with support from the Washington State Sheriffs' Association, argues that the law is unconstitutional and limits voter choice. He claims that the law's requirement of five consecutive years of uninterrupted, full-time law enforcement experience creates a barrier not applied to other elected positions. He also raises concerns about a provision allowing a state-appointed board to remove elected sheriffs and app

March RICO Correspondence

1 message

Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com>

Sat, Mar 7, 2026 at 11:30 AM

To: Trae Turner <trae@clarkandfeeney.com>

Cc: Jessica Kline <jkline@isb.idaho.gov>, Joseph Pirtle <jpirtle@isb.idaho.gov>, Lori Ostertag <lostertag@isb.idaho.gov>, Judahluke7@gmail.com, Lisa Webber <LWebber@asotincountywa.gov>, hliedkie@co.nezperce.id.us, jgish@co.nezperce.id.us, dhavens@co.nezperce.id.us, thirteentwelveforever@proton.me, info@southdakotatruth.com, 08mad10@gmail.com, city@lmtribune.com, Civil.Fraud@usdoj.gov, justin rodriguez <jrodspeaks@gmail.com>, idahoauditors@gmail.com, tips@nbcuni.com, tips@inlander.com, news@theregister.com, news@kpbx.org, Newsdesk@krem.com, newsroom@idahopress.com, news@bigcountry977.com, News4@kxly.com, Ada Eldridge <Adaeldridge@hotmail.com>, brennonlleafty@gmail.com, SUEANNSMITH32@YAHOO.COM <sueannsmith32@yahoo.com>, Imccann@house.idaho.gov, nancececcarelli@co.nezperce.id.us, Monte Schmidt <monte.schmidt@itd.idaho.gov>, jklein@cityoflewiston.org, Representative Brandon Mitchell <bmmitchell@house.idaho.gov>, bryces@co.nezperce.id.us, ISPPPIO@isp.idaho.gov, Brooke Burns <BBurns@co.asotin.wa.us>, Stephanie Cuddihy <StephanieC@co.nezperce.id.us>, Dispatch LPD <dispatch@cityoflewiston.org>, Jason Kuzik <jkuzik@cityoflewiston.org>, Amy Ledgerwood <AmyLedgerwood@co.nezperce.id.us>, Constituent Mailbox <AGLabrador@ag.idaho.gov>, Ombuds AGO <AGOOmbuds@atg.wa.gov>, tsparks@clarkstonpolice.org, AprilS@co.nezperce.id.us <AprilS@co.nezperce.id.us>, Dan Johnson <danjohnson@cityoflewiston.org>, Patty Weeks <PattyWeeks@co.nezperce.id.us>, Brian Shinn <BShinn@asotincountywa.gov>, Mariel Gates <Mariel.Gates@tax.idaho.gov>, Chris Seubert <cseubert@asotincountywa.gov>, Justin Coleman <JustinColeman@co.nezperce.id.us>, Charles Whitman <CWhitman@asotincountywa.gov>, Curt Liedkie <CLiedkie@asotincountywa.gov>, Intake <intake@wsba.org>, Amanda Daylong <ADaylong@nwtrialattorneys.com>, apearce@nwtrialattorneys.com, Karen Carlisle <kcarlisle@isb.idaho.gov>, legal@libertasfunding.com, Investigations Info Requests <InvestigationsInfoRequests@isp.idaho.gov>, dmckay@asotincountywa.gov, rlynch@asotincountywa.gov, Public Disclosure <PDisclosure@asotincountywa.gov>, Stacey Harman <SHarman@asotincountywa.gov>, usdemsocialists@gmail.com, objectionoverruled2@gmail.com, whistleblower@startribune.com, Kevin Munstermann <kevin@travelland-rv.com>, Tricia.McLaughlin@hq.dhs.gov, doswald@idahostatesman.com, Nicholas Woods <nicholasw@co.nezperce.id.us>, news@spokesman.com, kelleyp@co.nezperce.id.us, Alisha Shaw <shaw@sa.o.wa.gov>, andreat@choosclear.com, publicrecords@atg.wa.gov

Mr. Turner,

Thank you for your thoughtful and substantive response to my public records request. The YouTube link—"How about No"—has been received and will be preserved as evidence of your professional correspondence in this matter.

I appreciate you taking time out of your busy schedule to demonstrate, in such a clear and public manner, exactly the kind of dismissive obstruction that has been documented throughout these proceedings. Your response is noted.

A Few Clarifications, Since You've Chosen to Engage:

1. Jurisdiction – You are responding to a public records request directed to Asotin County, Washington. You have no clients there. You have no office there. You are admitted to practice in Washington state (to my knowledge). And yet, here you are, interjecting yourself into a Washington public records matter on behalf of... whom, exactly?

- Judge Brooke Burns? She has private counsel (Amanda Daylong).
- Curtis Liedkie? He's the Asotin County Prosecutor—surely he can speak for himself.
- The Asotin County Commissioners? They have a Chief Operating Officer and legal counsel.

So I must ask: Who are you representing here? And why is an Idaho attorney, whose practice is conducting business limited to Idaho, involving himself in a Washington county's public records compliance? The appearance is that you are functioning as an informal gatekeeper for a network of officials who would prefer these records not see the light of day.

2. Conflicts of Interest – You currently represent Travelland RV. You have represented Nez Perce County Prosecutor Justin Coleman. You are married to Kali Parker, a deputy prosecutor in that same office. And now, on March 4, 2026, the State of Idaho is prosecuting Di Ann Geagley for embezzling \$554,000 from Travelland RV—the

very crimes I reported years ago, the very crimes your client's business was victimized by, and the very crimes your close associate Justin Coleman's office is now finally prosecuting.

You understand how this looks, yes? The public will.

3. Your Client, Vittoria Paxe Puccini (f/k/a Meghan McCreary) – Since you seem to have time for YouTube links, perhaps you could explain the following to the many people copied on this email:

- How is it that your client, Vittoria Puccini, has been listed as the Secretary of Travelland RV in every single Idaho Secretary of State filing from 2020 to the present—including the 2023 and 2024 filings—while simultaneously claiming total disability and receiving (or attempting to receive) Social Security benefits based on her inability to work?

- How does someone function as the corporate secretary of a multi-million dollar RV dealership while simultaneously being too disabled to hold any job?

- And how does an attorney—you—ethically represent a client in active litigation (the Travelland RV matters, the disputes with me, the police report in Clarkston) while that client is potentially defrauding the federal government?

These are not rhetorical questions. The Idaho Secretary of State's website is public. The Social Security Administration's docket is public (see Puccini v. King, Case No. 2:23-cv-00218). The timing of her disability claims and her continued corporate role are now part of the record.

4. Tangential Blowback – You don't want to be involved in Asotin County matters. I understand why. The records being requested in PDR 25-23 and PDR #26-01 involve communications between Judge Brooke Burns, Curtis Liedkie, and Lisa Webber—individuals connected, by marriage and by professional association, to people and entities in your orbit. You don't want your name in those emails. You don't want deposition questions about what you knew and when. You don't want to explain to a federal judge why you inserted yourself into a Washington public records dispute.

But here's the problem: I bet your name is already in those emails. The PDR #26-01 production already shows Amanda Daylong copying people on strategy discussions. The December 22, 2025 "SAO Complaint meeting" included outside counsel and the county insurer—and are you looped in? You are not an innocent bystander. You are documented.

Demand (Reiterated):

To the extent you are acting as counsel or advisor to any Asotin County official or employee regarding these matters, please confirm that role in writing. If you are not, please explain your involvement and produce any records responsive to PDR 25-23 that are in your possession or control, as required by law.

If your "How about No" is intended as a formal refusal, please state that clearly so I may adjust my filings accordingly—including my supplemental submission to the Idaho Supreme Court, my pending RICO draft, and my communications with the Washington State Auditor and the Department of Justice.

Respectfully,

Corey Michael Switzer
264 Kernodle Rd
Gibsonville, NC 27249
coreyswitzer@gmail.com
218-461-9868

Note: This communication is a public record. Retaliatory action against a person exercising their rights violates RCW 42.56.550(4).

P.S. – The YouTube link has been archived and preserved. It will make an excellent exhibit.

[Quoted text hidden]

March RICO Correspondence

1 message

Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com>

Sun, Mar 8, 2026 at 7:49 AM

To: Trae Turner <trae@clarkandfeeney.com>, kelleyp@co.nezperce.id.us, Justin Coleman <JustinColeman@co.nezperce.id.us>

Cc: Jessica Kline <jkline@isb.idaho.gov>, Joseph Pirtle <jpirtle@isb.idaho.gov>, Lori Ostertag <lostertag@isb.idaho.gov>, Judahluke7@gmail.com, Lisa Webber <LWebber@asotincountywa.gov>, hliedkie@co.nezperce.id.us, jgish@co.nezperce.id.us, dhavens@co.nezperce.id.us, thirteentwelveforever@proton.me, info@southdakotatruth.com, 08mad10@gmail.com, city@lmtribune.com, Civil.Fraud@usdoj.gov, justin rodriguez <jrodspeaks@gmail.com>, idahoauditors@gmail.com, tips@nbcuni.com, tips@inlander.com, news@theregister.com, news@kpbx.org, Newsdesk@krem.com, newsroom@idahopress.com, news@bigcountry977.com, News4@kxly.com, Ada Eldridge <Adaeldridge@hotmail.com>, brennonlleafty@gmail.com, SUEANNSMITH32@YAHOO.COM <sueannsmith32@yahoo.com>, Imccann@house.idaho.gov, nancececcarelli@co.nezperce.id.us, Monte Schmidt <monte.schmidt@itd.idaho.gov>, jklein@cityoflewiston.org, Representative Brandon Mitchell <bmitchell@house.idaho.gov>, bryces@co.nezperce.id.us, ISPPPIO@isp.idaho.gov, Brooke Burns <BBurns@co.asotin.wa.us>, Stephanie Cuddihy <StephanieC@co.nezperce.id.us>, Dispatch LPD <dispatch@cityoflewiston.org>, Jason Kuzik <jkuzik@cityoflewiston.org>, Amy Ledgerwood <AmyLedgerwood@co.nezperce.id.us>, Constituent Mailbox <AGLabrador@ag.idaho.gov>, Ombuds AGO <AGOOmbuds@atg.wa.gov>, tsparks@clarkstonpolice.org, AprilS@co.nezperce.id.us <AprilS@co.nezperce.id.us>, Dan Johnson <danjohnson@cityoflewiston.org>, Patty Weeks <PattyWeeks@co.nezperce.id.us>, Brian Shinn <BShinn@asotincountywa.gov>, Mariel Gates <Mariel.Gates@tax.idaho.gov>, Chris Seubert <cseubert@asotincountywa.gov>, Charles Whitman <CWhitman@asotincountywa.gov>, Curt Liedkie <CLiedkie@asotincountywa.gov>, Intake <intake@wsba.org>, Amanda Daylong <ADaylong@nwtrialattorneys.com>, apearce@nwtrialattorneys.com, Karen Carlisle <kcarlisle@isb.idaho.gov>, legal@libertasfunding.com, Investigations Info Requests <InvestigationsInfoRequests@isp.idaho.gov>, dmckay@asotincountywa.gov, rlynch@asotincountywa.gov, Public Disclosure <PDisclosure@asotincountywa.gov>, Stacey Harman <SHarman@asotincountywa.gov>, usdemsocialists@gmail.com, objectionoverruled2@gmail.com, whistleblower@startribune.com, Kevin Munstermann <kevin@travelland-rv.com>, Tricia.McLaughlin@hq.dhs.gov, doswald@idahostatesman.com, Nicholas Woods <nicholasw@co.nezperce.id.us>, news@spokesman.com, Alisha Shaw <shawa@sao.wa.gov>, andreat@choosclear.com, publicrecords@atg.wa.gov

Subject: FOLLOW-UP: Unanswered Questions & New Documentary Evidence (March 8, 2026)

March 8, 2026

To:

Trae Turner <trae@clarkandfeeney.com>

Dear Mr. Turner,

Thank you again for your March 7, 2026 response to my public records request. The YouTube link—"How about No"—has been archived, timestamped, and added to the evidentiary record. It joins your other professional correspondence in what is, and has always been a rather colorful collection of insults from you in response to lawful questions, notwithstanding telling a Federal Labor Investigator falsely that I had been Convicted of Solicitation of a Juvenile, a charge which does not, nor has ever existed in my record.

Since you've chosen not to answer any of the substantive questions posed in my previous email, I thought I'd provide you with some additional documentary evidence—courtesy of the Idaho Secretary of State, the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Washington, and the Asotin County District Court—to help refresh your memory and perhaps prompt a more substantive response this time.

1. Your Client, Vittoria Paxe Puccini (f/k/a Meghan McCreary)

You've had since March 7 to address the rather obvious discrepancy between your client's corporate role and her disability claims. Silence is not a defense, so let's lay it out more explicitly.

Idaho Secretary of State Records (Travelland RV, Inc. File #0003747721):

Filing Date Document Secretary Listed

01/15/2020 Articles of Incorporation Meghan McCreary

12/04/2020 Annual Report Meghan McCreary

12/07/2021 Annual Report Meghan McCreary

12/06/2022 Annual Report Meghan McCreary

01/08/2024 Annual Report Meghan McCreary

01/03/2025 Annual Report Meghan McCreary

12/29/2025 Annual Report Meghan McCreary

Asotin County District Court (Case No. CI0018767):

· 07/07/2021: Meghan Joellen McCreary legally changes her name to Vittoria Paxe Puccini.

U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Washington (Case No. 2:25-cv-00010-EFS):

- Alleged Onset Date of Disability: August 21, 2021
- Disability Claim Basis: Bipolar disorder, depression, anxiety, OCD, panic attacks, migraine headaches—allegedly preventing any full-time work.
- Treatment Notes (PMHNP Rowland, August 15, 2023): Your client reported she was seeking a new provider because her previous one "did not support her disability application."
- ALJ Decision (Affirmed July 9, 2025): Benefits denied. The Court found the ALJ properly considered that your client's mental status examinations, and in spite of Kevin Munstermann's supporting letter of disability, were "predominantly within normal limits and unremarkable" throughout the relevant period.

The Inconvenient Question:

How does someone serve as the Secretary of a corporation, specifically Travelland RV,—a role with fiduciary duties, requiring active participation in corporate governance, filing annual reports, and maintaining corporate records—for five consecutive years (2020-2025), while simultaneously claiming to be totally disabled and unable to work?

More pointedly: How does her attorney—you—ethically represent her in litigation arising from that very corporation (Travelland RV) while she is potentially defrauding the State of Idaho for false Secretary of State filings, the State of Washington for receiving Supplemental Nutritional Aid -and- the federal government Social Security Disability Income?

And how do you then justify representing Justin Coleman before the Idaho State Bar, given you were married to Kali Jo Parker at the same time?

And how does that attorney then turn around and involve himself in a plea against the lawful release of requested Washington public records dispute on behalf of... whom, exactly, Mr. Turner?

The Idaho State Bar's Rules of Professional Conduct might have something to say about that. So does the Washington State Bar Association. But then again, we've seen how that process works.

You've got Patty Weeks, County Clerk and Bar Association Commissioner for two districts in Idaho and Katie Hawkins of Clark and Feeney as a Commissioner in Washington State, besides formerly working under Todd Richardson, acting City Attorney in Troy, ID, and Justin Coleman was the best man at your wedding?

2. Your Role in Asotin County (Still Unexplained)

You still haven't answered the jurisdictional question. Let me make it simpler:

- You are an Idaho attorney that has lived in Clarkston.
- You are admitted to practice law in both in Idaho State and in Washington State (to my knowledge).
- You have no clients in Asotin County aside from Kevin Munstermann and Vittoria Puccini located at the same address in Clarkston, Washington (that you've disclosed).
- You are not counsel of record for Judge Brooke Burns (Amanda Daylong is).
- You are not counsel for the Asotin County Commissioners (Chris Kemp, Amanda Daylong and county counsel handle that).

And yet, here you are—inserting yourself into a Washington public records dispute, responding to requests directed to Washington officials, and apparently monitoring the distribution list closely enough to fire off a YouTube link within hours.

The only logical explanation is that you are acting as a mouthpiece and informal gatekeeper for a network of officials who would prefer these records not see the light of day. The December 22, 2025 "SAO Complaint meeting"—attended by county officials, outside counsel, and the county's insurer—suggests a coordinated strategy.

Were you on that call? Were you consulted? Did you advise anyone in Asotin County on how to respond to my records requests or the State Auditor's investigation like you advised Coleman, and received information from him to assist Puccini in filing an erroneous police report in Clarkston? Please, please say yes.

If so, you have discoverable records.

If not, please explain your objections to illicit your involvement on these emails,
Or lets focus on the people who actually have authority to respond to the request for documentation...
Or include documents that directly refute and rebut these facts.

3. The Geagley Indictment & Your Client's Embezzlement Nightmare

On March 4, 2026, the State of Idaho began prosecuting Di Ann R. Geagley for embezzling **\$554,000** from Travelland RV between 2021 and 2025—claiming nearly half of which (\$233,000) went to online gambling debts.

Your client, Travelland RV, was the victim.

Your client, Kevin Munstermann, was the President.

Your client, Meghan McCreary (Vittoria Puccini), was the Secretary during the entire alleged embezzlement period while she claimed total disability as illustrated.

You represented Travelland RV in litigation against me during that same period alleged, throughout 2022 and "as a courtesy" to represent Puccini for K.Munstermann in 2023.

Your wife, (until January of 2026), Kali Parker, is a deputy prosecutor underneath Justin Coleman in the same office now prosecuting the case against your Clients employee, the Embezzling I have been reporting for 5 years. Your close associate, Justin Coleman, is the elected prosecutor overseeing that office.

You, Mr. Turner, Justin Coleman and April Smith all have had inside knowledge of this indictment since at least October of 2025, throughout each hearing in December, January, as reported by the regional newspaper February 3rd and by Travelland RV themselves, February 4th.

And now, public records from the Idaho Secretary of State confirm what I've been saying for years: Travelland RV was drowning in tax liens, UCC filings, substantial judicial claims registered against them, and financial chaos throughout this period.

Liens Against Travelland RV, Inc. (2020-2026):

- 03/11/2020: UCC filings with Timothy & Susan Krueger (lapsed)
- 03/25/2020: UCC filing with Twin River Bank (active)
- 10/22/2021: Two Idaho Department of Labor liens (released)
- 10/25/2022: Idaho State Tax Commission lien (released)
- 11/28/2022: Five Idaho State Tax Commission liens (released)
- 12/09/2022: Two Idaho State Tax Commission liens (released)
- 03/07/2023: Idaho State Tax Commission lien (released)
- 04/28/2023: Idaho State Tax Commission lien (released)
- 05/31/2023: Idaho State Tax Commission lien (released)
- 06/13/2023: Idaho State Tax Commission lien (released)
- 07/28/2023: Idaho State Tax Commission lien (released)
- 08/08/2023: UCC filing with C T Corporation System (active—Libertas Funding)
- 09/29/2023: Two Idaho State Tax Commission liens (released)
- 12/20/2024: Idaho State Tax Commission lien (released)
- 07/29/2025: Idaho State Tax Commission lien (released)

- 08/29/2025: Idaho State Tax Commission lien (released)
- 09/12/2025: Two Idaho State Tax Commission liens (released)
- 09/26/2025: Idaho State Tax Commission lien (released)
- 10/28/2025: Idaho State Tax Commission lien (released)
- 11/04/2025: Idaho State Tax Commission lien (released)
- 12/01/2025: Idaho State Tax Commission lien (released)
- 12/09/2025: Idaho State Tax Commission lien (released)
- 2026: Multiple additional filings (ongoing)

Liens Against Kevin M. Munstermann (Personal):

- 05/12/2023: Four Idaho State Tax Commission liens (released)
- 08/22/2023: Idaho State Tax Commission lien (released)
- 10/11/2023: Idaho State Tax Commission lien (released)
- 03/12/2024: Idaho State Tax Commission lien (released)

This is not the profile of a well-managed, financially stable business. This is the profile of an enterprise under continuous financial distress, with tax liens filed, judgement against your Client for immediately defaulting on a receipt loan, and released in a timely cycle—coinciding almost perfectly with the period when your client's bookkeeper was allegedly stealing over half a million dollars. I have been saying the same thing for over 5 years.

And you knew this because that's exactly what I posted, embezzling, fraud, Forgery and tax evasion on the Nez Perce County Prosecutors Office page which elicited Coleman to urge you to have Puccini (McCreary) file charges against me in Clarkston Washington WHILE Puccini claiming total disability benefits. The charges against me you tried to file were nested deep within the same cache of evidence I (have previously and) now provide in the following link:

https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1GpJN_qarcqORIFCZsPmBUKDCY3HMTw61

It's the reason why I received harassment from former Lewiston City Council President Hannah Liedkie and led me to find her relationship with Tim Krueger through the Calem Shriners and Hannah Liedkie's OWN self-dealing taxpayers money.

There's no "should have known" Or "chose not to know".

These crimes committed by your clients at Travelland RV were ignored investigation because of your demonstrably close relationship to the Nez Perce County Prosecutors Office and elected City of Lewiston Officials.

4. The Washington Connection (PDR 25-23 & PDR #26-01)

My public records requests to Asotin County seek communications involving Judge Brooke Burns, Curtis Liedkie, and Lisa Webber regarding the unauthorized use of public funds for Judge Burns' legal defense. The PDR #26-01 production already confirms:

- December 16, 2025: Within hours of my formal complaint, Chris Kemp forwarded the matter to Andrea Tsivgadellis of Clear Risk Solutions (Claim No. W1756).
- December 22, 2025: A private "SAO Complaint meeting" was held with county officials, outside counsel Amanda Daylong, and the insurer to attempt to mitigate liability for unlawful Representation by Curtis Liedkie and Lisa Webber of Judge Brooke Burns.
- 15 communications are now withheld entirely under claims of attorney-client privilege.

Your name appears NOWHERE throughout the published email chains. You are looped into ZERO published strategy discussions. You are cc'd on ZERO published communications with the insurer. You are, by any and ALL reasonable measure, NOT involved.

So again: On whose behalf? On what grounds? And why?

If you have no responsive records, say so.

If you are not acting as counsel to anyone in Asotin County, say so.

If your involvement is purely as a concerned observer, say so. But "How about No" is not a legal response. It's not a professional response. It's the response of someone who knows the questions, who knows the answers and shows that you are uncomfortable with both questions and answers and hopes mockery and instigation will make me go away.

It hasn't. It won't.

It's going to crescendo to the Washington SAO Audit this fall, and address the documented unlawful expenditures used to represent Judge Burns by Curtis Liedkie, Lisa Webber, authored by Chris Kemp and Employed Amanda Daylong at the behest of the insurance company. It is already further compounded by a private attorney, Amanda Daylong redacting her own communication regarding the SAO Audit strategy for her replacement for Curtis Liedkie.

5. What Happens Next

Your response—or continued silence—will be noted in:

- This Public Document Request
- My pending federal RICO complaint
- My communications with the Washington State Auditor (SAO Hotline Case H-25-795)
- My communications with the U.S. Department of Justice (Civil.Fraud@usdoj.gov already copied)
- My ongoing public records litigation in Washington state

The evidentiary record now includes:

- Idaho Secretary of State filings confirming Meghan McCreary's continuous role as Secretary of Travelland RV (2020-2025)
- Federal court records affirming the repeated denial of her disability claim
- Asotin County name change records
- Lien histories for Travelland RV and Kevin Munstermann
- Your YouTube link

If you have something to say—something substantive with receipts, something that addresses the questions above with legal justification—now would be that exact time.

If you'd prefer to send another YouTube link, or add another colorful insult I'm sure the Internet has plenty. I'll be sure to add it to the collection.

The very literal moment I have the Geagley matter court case number, please have every single expectation of receiving a supplemental filing to the Nez Perce County Prosecutors Office, to the Honorable Judge Porter, and to you regarding your clients, including your client before the Idaho State Bar, Justin Coleman.

I hope you also take notice that Judge Kelley Porter and Nez Perce County Prosecutor Justin Coleman is intentionally CC'd.

Until we address the assault by Troy Munstermann and robbery by Wynter Spencer,

Until we firmly address the bribery of Captain Rick Fuentes, Andrew Fox and Nick Woods by Tim Krueger,

Until we firmly address the extortion by sales Manager of Travelland RV, Shawn Whitmore,

Until we firmly address the Forgery of the Title Application by Puccini at Travelland RV in Idaho to be registered to Munstermann's address in Clarkston, Washington,

And...

Until we address this tax evasion, tax fraud, and subsequent obstruction of justice by the above and herein named,

Have every single expectation that I shall remain a persistent thorn in the proverbial legal side of unresolved justice in the Lewiston Clarkston Valley, for myself and for others like Sue Ann Meyers.

Resign, like Stacey Harmon, Asotin County Clerk after the SAO Audit was mentioned, before it gets too late for you to do anything else, Mr. Turner.

Respectfully,

Corey Michael Switzer
264 Kernodle Rd
Gibsonville, NC 27249
coreyswitzer@gmail.com
218-461-9868

Note: This communication is a public record. Retaliatory action against a person exercising their rights violates RCW 42.56.550(4).

Attachments:

1. Idaho Secretary of State - Travelland RV Lien Search Results
2. Idaho Secretary of State - Kevin Munstermann Lien Search Results
3. Puccini v. Bisignano, No. 2:25-cv-00010-EFS (Order Affirming Denial of Benefits, July 9, 2025)
4. Asotin County District Court - Name Change (CI0018767)
5. SOS Filing Links (2020-2025 Annual Reports)
6. B1077-0232 (2025 Annual Report - Travelland RV)
7. B0977-2389 (2025 Annual Report - Travelland RV)
8. B0872-1191 (2024 Annual Report - Travelland RV)
9. B0760-0784 (2022 Annual Report - Travelland RV)
10. B0667-0593 (2021 Annual Report - Travelland RV)
11. B0558-1058 (2020 Annual Report - Travelland RV)
12. B0462-9644 (Articles of Incorporation - Travelland RV, 01/15/2020)
13. Travelland RV v Libertas Funding judgement (02/06/2024)
<https://cases.justia.com/new-york/other-courts/2024-2024-ny-slip-op-30415-u.pdf>
14. Gmail - ISB, Coleman notifies of his attorney, Trae Turner.

[Quoted text hidden]

15 attachments

B0760-0784 (2).pdf

22 KB

B0558-1058 (2).pdf

21 KB

B1077-0232 (2).pdf

22 KB

Search _ Idaho Secretary of State Business Filings.pdf

412 KB

B0462-9644 (1).pdf

26 KB

B0872-1191 (2).pdf

22 KB

B0977-2389 (2).pdf

22 KB

B0667-0593 (2).pdf

21 KB

SOS Filing Links.pdf

36 KB

Name Change.pdf

110 KB

Puccini.pdf

395 KB

Search _ Idaho Secretary of State _ Kevin Munstermann.pdf

201 KB

Search _ Idaho Secretary of State _ Travelland RV.pdf

291 KB

2024-2024-ny-slip-op-30415-u.pdf

211 KB

Gmail - Fwd_ Justin Coleman ISB complaint.pdf

40 KB



RE: APRIL RICO CORRESPONDENCE

3 messages

Lori Ostertag <lostertag@isb.idaho.gov>
To: Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com>

Mon, Apr 27, 2026 at 2:22 PM

I am out of the office on Fridays. If you need immediate assistance, please contact Karen Carlisle at kcarlisle@isb.idaho.gov.

Trae Turner <trae@clarkandfeeney.com>
To: Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com>

Mon, Apr 27, 2026 at 4:23 PM

You missed it again, as usual.

The separation was stipulated to by all parties, so judge burns just signed off on it. The judgement wasn't against me, it was to me and it's been paid off long ago. Do you think changing that fact will adjust whatever conclusion ChatGPT comes up with? What prompts are you putting in?

TT
Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 27, 2026, at 5:14 AM, Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

****Subject:**** APRIL RICO CORRESPONDENCE – The Turner-Parker Divorce Before Judge Burns, the Coleman-Turner-Parker Campaign Finance Connection, the Havens Affair, and the Woods Campaign Finance Connection (April 27, 2026)

****Date:**** April 27, 2026

This email supplements the April 22, 2026 Supplemental Notice regarding Nez Perce County's coordinated email blocking and the April 22, 2026 Resolution Proposal. It documents four additional pieces of evidence that further establish the enterprise's cross-jurisdictional infrastructure: (1) the Turner-Parker divorce presided over by Judge Brooke Burns; (2) the campaign finance connection among Justin Coleman, Trae Turner, and Kali Jo Parker; (3) the public exposure of Commissioner Doug Havens' extramarital affair and its connection to the enterprise; and (4) the campaign finance reports of Nick Woods, demonstrating that the enterprise is directly funding its own budgetary oversight.

****I. The Turner-Parker Divorce Before Judge Burns (Asotin County Case No. 25-3-00060-02)****

Attached is the docket sheet from *Turner v. Parker*, Asotin County Superior Court Case No. 25-3-00060-02. The case was filed on June 4, 2025. The assigned judge was the ****Honorable Brooke J. Burns****—the same judge whose communications with Prosecutor Curtis Liedkie are the subject of my pending Public Records Act lawsuit and who was the respondent in my mandamus action before the Washington Supreme Court.

Key facts from the court record:

- **Trae Turner** (Petitioner) filed for legal separation from **Kali Jo Parker** (Respondent) on June 4, 2025.
- **Judge Burns** presided over the entire proceeding.
- **June 25, 2025:** Judge Burns entered a **\$30,000 monetary judgment** against Turner, payable to Parker, with 12% annual interest.
- **June 25, 2025:** Judge Burns approved the final parenting plan for Turner and Parker's children.
- **January 6, 2026:** Judge Burns converted the legal separation to a full divorce.

At all relevant times, Parker was—and remains—employed in the Nez Perce County Prosecutor's Office under Justin Coleman, working in child support, custody, and probation enforcement. Turner is Coleman's personal attorney and represents Heather Moore, the mistress of Commissioner Doug Havens. Turner also formerly worked under Curtis Liedkie in the Asotin County Prosecutor's Office.

The Timeline of Coordinated Activity

Date	Event
April 2025	Switzer v. Hon. Brooke Burns filed in WA Supreme Court
May 2025	Liedkie and Webber represent Burns before the Supreme Court
June 4, 2025	Turner files for legal separation from Parker in Asotin County—Judge Burns presiding
June 25, 2025	Judge Burns enters \$30,000 judgment against Turner; approves parenting plan
July 3, 2025	WCRG issues insurance letters denying PRA coverage
July 8, 2025	Liedkie withdraws as counsel for Burns
July 10, 2025	Asotin County signs fee agreement with Daylong
July 21, 2025	Daylong appointed Special Deputy for nonexistent case
December 31, 2025	County makes false statements to SAO
January 6, 2026	Judge Burns converts Turner-Parker separation to divorce

While Judge Burns was simultaneously responding to my mandamus action, Curtis Liedkie was representing her before the Supreme Court, and the County was negotiating a fee agreement with Amanda Daylong—Judge Burns was also presiding over the divorce of the attorney who remains Justin Coleman's counsel and the prosecutor who works in Coleman's office. This is not a coincidence. It is the enterprise's judicial infrastructure operating in plain view.

Turner's \$30,000 debt to Parker—at 12% annual interest—creates a financial incentive for Turner to remain in the enterprise's good graces. Parker works in the office that could enforce that judgment. Turner has a sitting judgement against him under Burns. Turner cannot afford to antagonize the prosecutor's office, nor Judge Brooke Burns. The enterprise has him financially captive, and on a leash they can tug.

II. The Coleman-Turner-Parker Campaign Finance Connection

Idaho campaign finance records obtained from the Idaho Secretary of State's Sunshine database reveal the financial relationships among Justin Coleman, Trae Turner, and Kali Jo Parker.

Campaign Donations to Justin Coleman for District Judge - District SW:

Date	Donor	Amount
April 4, 2022	Trae Turner	\$500.00
April 4, 2022	Kali Jo Parker (Turner)	\$500.00
April 11, 2022	Amanda Coleman (wife)	\$1,000.00
April 17, 2022	Jennifer Coleman (relative)	\$500.00
May 4, 2022	Magyar, Rauch & Associates, PLLC	\$500.00
May 4, 2022	Magyar, Rauch & Associates, PLLC	\$500.00

Significance:

1. ****Trae Turner and Kali Jo Parker both donated the statutory maximum of \$500 to Coleman's campaign on the same day—April 4, 2022.**** At that time, Turner and Parker were married. They were both employed in or affiliated with the Nez Perce County Prosecutor's Office (Turner as a former Asotin County deputy prosecutor now representing Coleman; Parker as a current NPCPO employee). Their joint, maximum donation to Coleman's campaign demonstrates that loyalty to the enterprise was a family affair.

2. ****The marriage is now dissolved.**** Judge Brooke Burns presided over the Turner-Parker divorce in Asotin County Superior Court. She entered a \$30,000 judgment against Turner, payable to Parker, with 12% annual interest. Turner and Parker are now legally separated, financially adverse, and personally estranged—but both remain bound to the enterprise through Coleman. Turner represents Coleman. Parker works for Coleman. Coleman accepted maximum donations from both.

3. ****Amanda Coleman donated \$1,000**** to her (former) husband's campaign. Jennifer Coleman donated an additional \$500. The Coleman family directly funded the campaign of the man whose office now employs Turner's ex-wife and whom Turner personally represents.

4. ****Magyar, Rauch & Associates, PLLC****—a law firm—donated \$1,000 total across two contributions. The involvement of a law firm in funding a prosecutor's campaign raises obvious questions about access and influence.

5. ****Coleman's campaign status is listed as "Terminated"**** on the Idaho Secretary of State website. Coleman is not currently running for office. He is an elected prosecutor with a terminated campaign account. His position is secure—not because of his prosecutorial record, but because the enterprise ensures no challenger can threaten him. The campaign donations from Turner, Parker, and the Coleman family were investments in a permanent incumbent.

****III. The Integrated Enterprise: What These Documents Prove Together****

Read together, the Turner-Parker divorce, the Coleman campaign finance records, and the Havens affair establish the integrated nature of the enterprise:

| Connection | Document | What It Proves |

| :-- | :-- | :-- |

| ****Turner → Coleman**** | Campaign finance | Turner donated \$500 to Coleman. Coleman admits Turner was his best man. |

| ****Parker → Coleman**** | Campaign finance | Parker donated \$500 to Coleman on the same day as Turner. She works in Coleman's office. The enterprise was funded by the family that now litigates within it. |

| ****Turner ← Parker**** | Divorce record | Turner owes Parker \$30,000 at 12% interest. Parker works in Coleman's office. Turner is financially captive. Parker has enforcement power. |

| ****Turner → Judge Burns**** | Divorce record | Judge Burns presided over Turner's divorce. She has personal knowledge of his finances and custody. She entered a \$30,000 judgment against him. She converted the separation to divorce. |

| ****Judge Burns → Curtis Liedkie**** | PRA request (PDR 25-23) | Burns and Liedkie communicated about her legal defense. That email is being withheld under attorney-client privilege. |

| ****Curtis Liedkie → Hannah Liedkie**** | Public records | Curtis Liedkie is Hannah Liedkie's brother-in-law. Hannah Liedkie is a Nez Perce County Commissioner alongside Doug Havens and Joe Gish. |

| ****Hannah Liedkie → Heather Moore**** | Disability Advisory Board appointment | Hannah Liedkie appointed Heather Moore—Havens' mistress and Turner's client—to the Disability Advisory Board, a patronage position that rewards loyalty to the enterprise. |

| ****Doug Havens → Retirement → Keith Havens / Nick Woods**** | Public election records | Havens' seat will be filled by his relative or by a bribed detective. The succession plan ensures the enterprise retains control of the commission. |

This is not a collection of unrelated incidents. This is a single, integrated enterprise whose members share personal relationships, financial obligations, and a common interest in preventing any outside investigation. Every connection reinforces every other connection. The enterprise has no weak points

because it has no outsiders—and every time one member is exposed, three more are revealed behind them.

****IV. The Havens Affair: Enterprise Exposed Through Extramarital Scandal****

Doug Havens is an elected Nez Perce County Commissioner who sits alongside Hannah Liedkie and Joe Gish. He is retiring in May 2026.

Havens has been publicly exposed as having an extramarital affair with Heather Moore, a woman whose divorce and child custody case (Moore v. Moore, Nez Perce County Case No. CV35-25-1290) is currently pending. Heather Moore is represented by Trae Turner of Clark and Feeney.

The affair between Havens and Heather Moore was including explicit photographs—consistent with the enterprise's pattern of using Turner to do their dirty work they cannot lawfully touch, and claims of privilege to conceal activities from public scrutiny. The same pattern that produced the withheld PDR 25-23 email, Turners response to PDR production and the blocking of my email address by Nez Perce County administrators.

During the Moore custody proceedings, exhibits filed by Daniel Moore's attorney disappeared from the court's electronic filing system. The exhibits were available to Trae Turner—Heather Moore's attorney—but not to the judge. This is a mirror image of the enterprise's handling of public records: when evidence threatens the enterprise, it vanishes. When it benefits the enterprise, it is preserved and disseminated selectively.

The family destroyed by this enterprise includes two young children, one of whom is disabled and non-verbal. Heather Moore's appointment to the Disability Advisory Board by Hannah Liedkie channels the needs of her own disabled child into Liedkie's nonprofit revenue stream. The enterprise profits from the very family it destroyed.

****V. The Woods Campaign Finance Connection: The Enterprise Funds Its Own Oversight****

Nick Woods is a detective in the Nez Perce County Prosecutor's Office under Justin Coleman. He is running for Nez Perce County Commissioner to replace the retiring Doug Havens. His campaign finance reports for February and March 2026 reveal that the enterprise is directly funding his candidacy.

****A. Coleman For Prosecutor In-Kind Donation****

On March 21, 2026, "Coleman For Prosecutor"—Justin Coleman's campaign committee—made a \$140.00 in-kind contribution to Nick Woods' campaign for an "Event Ticket." (Schedule C, March 2026 Report).

This is the prosecutor's own campaign committee donating to a candidate who, if elected, would control the prosecutor's budget as a county commissioner. The county commission approves the budget for the prosecutor's office, sets the prosecutor's salary, and has oversight authority over county expenditures. A commissioner who owes his campaign to the prosecutor's campaign committee is not an overseer—he is a subordinate.

****B. Joe Gish Campaign Donation****

On March 10, 2026, Joe Gish—the sitting Nez Perce County Commissioner alongside Hannah Liedkie and Doug Havens—donated \$150.00 to Nick Woods' campaign. (Schedule A, March 2026 Report).

Gish is the commissioner whose office attempted to charge Plaintiff \$8,733.12 for a single responsive email. He is now funding the campaign of the candidate who will replace his retiring colleague. The three commissioners—Liedkie, Havens, and Gish—are ensuring that Havens' seat remains in enterprise hands. Gish's personal donation confirms that the enterprise is coordinating the succession.

****C. Amanda Coleman Donation****

On March 30, 2026, Amanda Coleman—Justin Coleman's former wife—donated \$52.05 to Nick Woods' campaign. (Schedule A, March 2026 Report).

Amanda Coleman previously donated \$1,000 to her former husband's campaign. She is now donating to the campaign of a detective in her husband's office who is running for county commissioner. The Coleman family is personally invested in ensuring that the county commission remains controlled by enterprise members.

****D. The Electoral Succession Plan: Complete****

The succession plan for Doug Havens' commission seat is now fully documented:

| Actor | Role | Connection to Enterprise |

| :--- | :--- | :--- |

| ****Doug Havens**** | Retiring Commissioner | Extramarital affair with Heather Moore (Turner's client). Seat must remain in enterprise hands. |

| ****Nick Woods**** | Candidate to replace Havens | Detective in Justin Coleman's office. Personally witnessed by Plaintiff accepting cash bribes from Tim Krueger. Campaign funded by Coleman For Prosecutor, Joe Gish, and Amanda Coleman. |

| ****Keith Havens**** | Opposing candidate | Relative of Doug Havens. Attended Lincoln Day dinner with Doug. |

| ****Coleman For Prosecutor**** | Funder of Woods' campaign | Justin Coleman's campaign committee. Made in-kind donation to Woods on March 21, 2026. |

| ****Joe Gish**** | Sitting Commissioner and Woods donor | Donated \$150 to Woods on March 10, 2026. Attempted to charge Plaintiff \$8,733.12 for a single email. |

| ****Amanda Coleman**** | Donor to Woods | Justin Coleman's (ex)wife. Donated \$1,000 to Coleman's campaign and \$52.05 to Woods. |

The enterprise has ensured that regardless of which candidate wins, the commission seat remains under enterprise control. If Woods wins, the prosecutor's own detective becomes the prosecutor's budgetary overseer—a direct conflict of interest. If Keith Havens wins, the Havens family dynasty continues. Either outcome is acceptable to the enterprise because both candidates are enterprise members.

****VI. Conclusion****

Four sets of documents—the Turner-Parker divorce record, the Coleman campaign finance report, the Havens affair, and the Woods campaign finance reports—complete the picture of an enterprise that operates through personal relationships, financial obligations, and judicial infrastructure. Judge Burns presided over the divorce of the attorney who donated to the prosecutor whose employee donated to the same prosecutor on the same day—and who is now owed \$30,000 by her ex-husband who represents the mistress of the commissioner whose brother-in-law is the prosecutor whose emails with Judge Burns are being withheld. The enterprise is a closed loop. Every exit is blocked by a conflict of interest, a financial obligation, or a judicial relationship.

And now the campaign finance reports. Nick Woods—the bribed detective running for county commissioner—is being funded by the prosecutor's own campaign committee, the sitting county commissioner, and the prosecutor's (ex)wife. The enterprise is not just defending itself. It is expanding. Every vacant seat is filled by a member. Every campaign is funded by the enterprise. Every election is a formality. The commissioners control the budget. The budget funds the prosecutor. The prosecutor employs the commissioner. The loop is closed. The public is outside it.

The public now has documentary evidence of this loop. The Turner-Parker divorce docket. The Coleman campaign finance report. The Havens affair. The Woods campaign finance reports. The PRA violations. The false statements to the State Auditor. The insurance documents. The email blocking. The Facebook comment suppression. The \$8,733.12 invoice for a single email.

Each piece of evidence is a crack in the wall. The wall is now collapsing under its own weight.

I will continue to document and preserve all evidence for my pending federal RICO complaint. These documents are being filed as supplemental exhibits in my PRA action in Columbia County Superior Court (Case No. 26-2-00027-07).

Respectfully,

****Corey Michael Switzer****

264 Kernodle Rd
Gibsonville, NC 27249
coreyswitzer@gmail.com
(218) 461-9868

This communication is a public record. Retaliatory action against a whistleblower violates public policy and may constitute obstruction of justice.

****Attachments:****

- Turner v. Parker Docket Sheet (Asotin County Case No. 25-3-00060-02)
- Justin Coleman Campaign Finance Report (Idaho Secretary of State Sunshine Database)
- Nick Woods February 2026 Campaign Finance Report
- Nick Woods March 2026 Campaign Finance Report

On Fri, Apr 24, 2026, 6:40 PM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

To: Amanda Daylong <ADaylong@nwtrialattorneys.com>

Cc: Chris Kemp <CKemp@asotincountywa.gov>, Public Disclosure <PDisclosure@asotincountywa.gov>

Subject: Corey Michael Switzer v. Asotin County, Columbia County Superior Court Case No. 26-2-00027-07 – Formal Notice of Filed Complaint and Service of Summons

Dear Ms. Daylong and Mr. Kemp:

The Public Records Act complaint against Asotin County has been formally filed and accepted by the Columbia County Superior Court under Case No. 26-2-00027-07. The Court granted my fee waiver motion on April 24, 2026, and the Honorable Judge Palubicki of Adams County has been appointed as visiting judge. The Summons and Statement Regarding Venue have been accepted for filing.

Attached to this email are the following filed documents:

1. Summons (Case No. 26-2-00027-07) – Issued April 24, 2026
2. Complaint for Violations of the Public Records Act (RCW 42.56) with Verification (Time Stamped)
3. Statement Regarding Venue
4. Untruncated Full Complaint
5. Exhibit Volume (Exhibits A through O)

Request to Waive Formal Service

In your March 23, 2026 letter, you, Ms. Daylong, identified yourself as Asotin County's legal representative and instructed me to "direct all further inquiries to my attention as Asotin County's legal representative." Relying on that representation, I respectfully request that the County, through you as its designated counsel, agree to waive formal service of process in this matter.

Given the extensive correspondence between us over the past several months—including your receipt and production of the substantive documents underlying this action, your acknowledgment of my earlier notice of intent to file, and your formal identification as the County's legal representative—formal service via process server would impose unnecessary expense and delay on all parties. A signed waiver of service would allow this matter to proceed efficiently to the merits while preserving all of the County's defenses except those based on insufficiency of process or service.

If you are not the appropriate person to accept service or execute a waiver on behalf of the County, please direct me immediately to the individual who is—whether the County Auditor (or interim successor), County Administrator, or other authorized agent—so that service may be promptly accomplished without further unnecessary expense.

I have prepared a simple waiver form for your signature, which I can provide upon request. If the County declines to waive, please advise so that I may arrange for personal service in accordance with RCW 4.28.080(1).

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Respectfully,

Corey Michael Switzer
[264 Kernodle Rd](#)
[Gibsonville, NC 27249](#)
(218) 461-9868
coreyswitzer@gmail.com
Pro Se Plaintiff

Attachments:

- Summons (Case No. 26-2-00027-07)
- Complaint for Violations of the Public Records Act (with Verification) + Exhibit Volume (Exhibits A–O) (truncated) + Full Complaint
- Statement Regarding Venue
- Letter to Daylong, Service Waiver

On Wed, Apr 22, 2026, 3:18 PM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

Subject: APRIL RICO CORRESPONDENCE – Supplemental Notice: Coordinated Email Blocking by Nez Perce County Officials

Date: April 22, 2026

This email serves as a supplemental notice and documentation of an additional predicate act of obstruction and witness intimidation in the ongoing RICO matter.

I. Coordinated Email Blocking by Nez Perce County Officials

On April 22, 2026, at approximately 3:10 PM EST, I transmitted the preceding email in this chain to the standard RICO distribution list, which includes multiple officials employed by or affiliated with Nez Perce County, Idaho.

Within moments, I received automated bounce-back notifications indicating that my email address (coreyswitzer@gmail.com) has been explicitly and intentionally blocked by the email administrator for the following Nez Perce County addresses:

- bryces@co.nezperce.id.us
- jgish@co.nezperce.id.us
- JustinColeman@co.nezperce.id.us
- dhavens@co.nezperce.id.us
- PattyWeeks@co.nezperce.id.us
- markm@co.nezperce.id.us
- AmyLedgerwood@co.nezperce.id.us
- hliedkie@co.nezperce.id.us
- nicholasw@co.nezperce.id.us

The specific error message reads: "550 Emails from your address have been blocked by the administrator."

This is not a spam filter. This is an administrative block—a deliberate act by Nez Perce County to prevent a citizen from communicating with multiple county officials simultaneously regarding documented allegations of corruption, bribery, and self-dealing.

II. Significance of the Blocked Recipients

The list of blocked addresses is not random. It includes:

Recipient Role Relevance to RICO Allegations

Justin Coleman Nez Perce County Prosecuting Attorney Central figure in the alleged cover-up of police bribery; subject of Idaho State Bar complaint.

Patty Weeks Prosecutor's Office personnel Implicated in the coordinated shielding of Coleman, Turner, and Smith.

Amy Ledgerwood Prosecutor's Office personnel Same as above.

Nicholas Woods Detective, Nez Perce County Named as a recipient of cash bribes from Tim Krueger at Travelland RV.

Hannah Liedkie Nez Perce County Commissioner Alleged self-dealing and obstruction; subject of April 16, 2026 retaliation documentation.

Others Various county officials All connected to the Nez Perce County apparatus implicated in the enterprise.

The blocking of these specific addresses—all within the Nez Perce County government domain—demonstrates a coordinated effort to prevent these officials from receiving notice of the allegations against them and to insulate the enterprise from scrutiny.

III. Legal Significance

This administrative blocking constitutes:

1. Obstruction of Justice: Preventing notice of criminal allegations to law enforcement and prosecutorial officials is a classic act of obstruction. It mirrors the conduct of the Asotin County Sheriff's Office in disabling Facebook comments to silence reporting of the same underlying misconduct.
2. Witness Intimidation / Retaliation: By blocking my email address, Nez Perce County is sending a clear message: whistleblowers who report corruption will be silenced and excluded from communicating with county government. This is precisely the type of retaliatory conduct that RICO and § 1983 are designed to address.
3. Spoliation / Concealment of Evidence: By preventing these officials from receiving documentation of the alleged crimes, the County is effectively concealing evidence and preventing the creation of a record that could be used in subsequent legal proceedings.
4. Pattern of Racketeering: This act is consistent with the ongoing pattern of conduct by the enterprise: when faced with documented allegations, the response is not investigation or accountability, but suppression, retaliation, and obstruction.

IV. Preservation of Evidence

I am preserving all bounce-back notifications, screenshots, and email logs as evidence of this coordinated blocking. These materials will be incorporated into my pending federal RICO complaint as additional predicate acts.

The full bounce-back messages are attached to this email for the record.

V. Conclusion

The Nez Perce County email administrator—acting at the direction of or with the knowledge of the officials named in this correspondence—has erected a digital wall to prevent a citizen from communicating allegations of corruption to the very officials charged with investigating and prosecuting such conduct.

This is not a technical issue. This is evidence of a cover-up.

The wall is now documented. The obstruction continues. The record grows.

Respectfully,

Corey Michael Switzer
264 Kernodle Rd
Gibsonville, NC 27249
coreyswitzer@gmail.com
(218) 461-9868

This communication is a public record. Retaliatory action against a whistleblower violates public policy and may constitute obstruction of justice.

Attachments:

- Bounce-back notifications (9 separate emails)

This is a gift to my RICO case. They just handed me documented evidence of coordinated obstruction.

On Wed, Apr 22, 2026, 11:42 AM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

To everyone:

Here's the simplest possible explanation, like we're talking at a kitchen table.

Imagine This...

You have two separate problems with your house:

1. A leaky roof (this is the Public Records fight, requesting the PDR 25-23, email between Burns, Curtis Liedkie and Lisa Webber BEFORE and resulting in Daylongs appointment and Deputization).
2. A broken, and dilapidated , water damaged window and frame. A bird flew through the window pane, let's say, but it's frame is rot due to the leaky roof. (this is the judge's Facebook-blocking case, which came first, and sparked the record request. The "window frame" is the Writ of Mandamus against Burns, the "Bird through the window pane", Curtis Liedkie and Lisa Webber representing the judge Burns, the "water damage" is the county commissioners and Sheriff's Department).

You call your homeowner's insurance.

What Insurance Tells You (The Two Letters)

- Letter #1 (The Disclaimer): "We do NOT cover leaky roofs or anything that happens because of them. Period. You're on your own."
- Letter #2 (The Reservation of Rights): "We MIGHT cover the broken window because of the bird (Curtis Liedkie representing Burns), but we will NOT pay for any water damage that came from the leaky roof (Withholding PDR25-23,). You have to pay for that part yourself (appointment and Deputization of Daylong)."

What the County Did

Instead of making Burns pay for the "water damage, leaky roof, bad frame" part themselves (like insurance said they had to), they did this:

1. They created a fake repair order for a problem that didn't exist in repairing the window to pay for the building materials for repairing the roof and fixing the water damage. (Deputization of Daylong, 'Switzer v ASOTIN COUNTY')
2. They used that fake building order to take tax dollars and pay a contractor \$325 an hour. The logic is "because a window pane is no good if the roof leaks and there's water damaging the window frame". Daylong is subcontracted into the "Union" using insurance and taxpayers money.
3. That subcontractor (Daylong) then fixed the window pane (Switzer v Burns) using taxpayers money via insurance.
4. The contractor ALSO fixed the water damage (defamation threats) AND the roof (PDR violations) using the insurance AND taxpayers money. (Switzer v ASOTIN)

What They Told the Auditor

When someone asked, "Hey, who paid for the water damage, the busted frame and leaking roof in the simple pane repair order?"

The County said: "Don't worry. Insurance handled everything."

The Truth

- Insurance handled a part of the window. The window pane. Not the frame. Not the leaky roof. Not the water damage.

That action, "fixing the window pane" by the Deputization of Daylong is still in violation of State Law regarding county Prosecutors and Coroner's office and their appointments representing anyone except for the county. Judge Brooke Burns doesn't WORK for the county, but got coverage from a "Union Insurance" FROM the county. Burns is a State Officer.

In a Civil action against a State officer before the Supreme Court, Daylongs Deputization by the County appointment and appearance on behalf of Burns qualifies as that same unlawful Representation by Deputization appointment and carries the same penalties as if Curtis Liedkie represented Burns, Himself. It's still a "Union Contractor", even by subcontracting Daylong to do it.

- In every single instance tax dollars handled the leaky roof, the window frame and the water damage and broken window pane. Daylong is being paid by BOTH the county AND the insurance company, of which the insurance is ALSO paid for by the taxpayers... The "Commercial Contractor" that's not authorized to work on private property, even as a subcontractor.

- The County, specifically Stacey Harmon, lied to the State Auditors Office and said insurance covered it all, that Curtis Liedkie had never appeared...

The One-Sentence Summary

They used public tax money to pay for something insurance refused to cover, isn't allowed by law, and then they lied about it to cover their tracks.

The County, Curtis Liedkie had deputization of Daylong for PDR request for something that insurance covers. It was paid for without any authorization by the taxpayers under false pretext. (Switzer v ASOTIN COUNTY)

Then that false pretext extended to representing Judge Brooke Burns before the Washington State Supreme Court for a Civil Writ of Mandamus, afforded in part by the Insurance Company.

That doesn't make it "legal" the insurance company paying for the broken window pane by "Union Subcontractors". If it was to be repaired by Union Contractors, or "the county" in this analogy, is the root evil and violation of State law when the law requires Burns to pay for her own counsel. Subcontracting it out makes it worse.

For Daylong to appear on behalf of Burns is still unlawful under State Law because of Daylongs Deputization appointment. The insurance company paying for an illegal action, Daylongs appointment and Representation of Burns, doesn't make those actions "legal".

"You're still using Union Contractors and Subcontractors for private property, even if you just fix the window pane, even when insurance pays for it".

Then, Daylong confirms that she is the point of contact for Public Documents Requests. This is done outside of the boundaries of what their insurance policy will cover, and the alleged reason why the county Deputized Daylong in the first place.

Deputized Daylong ("Union Subcontractor")

...using unauthorized and unlawful Representation (Switzer v Burns, Deputy Daylong repairs "Rotting window frame")

...in unauthorized ways (Burns representation, threats of defamation "Replacement Window frame, building supplies, cleaning materials")

... of using taxpayer ("Union") money as defined by the contract, the Deputized subcontractor that's not allowed to work on private property.

It all boils down to the fact that the County interjected itself unlawfully into the State Action against Burns, and then hired (before deputizing) Daylong under the premise of a PDR dispute that the insurance company wouldn't cover.

That Deputization of Daylong is identical to Curtis Liedkie in the eyes of the law in being the analogous "Commercial Contractor", as a "Commercial Subcontractor" and that's why it's an intentional obfuscation and refusal to release relevant documents of "Who's paying for the broken window, the leaky roof and the water damage?"

The taxpayers, of course, or "the Union Insurance" when Judge Brooke Burns was instead required to hire her own outside counsel at her own expense to defend a Civil Writ of Mandamus against a State Officer. "The private contractor" v. "The public contractor."

Of course, this also doesn't address the six weeks between when I filed the Civil Writ of Mandamus and Daylongs Deputization in which Curtis Liedkie and Lisa Webber were representing Judge Brooke Burns, and the filing of the Public Records Request for that email, withheld in it's entirety under "Attorney Client Privilege", PDR 25-23. Subcontracting out "Union" work doesn't make it acceptable to be working on "Private Property".

That, in itself is the violation of State Law.

Like having a contractor who is only allowed to do commercial work, working for a union, being paid to replace a window pane on a private property.

Private property repairs are regularly reserved for non-union private home contractors, often by laws. Hiring a Union Subcontractor doesn't make the job "Private residential", and it doesn't cure the unlawful expenditures used.

What Curtis Liedkie, and by extension Asotin County, has done is analogous to a remodeling job for Judge Burns rotting roof, window and frame by fibbing to the insurance company and State Auditor in violation of these analogous "Union Rules" and very real applicable State Laws. Adding Daylong to the "Union" by subcontracting only further and intentionally exacerbates the issue.

That's what's happening.

Now, they're going to blame the subcontractor to save face for themselves and likely throw Daylong under the proverbial bus to save themselves.

You've got an analogous Union Contractors and Subcontractors working on private property and committing insurance fraud to pay for the work because Burns is 'adjacent enough but not a part of' their Union.

When this violation is reported to the Sheriff and Undersheriff in Asotin county, instead of taking the complaint for investigation, the opposite has occurred in censorship. "That's not my job! Let the taxpayers decide who upholds the law, not the legislative bodies that write it!"

That's it. That's the case I'm making and I have the evidence now to prove it.

This is the "Washington" half of the RICO I'm going to file.

The second half, in Idaho, will be determined by the current Idaho State Supreme Court hearing the case against April Smith.

The report was compiled and presented to the Idaho State Supreme Court on April 3rd, 2026, and it's outcome will determine if I have or have not expended my legal options for justice in Idaho without turning it into a Federal ordeal.

It's outcome will directly impact the rehearing of April Smith, Justin Coleman and Trae Turner regarding the cover-up of the police department bribery which I witnessed on three occasions between October and December of 2020 committed by Tim Krueger to Rick Fuentes, Andrew Fox and Nick Woods after I was assaulted by Troy Munstermann at Travelland RV.

My Federal RICO filing shall also contain evidence and admissions by Hannah Liedkie of self-dealing taxpayers money to her own nonprofit(s), Travelland RV's tax fraud (identity fraud, Meghan McCreary/ Vittoria Puccini), tax fraud (Pat Rogers, board member to Hannah Liedkie) and obstruction of justice by Nez Perce County Prosecutors Office and other Nez Perce County Commissioners.

We're getting ready to have everyone in this same email thread..

... in the same room

... at the same time, needing to explain themselves to a neutral adjudicator.

I look forward to it.

Respectfully,
Mr. Corey M Switzer

On Wed, Apr 22, 2026, 8:03 AM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

Subject: FINAL CONSOLIDATED NOTICE OF DEFICIENCIES AND NOTICE OF INTENT TO LITIGATE - Amanda Daylong and Asotin County (SAO Hotline H-25-795 / PRA Violations / Ultra Vires Acts)

Date: April 22, 2026

To: Amanda D. Daylong <ADaylong@nwtrialattorneys.com>

Cc: Chris Kemp <CKemp@asotincountywa.gov>; Public Disclosure

<PDisclosure@asotincountywa.gov>; Alisha Shaw (SAO) <shawa@sao.wa.gov>; Nick Brown (AGO) <nick.brown@atg.wa.gov>; Intake <intake@wsba.org>; [Standard Media/Oversight Distribution List]

Ms. Daylong and Mr. Kemp,

This correspondence serves as a final consolidated record of the legal and procedural deficiencies attributable to Asotin County and its deputized counsel, Amanda Daylong. Despite multiple notices and expired deadlines (April 5, April 16, and April 18, 2026), the County has failed to cure these violations.

As of this writing, the County's strategy of silence and extra-record document production confirms bad faith. This email summarizes the current state of non-compliance and serves as the final notice before the filing of additional actions in Columbia County Superior Court and the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Washington.

I. The Core Unlawful Scheme: Laundering Public Funds for Judge Burns' Defense

The documentary record—including documents produced by Ms. Daylong on April 21, 2026, outside the PRA process—conclusively establishes the following scheme:

1. Insurance Excluded PRA Coverage: On July 3, 2025, WCRG/Clear Risk Solutions issued a Disclaimer Letter stating coverage was not afforded for Public Records Act (PRA) claims.
2. County Hired Private Counsel Anyway: On July 10, 2025, Asotin County entered into a Fee Agreement with Floyd, Pflueger, Kearns, Nedderman & Gress, P.S. (Daylong's firm) at \$325/hour for "Public Records Act Litigation and Consulting, Switzer v. Asotin County, et al."
3. The Legal Fiction Appointment: On July 21, 2025, Prosecutor Curtis Liedkie signed a Special Deputy Prosecuting Attorney Appointment for Ms. Daylong for the purpose of representing Asotin County in a lawsuit that did not exist (Switzer v. Asotin County, et al. was never filed).
4. The Actual Representation: Ms. Daylong substituted for Curtis Liedkie as counsel for Judge Brooke Burns in Switzer v. Hon. Brooke Burns (No. 104080-6), a personal capacity First Amendment action.

Conclusion: The County manufactured the "Special Deputy" appointment to route taxpayer funds through the Prosecutor's budget to pay for Judge Burns' private defense—a purpose for which insurance coverage was expressly denied. This constitutes misuse of public funds under RCW 42.20.010.

II. Specific Deficiencies of Amanda Daylong and Asotin County

The following is a complete list of outstanding deficiencies as of April 22, 2026.

A. Public Records Act (PRA) Violations (RCW 42.56)

PRA Request Deficiency / Violation Legal Authority

PDR 25-23 Withheld Email: Email withheld in entirety under RCW 5.60.060(2)(a). No lawful exemption log provided. The one-line description fails to explain how privilege applies or confirm segregable portions were considered. RCW 42.56.210(3); Sanders v. State
PDR 26-01 Unlawful Scanning Fee: County charged \$10.20 for scanning electronic records, a fee prohibited for born-digital records. Deficient Log: Redactions performed by Ms. Daylong (conflicted counsel) are accompanied by a spreadsheet lacking the required specific explanation. RCW 42.56.120(2); RCW 42.56.210(3)
PDR 26-10 Unreasonable Timeline & Withholding: The County's estimate of 93 days (June 8, 2026) for electronic records violates the "prompt" response requirement. The records remain wholly unproduced and no proper exemption log has been provided. RCW 42.56.520
Extra-Record Production Concealment: Ms. Daylong produced the WCRG Insurance Disclaimer and Memorandum of Coverage outside the PRA process on April 21, 2026. These documents were responsive to PDR 26-01 and were willfully withheld from the official production. RCW 42.56.550(4) (Bad Faith Penalty)

B. Misuse of Public Funds and Ultra Vires Acts

Actor Deficiency / Violation Legal Authority

Amanda Daylong Ultra Vires Threat: March 23, 2026 letter threatening a "defamation" lawsuit against a whistleblower. This act is outside the scope of the Special Deputy Appointment (limited to PRA litigation) and constitutes a misuse of county resources and intimidation. RCW 42.20.010; RCW 4.24.510 (Anti-SLAPP)

Asotin County False Statements to SAO: December 16, 2025 email to State Auditor claiming "No funds have been expended" and "Coverage was provided under insurance." These statements are materially false based on the July 2025 Fee Agreement and Insurance Disclaimer. RCW 9A.76.175 (False Statement to Public Servant)
Curtis Liedkie / Lisa Webber Unauthorized Practice / Private Practice: Prosecutor Liedkie and Coroner Webber (statutorily barred from law practice) represented Judge Burns in a personal capacity suit before the Supreme Court. RCW 36.27.060; RCW 36.24.170; RCW 2.48.200

C. First Amendment Retaliation (Sheriff's Office)

Actor Deficiency / Violation Legal Authority
Sheriff Hilderbrand / Undersheriff Richards Viewpoint Discrimination: Disabling Facebook comments on official county pages immediately after I reported potential criminal conduct by Liedkie and Webber. The temporary restoration of comments does not cure the retaliatory intent. *Lindke v. Freed*, 601 U.S. 187 (2024); First Amendment

D. Open Public Meetings Act (OPMA) Violation

Actor Deficiency / Violation Legal Authority
Board of Commissioners Refusal to Hold Hearing: My December 16, 2025 formal complaint regarding the misuse of public funds has never been placed on a public meeting agenda. RCW 42.30 (OPMA)

III. The Significance of the April 21, 2026 Production

On April 21, 2026, Ms. Daylong forwarded the WCRG Disclaimer Letter and Memorandum of Coverage. This action confirms two critical facts:

1. PRA Violation: Asotin County possessed these responsive public records and failed to produce them in response to PDR 26-01. This is a per se violation of the PRA and evidence of bad faith concealment.
2. Admission of the Scheme: The Disclaimer Letter proves the County knew PRA matters were excluded from insurance coverage as of July 3, 2025. The subsequent Fee Agreement (July 10) and Special Deputy Appointment (July 21) were deliberate acts to circumvent the insurance exclusion using taxpayer money.

IV. Procedural Status in Columbia County Superior Court

As you are aware, the PRA Complaint was filed in Columbia County Superior Court. Because Judge Brooke Burns is the sole elected Superior Court Judge for Columbia County and is a central figure in the underlying facts of this dispute, she is statutorily disqualified under CJC Rule 2.11(A).

The Court has appointed the Honorable Roger S. Sandberg (Whitman County) as a visiting judge to review the Fee Waiver Motion (GR 34). On April 21, 2026, I filed a Notice of Disqualification (Affidavit of Prejudice) against Judge Sandberg pursuant to RCW 4.12.040 and RCW 4.12.050. This filing is a statutory right exercised prior to any discretionary ruling and is not a finding of actual bias.

Once the disqualification is processed and a new judge is assigned, the Fee Waiver Motion will be adjudicated, and the Complaint will be formally docketed for service.

V. Notice of Intent and Final Demands

The deadlines of April 5, April 16, and April 18, 2026, have passed without a legally sufficient response. The County's silence is noted and will be treated as a waiver of defenses and an admission of liability.

I will be proceeding with the following actions:

1. Columbia County Superior Court: Upon acceptance of the filing and resolution of the judicial assignment, this PRA lawsuit will proceed seeking penalties (up to \$100/day per violation), attorney fees, and an order compelling compliance with all outstanding demands.
2. U.S. District Court (Eastern District of Washington): Amendment of the pending § 1983 and RICO complaint to include the additional First Amendment retaliation by the Sheriff's Office and the ultra vires defamation threat as predicate acts.

Final Opportunity to Mitigate Damages:

To avoid the immediate filing of supplemental pleadings and the pursuit of maximum statutory penalties, the County must, by 5:00 PM PST on April 24, 2026:

1. Produce the full, unredacted PDR 25-23 email (or a properly redacted version with a detailed, lawful exemption log explaining any redactions).
2. Issue a refund check for \$10.20 payable to Corey Switzer for the unlawful scanning fee associated with PDR 26-01.
3. Provide full electronic production of all responsive records for PDR 26-10, with a proper exemption log for any withheld or redacted content.
4. Provide written confirmation that my December 16, 2025 formal complaint regarding the misuse of public funds will be placed on the agenda of the next public meeting of the Asotin County Board of Commissioners, with remote participation permitted.
5. Issue a written retraction of the March 23, 2026 defamation threat, confirming that no public funds will be used to pursue any defamation action against me.

Failure to meet this final deadline will result in the immediate filing of all available motions and complaints, and I will seek the maximum penalties available under law.

Respectfully,

Corey Michael Switzer
[264 Kernodle Rd](#)
[Gibsonville, NC 27249](#)
coreyswitzer@gmail.com
(218) 461-9868

This communication is a public record. Retaliatory action against a whistleblower violates public policy and may constitute obstruction of justice.

On Tue, Apr 21, 2026, 8:21 PM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:
In layman's terms...

Curtis Liedkie and Lisa Webber represented Judge Brooke Burns before the Washington State Supreme Court in May of 2025.

At some point, likely after I filed a grievance against Curtis Liedkie and Lisa Webber with the Washington State Bar, and requested that Public Document between two elected officials they decided that their insurance policy would cover her writ of Mandamus. Not her Public Documents Requests.

To do so, they Deputized Daylong using county resources under the false pretense of a PDR request, my PDR request 25-23, requesting that email conversation Burns had asking Liedkie and Webber for representation.

Instead, Daylong represented Judge Brooke Burns after Liedkie withdrew before the Washington State Supreme Court.

Under the deputization of Daylong for and payment of Daylong for PDR request by the county, (remember, explicitly prohibited by their insurance,) Daylong used county resources to defend the Judge AND Prosecutors Office by Deputization, an action prohibited by law in a State action against a Superior Court Judge for a civil rights violation.

Stacey Harmon happened to lie to the State Auditors Office to cover it up. She resigned two weeks later.

That's why Daylong took a brave step towards threatening me with defamation.

No.

This corruption is now exposed and I intend to follow this to its conclusion.

On Tue, Apr 21, 2026, 7:48 PM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

Subject: APRIL RICO CORRESPONDENCE – Daylong's Production of Withheld Insurance Documents Confirms PRA Violations and Laundering of Public Funds; Columbia County Filing Update

Date: April 21, 2026

This email serves as an update to the April 17, 2026 FORMAL REFERRAL and the April 21, 2026 SUPPLEMENT regarding Blake Richards' lawsuit against SB 5974. It documents a significant development: Amanda Daylong's extra-record production of insurance documents that Asotin County willfully withheld from my Public Records Act requests—documents that confirm the County's insurance excludes all PRA coverage and that taxpayer money was used to fund a defense the insurer refused to cover.

I. Daylong's Extra-Record Production of Withheld Insurance Documents

On April 21, 2026, Amanda Daylong forwarded to me, outside the Public Records Act process, three documents that the County failed to produce in response to previously redacted PDR 26-01:

1. Clear Risk Solutions' July 3, 2025 Reservation of Rights letter (Claim W1756);
2. The full 159-page Memorandum of Coverage between Asotin County and Washington Counties Risk Group; and
3. Clear Risk Solutions' July 3, 2025 Disclaimer letter expressly denying coverage for PRA claims.

These documents are indisputably public records under RCW 42.56. They are responsive to my pending requests. They were not listed on any exemption log. The County's failure to disclose them through the PRA process constitutes a per se violation of RCW 42.56.210(3).

Daylong's voluntary production of these documents outside the PRA process does not cure the violation. It confirms that the County possessed responsive records it willfully withheld. I am preserving these documents and will supplement my pending PRA complaint to include this additional violation as evidence of bad faith warranting maximum penalties under RCW 42.56.550(4).

II. The Insurance Documents Confirm the Laundering Scheme

The newly produced documents confirm what I have alleged from the outset: Asotin County's insurance policy excludes all PRA claims, fines, penalties, and attorney fees. Exclusion 14 of the Wrongful Act Liability Coverage Part states unequivocally that coverage does not apply to "any Claims, fines, or penalties, including attorney fees arising out of the Washington Public Records Act, Open Public Meetings Act, or any other similar act or law."

The timeline is dispositive:

- July 3, 2025: WCRG issues two letters. The Disclaimer letter states coverage is "not afforded" for PRA claims. The Reservation of Rights letter states coverage is subject to exclusions and reserves all rights.
- July 8, 2025: Curtis Liedkie withdraws as counsel for Judge Brooke Burns in *Switzer v. Hon. Brooke Burns* (No. 104080-6).
- July 10, 2025: Asotin County enters into a fee agreement with Daylong's firm at \$325/hour for "Public Records Act Litigation and Consulting."
- July 21, 2025: Liedkie signs a Special Deputy appointment naming Daylong "for the purpose of representing Asotin County in Public Records Act Litigation and Consulting, *Switzer v. Asotin County, et al.*"—a case that did not exist.

The sequence is clear. The County learned on July 3 that insurance would not cover PRA matters. Within weeks, it manufactured a Special Deputy appointment to funnel public funds through the prosecutor's budget to pay private counsel for a defense the insurer refused to cover. The appointment was a transparent artifice to launder taxpayer money.

Despite this, on December 31, 2025, the County told the State Auditor's Office: "Coverage was provided under our insurance policy and assigned legal counsel." That statement was false when made. The County afforded outside Deputized counsel, not for a PRA request but for representing Judge Brooke Burns.

III. The Two Attachments That Prove the Laundering

Two documents, standing alone, establish the scheme:

1. July 10, 2025 Fee Agreement – Asotin County agrees to pay Daylong's firm \$325/hour for "Public Records Act Litigation and Consulting, *Switzer v. Asotin County, et al.*" This is a direct commitment of public funds for a purpose insurance refused to cover.
2. July 21, 2025 Special Deputy Prosecuting Attorney Appointment – Liedkie appoints Daylong "for the purpose of representing Asotin County in Public Records Act Litigation and Consulting, *Switzer v. Asotin County, et al.*" No such case existed. The appointment was a legal fiction designed to make Daylong's work appear to be a function of the prosecutor's office, allowing the County to pay her from the prosecutor's budget for a Public Documents Requests without specific legislative authorization to represent Judge Burns before the Washington State Supreme Court.

These two documents—read together with the WCRG Disclaimer letter denying PRA coverage—prove that the County knowingly used public funds for a purpose insurance excluded, then concealed that fact from the SAO.

IV. The False Statements to the State Auditor – Updated Table

The County's December 16, 2025 representations to the SAO were materially false:

County's Statement to SAO Truth (from County's Own Documents)
 "No funds have been expended for this purpose." July 10, 2025 fee agreement obligates County to pay \$325/hour.
 "The County did not hire and pay a private law firm." Fee agreement and Special Deputy appointment prove the County did.
 "Coverage was provided under our insurance policy and assigned legal counsel." WCRG letters (July 3, 2025) show PRA coverage was denied and excluded.
 "Mr. Liedkie never filed 'Notice of Appearance'..." July 8, 2025 substitution notice shows Liedkie withdrew as counsel for Judge Burns. Daylong also admits this, despite concealing her deputization.

These false statements materially misled the SAO and were part of a deliberate strategy to shield the misuse of public funds from scrutiny.

This is exacerbated by Daylongs reliance upon an appellate review of Neil, in which addresses a public documents request and NOT a Civil Writ of Mandamus against a State Officer.

V. Columbia County PRA Filing – Procedural Status

On April 20, 2026, I electronically filed a Public Records Act complaint against Asotin County in Columbia County Superior Court (Envelope No. 784957) It was closed and I needed to file a fee waiver motion under GR 34.

The fee waiver motion was initially referred to the sole Superior Court judge for the Asotin-Garfield-Columbia judicial district—the Honorable Brooke Burns. Because Judge Burns is the subject of the underlying PRA request and is implicated in the factual allegations giving rise to this dispute, she is statutorily disqualified from ruling on any matter in this case under CJC Rule 2.11(A). Her recusal was automatic and proper.

The Court has since assigned visiting judge Roger S. Sandberg of Whitman County to review the fee waiver motion. As of this writing, no discretionary ruling has been issued, and the Complaint awaits acceptance for filing pending resolution of the fee waiver. This is a routine procedural step, and I have no reason to believe the delay reflects anything other than the ordinary time required to secure a visiting judge for a matter involving a judicial conflict.

I have filed a Notice of Disqualification (Affidavit of Prejudice) against Judge Sandberg pursuant to RCW 4.12.040 and RCW 4.12.050. This filing is a statutory right, not an accusation of actual bias. It simply preserves my ability to request a different neutral judicial officer. A copy of the notice has been provided to counsel for the County.

Once the fee waiver order is signed and a case number is assigned, I will refile the Complaint and address service of process.

VI. Blake Richards' Lawsuit Against SB 5974

As documented in my April 21, 2026 SUPPLEMENT, Undersheriff Blake Richards—a candidate for Asotin County Sheriff—has filed a lawsuit challenging SB 5974, the newly enacted sheriff standards law. Richards seeks to block the very accountability mechanisms that could hold him responsible for his documented misconduct: silencing a citizen's report of potential corruption by disabling Facebook comments, and failing to fulfill his statutory duty under RCW 36.28.011 to investigate or refer that report.

Richards' lawsuit is not a principled stand for local control. It is the latest maneuver in a coordinated scheme to avoid accountability. His conduct is documented in WSCJTC Case Nos. 2026-0000213 and I shall be CERTAIN to bring it up the moment Undersheriff Richards gets his certification.

VII. Outstanding PRA Violations – No Cure

As of this writing, the County has still not:

- Produced the PDR 25-23 email withheld in its entirety, with a lawful exemption log;
- Provided a proper exemption log for PDR 26-01 redactions;
- Produced PDR 26-10 records or provided a reasonable timeline;
- Refunded the unlawful \$10.20 scanning fee;
- Scheduled my December 16, 2025 formal complaint for a public hearing.

The deadlines set in my April 13 and April 17 correspondence have passed without a legally sufficient response. The County's silence is noted and will be treated as a waiver of defenses and an admission of liability in all pending and forthcoming legal actions. I have repeatedly given you adequate notice.

VIII. Conclusion

The insurance documents produced by Daylong confirm what the record already showed: no insurance coverage for PRA defense, taxpayer money funding that defense, and false statements to the State Auditor to conceal both. The County's own documents break the cover-up.

The two attachments that most clearly demonstrate the laundering of public funds are the July 10, 2025 Fee Agreement and the July 21, 2025 Special Deputy Prosecuting Attorney Appointment. Read together with the WCRG Disclaimer letter denying PRA coverage, they establish that the County knowingly used taxpayer money for a purpose insurance excluded, then lied to the SAO about it.

The procedural posture in Columbia County—a fee waiver motion awaiting review by a visiting judge following a proper judicial recusal—is not evidence of corruption. It is the system working as designed to route a conflicted matter to a neutral decision-maker. I am confident the fee waiver will be adjudicated fairly once the procedural steps are complete.

I will continue to document and preserve all evidence for my pending federal civil rights and RICO complaint, and for the PRA action once the fee waiver is granted and the case is docketed.

The record is complete. The cover-up is exposed. The process continues.

Respectfully,

Corey Michael Switzer
264 Kernodle Rd
Gibsonville, NC 27249
coreyswitzer@gmail.com
(218) 461-9868

This communication is a public record. Retaliatory action against a whistleblower violates public policy and may constitute obstruction of justice.

Attachments (available upon request):

- Exhibit F: July 10, 2025 Fee Agreement (showing \$325/hour commitment of public funds)
- Exhibit G: July 21, 2025 Special Deputy Prosecuting Attorney Appointment (showing laundering mechanism)
- WCRG Disclaimer Letter (July 3, 2025) (showing PRA coverage denied)
- Notice of Disqualification (filed April 21, 2026)

1. Exhibit F – July 10, 2025 Fee Agreement
 - Shows the County committed public funds (\$325/hour) for "Public Records Act Litigation and Consulting."
 - Proves expenditure of taxpayer money.
2. Exhibit G – July 21, 2025 Special Deputy Prosecuting Attorney Appointment
 - Shows the mechanism: Liedkie deputized Daylong for a case that didn't exist to route the payment through the prosecutor's budget.
 - Proves the laundering vehicle.

These two documents, standing alone, establish the scheme. The WCRG Disclaimer letter provides the motive (insurance wouldn't cover it), but the Fee Agreement and Special Deputy Appointment are the smoking guns.

On Tue, Apr 21, 2026, 7:09 PM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

To: Amanda Daylong <ADaylong@nwtrialattorneys.com>

Cc: Alisha Shaw (SAO) <shaw@sa.wa.gov>, Public Disclosure
<PDisclosure@asotincountywa.gov>

Subject: Re: Formal Notice: Misuse of Public Funds – Acknowledgment of Receipt and Notice of PRA Violation

Ms. Daylong:

I acknowledge receipt of your April 21, 2026 email forwarding correspondence from Clear Risk Solutions, including the Reservation of Rights letter, the Memorandum of Coverage, and the Disclaimer letter regarding Claim No. W1756.

These documents are public records under RCW 42.56. They are responsive to my pending Public Records Act requests, PDR 26-01 unredacted and sent via email. They were not produced in response to those requests, nor were they listed on any exemption log.

Your voluntary production of these documents outside the PRA process does not cure the County's ongoing PRA violations. It confirms that the County possessed responsive records that it failed to disclose timely, unredacted, and without unlawful fees assessed for their production.

I am preserving these documents and will supplement my pending PRA complaint in Columbia County Superior Court to include this additional violation.

Nothing in this email waives any rights or remedies available under the PRA.

Please CC the public documents request in response to these records, as they are responsive to PDR26-10.

My original demands for production of the unredacted PDR25-23 and unredacted PDR26-10 remain unresolved in addition to the timely hearing before the Asotin County Commissioners regarding the unlawful expenditures of public funds and resources for the Asotin County Prosecutor Curtis Liedkie, and Asotin County Coroner Lisa Webber, the expenditures of taxpayers resources for the unlawful Representation of Judge Brooke Burns.

Respectfully,

Corey Michael Switzer

On Tue, Apr 21, 2026, 6:56 PM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

To: Amanda Daylong <adaylong@nwtrialattorneys.com>

Cc: Chris Kemp <CKemp@asotincountywa.gov>, Public Disclosure
<PDisclosure@asotincountywa.gov>

Subject: Corey Michael Switzer v. Asotin County – Procedural Status and Disqualification Process

Dear Ms. Daylong:

Thank you for your email. I am writing to clarify the procedural posture of this matter and to address your question regarding service of process.

I. Current Procedural Posture

The Public Records Act complaint was submitted for electronic filing in Columbia County Superior Court on April 20, 2026, along with a Motion and Declaration for Waiver of Civil Fees and Surcharges under GR 34. The Court has not yet accepted the filing. The fee waiver motion remains pending before the Honorable Roger S. Sandberg, who was assigned as a visiting judge. As of this writing, no discretionary ruling has been made on the fee waiver motion, and no case number has been assigned.

Formal service of process cannot be completed until the Complaint is accepted for filing and a case number is assigned. Once that occurs, I will address service in accordance with the Rules.

II. Distinction Between Disqualification at the Fee Waiver Stage and After a Ruling

Under Washington law, the method for disqualifying a judge depends on the stage of the proceeding.

A. Before a Discretionary Ruling: Notice of Disqualification (Affidavit of Prejudice)

RCW 4.12.050 provides a party with the right to disqualify a judge as a matter of right by filing a notice of disqualification—historically referred to as an affidavit of prejudice—before the judge has made any discretionary ruling. The statute is mandatory: "Notice of disqualification must be filed and called to the attention of the judge before the judge has made any discretionary ruling in the case". Once a proper and timely notice of disqualification is filed, the judge is divested of authority to hear the matter, and the presiding judge must transfer the action to another department or call in a visiting judge. This is a low-bar, procedural mechanism; the party need not prove actual bias, only file the notice before a discretionary ruling is made.

B. After a Discretionary Ruling: Motion to Recuse Under CJC 2.11(A)

If a discretionary ruling has already been made—for example, if the fee waiver order is signed before the notice of disqualification is filed—the statutory right under RCW 4.12.050 is lost. At that point, the party must move for recusal under CJC 2.11(A), which requires a showing that "the judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned". This is a higher bar; the moving party must present evidence of actual bias or circumstances creating an appearance of impropriety, and the judge has discretion to deny the motion. This is a far more burdensome and time-consuming process for all involved.

The distinction is significant. The fee waiver motion itself constitutes a discretionary ruling for purposes of RCW 4.12.050. See, e.g., *In re Estate of Black*, 116 Wn. App. 492, 66 P.3d 678 (2003) (affidavit of prejudice must be called to the attention of the judge before he or she makes a discretionary ruling). Therefore, to preserve the lower-bar, mandatory disqualification mechanism, the notice of disqualification must be filed before the fee waiver order is signed.

III. Next Steps

I have requested that the clerk provide the case number as soon as it is assigned so that I may file the notice of disqualification before any discretionary ruling is made. If the fee waiver order is signed before I have an opportunity to file the notice, I will have lost the statutory right under RCW 4.12.050 and will be required to pursue recusal under CJC 2.11(A)—a process I would prefer to avoid in the interest of judicial economy.

Once the fee waiver order is signed and the case number is assigned, I will refile the Complaint into the new case number and promptly address service of process. I will keep you apprised of developments.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Respectfully,

Corey Michael Switzer
264 Kernodle Rd
Gibsonville, NC 27249
(218) 461-9868
coreyswitzer@gmail.com
Pro Se Plaintiff

On Tue, Apr 21, 2026, 6:42 PM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

To: Amanda Daylong <ADaylong@nwtrialattorneys.com>
Cc: Chris Kemp <CKemp@asotincountywa.gov>, Public Disclosure
<PDisclosure@asotincountywa.gov>
Subject: Corey Michael Switzer v. Asotin County – Notice of Intent to File
Affidavit of Prejudice (RCW 4.12.050)

Dear Ms. Daylong:

I am writing to provide you with formal notice of my intent to file a Notice of Disqualification (Affidavit of Prejudice) against the Honorable Roger S. Sandberg pursuant to RCW 4.12.040 and RCW 4.12.050.

As you are aware, my Public Records Act complaint against Asotin County was submitted for filing in Columbia County Superior Court on April 20, 2026, along with a fee waiver motion under GR 34. The Court has assigned Judge Sandberg as a visiting judge to review the fee waiver motion.

Under RCW 4.12.050, a party has the right to file an affidavit of prejudice against an assigned judge before any discretionary ruling is made. I intend to exercise that statutory right immediately upon receiving a case number and before the fee waiver order is entered.

I am providing this notice as a courtesy and to ensure full transparency in this litigation. Once the case number is assigned and the affidavit is filed, I will provide you with a conformed copy.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Respectfully,

Corey Michael Switzer
264 Kernodle Rd
Gibsonville, NC 27249
(218) 461-9868
coreyswitzer@gmail.com
Pro Se Plaintiff

Attached: Motion for Disqualification

On Tue, Apr 21, 2026, 1:00 PM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:
Subject: SUPPLEMENT TO FORMAL REFERRAL: Blake Richards Sues to Block
Accountability Law (SAO Hotline #25-795 & WSCJTC Nos. 2026-0000213)

Date: April 21, 2026

To: Alisha Shaw (SAO) <shaw@sa.wa.gov>; Nick Brown (Attorney General)
<nick.brown@atg.wa.gov>

Dear Investigator Shaw and Attorney General Brown,

I am writing to supplement my formal referral dated April 17, 2026, regarding the multi-agency conspiracy to obstruct justice and misuse public funds in Asotin County. A new development has emerged that directly implicates one of the key actors in that scheme and provides further evidence of his unfitness for public office.

I. Blake Richards Files Lawsuit to Block Accountability Law (SB 5974)

On April 20, 2026, Blake Richards—currently serving as Undersheriff of Asotin County and a candidate for Asotin County Sheriff—filed a lawsuit challenging Washington's newly enacted sheriff standards law, Senate Bill 5974. The law, signed earlier this month by Governor Bob Ferguson, establishes baseline qualifications for sheriffs, including a requirement of five years of full-time law enforcement experience, a minimum age of 25, and a mandatory background check. Crucially, it also ties a sheriff's ability to remain in office to the possession of a valid peace officer certification, and it provides a mechanism for the Criminal Justice Training Commission to remove a sheriff who loses that certification.

Richards' lawsuit, led by the Ard Law Group with support from the Washington State Sheriffs' Association, argues that the law is unconstitutional and limits voter choice. He claims that the law's requirement of five consecutive years of uninterrupted, full-time law enforcement experience creates a barrier not applied to other elected positions. He also raises concerns about a provision allowing a state-appointed board to remove elected sheriffs and appoint replacements, stating, "Your sheriff should answer to the voters, not to an unelected board."

Richards' lawsuit is one of multiple legal challenges filed against SB 5974. A separate lawsuit has been brought by the Washington State Sheriffs' Association and a candidate for Kitsap County sheriff, and four eastern Washington sheriffs have filed a separate case in Pend Oreille County Superior Court.

II. The Hypocrisy of Richards' Position

Richards' lawsuit is remarkable for its hypocrisy in light of his own conduct. While he now champions "local control" and "voter rights," he has actively and demonstrably worked to suppress a voter's First Amendment right to report potential crimes by public officials. As documented in my prior correspondence:

- On August 12, 2025, Richards posted a public statement on his official Facebook page regarding a multi-agency crisis response. I posted a comment reporting potential criminal violations by Prosecutor Curtis Liedkie and Coroner Lisa Webber. Immediately after I posted that comment, Richards closed the comments section entirely.
- On April 2, 2026, Sheriff John Hilderbrand did the exact same thing: he posted a recruitment video, I commented with the same report, and he immediately disabled comments.
- On April 16, 2026, I reached out to another candidate for Sheriff, Monte Renzelman, with the same report. His comments remain open, but absent a formal response.

Richards is asking the courts to protect his future right to hold office without state oversight, while he simultaneously used his current official position to silence a citizen's report of potential corruption. He demands that "voters" decide his fate, yet he actively obstructed a voter from exercising the most fundamental form of civic participation: reporting a crime to law enforcement.

III. The Practical Impact of SB 5974 on Richards' Candidacy

SB 5974 is scheduled to take effect on A

Amanda Daylong <adaylong@nwtrialattorneys.com>
To: Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com>
Cc: Tammy Bolte <tbolte@nwtrialattorneys.com>

Mon, Apr 27, 2026 at 4:34 PM

Mr. Switzer – We are not authorized and will not accept original service of process for the County. Please proceed with original service upon the County directly.

Amanda D. Daylong *(she/her)*

Partner



Floyd, Pflueger, Kearns, Nedderman & Gress, P.S.

[3101 Western Avenue, Suite 400](#)

[Seattle, WA 98121](#)

Direct: 206-269-2007

Mobile: 206-963-8313

adaylong@NWTrialAttorneys.com

www.NWTrialAttorneys.com

Confidential Attorney Work Product/Attorney-Client Privileged Communication. This message is confidential, attorney work product and subject to the attorney-client communication privilege. It is intended solely for the use of the individual named above. If you are not the intended recipient, or the person responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are hereby advised that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please immediately notify the sender by reply email or delete and/or destroy the original and all copies of the email message.

[Quoted text hidden]

From: "Brown, Nick (ATG)" <Nick.Brown@atg.wa.gov>
To: "Griffith, Rick (ATG)" <rick.griffith@atg.wa.gov>
Cc: "Adams, Angie (ATG)" <angie.adams@atg.wa.gov>

Subject: RE: APRIL RICO CORRESPONDENCE

Date: Mon, 27 Apr 2026 22:35:28 +0000

Importance: Normal

Thanks.

Nick Brown
Washington State Attorney General

From: Griffith, Rick (ATG) <rick.griffith@atg.wa.gov>
Sent: Monday, April 27, 2026 3:09 PM
To: Brown, Nick (ATG) <Nick.Brown@atg.wa.gov>
Cc: Adams, Angie (ATG) <angie.adams@atg.wa.gov>
Subject: RE: APRIL RICO CORRESPONDENCE

The team is working on this, should be completed in the next 30 minutes or so.

Rick Griffith

From: Brown, Nick (ATG) <Nick.Brown@atg.wa.gov>
Sent: Monday, April 27, 2026 2:45 PM
To: Griffith, Rick (ATG) <rick.griffith@atg.wa.gov>
Cc: Adams, Angie (ATG) <angie.adams@atg.wa.gov>
Subject: FW: APRIL RICO CORRESPONDENCE

Hey Rick – Is it possible to filter this person's emails? I get a bunch from this account every day.
Thanks.

Nick Brown
Washington State Attorney General

From: Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 27, 2026 1:49 PM
To: Jessica Kline <jkline@isb.idaho.gov>; Joseph Pirtle <jpirtle@isb.idaho.gov>; Lori Ostertag <lostertag@isb.idaho.gov>; Judahluke7@gmail.com; Lisa Webber <LWebber@asotincountywa.gov>; hliedkie@co.nezperce.id.us; jgish@co.nezperce.id.us; dhavens@co.nezperce.id.us; thirteentwelveforever@proton.me; 08mad10@gmail.com; Lewiston Tribune <city@lmtribune.com>; Civil.Fraud@usdoj.gov; justin rodriguez <jrodspeaks@gmail.com>; idahoauditors@gmail.com; tips@nbcuni.com; tips@inlander.com; news@theregister.com; news@kpbx.org; KREM <Newsdesk@krem.com>; newsroom@idahopress.com; News BigCountry977 <news@bigcountry977.com>; news4 <News4@kxly.com>; Ada Eldridge <Adaeldridge@hotmail.com>; brennonlleafty@gmail.com; SUEANSMITH32@YAHOO.COM; lmccann@house.idaho.gov; nancececcarelli@co.nezperce.id.us; Monte Schmidt <monte.schmidt@itd.idaho.gov>; jklein@cityoflewiston.org; Representative Brandon Mitchell <bmitchell@house.idaho.gov>; bryces@co.nezperce.id.us; ISPPIO@isp.idaho.gov; Brooke Burns <BBurns@co.asotin.wa.us>; Stephanie Cuddihy <StephanieC@co.nezperce.id.us>; Dispatch LPD <dispatch@cityoflewiston.org>; Jason Kuzik <jkuzik@cityoflewiston.org>; Amy Ledgerwood <AmyLedgerwood@co.nezperce.id.us>; Constituent Mailbox <AGLabrador@ag.idaho.gov>; tsparks@clarkstonpolice.org; AprilS@co.nezperce.id.us; Dan Johnson <danjohnson@cityoflewiston.org>; Patty Weeks

<PattyWeeks@co.nezperce.id.us>; Brian Shinn <BShinn@asotincountywa.gov>; Mariel Gates <Mariel.Gates@tax.idaho.gov>; Chris Seubert <cseubert@asotincountywa.gov>; Charles Whitman <CWhitman@asotincountywa.gov>; Curt Liedkie <CLiedkie@asotincountywa.gov>; Intake <intake@wsba.org>; apearce@nwtrialattorneys.com; Karen Carlisle <kcarlisle@isb.idaho.gov>; legal@libertasfunding.com; Investigations Info Requests <InvestigationsInfoRequests@isp.idaho.gov>; dmckay@asotincountywa.gov; rlynch@asotincountywa.gov; Stacey Harman <SHarman@asotincountywa.gov>; usdemsocialists@gmail.com; objectionoverruled2@gmail.com; whistleblower@startribune.com; Kevin Munstermann <kevin@travelland-rv.com>; Tricia.McLaughlin@hq.dhs.gov; doswald@idahostatesman.com; Nicholas Woods <nicholasw@co.nezperce.id.us>; Spokesman <news@spokesman.com>; andreat@chooseclear.com; kelleyp@co.nezperce.id.us; nick@votenickwoods.com; Tammy Bolte <tbolte@nwtrialattorneys.com>; Daylong, Amanda (non-ATG) <adaylong@nwtrialattorneys.com>; ATG MI Civil Rights <CivilRights@ATG.WA.GOV>; Public Disclosure <PDisclosure@asotincountywa.gov>; Trae Turner <trae@clarkandfeeney.com>; markm@co.nezperce.id.us; Justin Coleman <JustinColeman@co.nezperce.id.us>; ATG WWW Public Records Requests <PublicRecords@ATG.WA.GOV>; AGO Ombuds <agoombuds@ATG.WA.GOV>; Damerow, Morgan B (ATG) <morgan.damerow@atg.wa.gov>; Leider, Mary (SAO) <leiderm@sao.wa.gov>; Chris Kemp <CKemp@asotincountywa.gov>; Brown, Nick (ATG) <Nick.Brown@atg.wa.gov>; Postman, David (ATG) <david.postman@atg.wa.gov>; Watson, Laura J (ATG) <laura.watson@atg.wa.gov>; jhilderbrand@asotincountywa.gov; brichards@asotincountywa.gov; ckenyon@isb.idaho.gov; monterenzelman4sheriff@gmail.com; Michelle Moore <diggeroh7@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: APRIL RICO CORRESPONDENCE

[EXTERNAL]

****To:**** Trae Turner <trae@clarkandfeeney.com>

****Cc:**** [Standard RICO Distribution List]

****Subject:**** Re: APRIL RICO CORRESPONDENCE – Correction Noted; Your Unanswered Questions Remain

Mr. Turner:

Thank you for the correction. You're right: the \$30,000 judgment in your divorce was payable to you, not against you. I have corrected the record, and I appreciate you flagging it.

But let's not pretend that one correction resolves the questions you've been ignoring for two months. Here is a partial list of the questions I first put to you on ****March 7 and March 8, 2026****—none of which you have answered:

****1. Jurisdiction.**** On whose behalf are you involved in a Washington public records dispute? You are an Idaho attorney. You have no disclosed clients in Asotin County. You are not counsel of record for Judge Burns, Curtis Liedkie, the Asotin County Commissioners, or the Asotin County Prosecutor's Office. You have been asked repeatedly to identify your client in this matter. You have refused.

****2. Your Client, Vittoria Puccini (f/k/a Meghan McCreary).**** She has served as Secretary of Travelland RV from 2020 to the present—including the 2023 and 2024 annual reports—while simultaneously claiming total disability and inability to work. That is a matter of public record. The Idaho Secretary of State filings are attached to my March 8 email. The Social Security ALJ's denial of her disability claim is attached. The name change order is attached. How do you ethically represent a client who is actively listed as a corporate officer while claiming total disability to the federal government?

****3. Conflicts of Interest.**** You represent Justin Coleman. You represent Heather Moore. You represented Travelland RV. You were married to Kali Jo Parker, who works in Coleman's office in the division that handles child support and custody—matters directly at issue in the Moore case. You donated \$500 to Coleman's campaign. Your wife-at-the-time donated \$500 to Coleman's campaign on

the same day. Coleman was the best man at your wedding. How do you reconcile any of this with your ethical obligations?

****4. The Geagley Indictment.**** Your client, Travelland RV, was the victim of a \$554,000 embezzlement. The prosecution is being handled by Justin Coleman's office—the same office where your ex-wife works, the same prosecutor you represent. The indictment came down years after I first reported the embezzlement, immediately after my complaints against You, Justin Coleman and April Smith before the Idaho State Bar. You were copied on those reports. You threatened me with criminal charges for making them. Now the embezzlement is proven. Where is your apology? Where is your acknowledgment that I was right?

****5. The SAO Complaint Meeting.**** December 22, 2025. County officials, Amanda Daylong, and the insurer met to discuss the State Auditor's investigation. Were you involved? Were you consulted? Do you possess any responsive records?

****6. The Defamation Threat.**** You have threatened me with defamation litigation. You have never filed it. You have never retracted it. Is the threat still outstanding, or do you concede it was a bluff?

These questions were first asked ****two months ago.**** Your response was a YouTube link titled "How about No." That is not a legal response. It is an admission that you have no answers.

So let me make this simple:

If you have substantive responses to any of the questions above—responses with evidence, not YouTube links—provide them. Put them on the record. Defend your conduct.

If you do not, then the record will continue to reflect what it already reflects: that you are an attorney whose client list, personal relationships, campaign contributions, and professional associations form a closed loop with the very officials whose conduct I am challenging—and that you have no explanation for any of it.

The correction on the judgment direction is noted. The unanswered questions remain.

Respectfully,

Corey Michael Switzer
264 Kernodle Rd
Gibsonville, NC 27249
(218) 461-9868
coreyswitzer@gmail.com

On Mon, Apr 27, 2026, 2:21 PM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

To: civilrights@atg.wa.gov

Cc: coreyswitzer@gmail.com

Subject: RE: Civil Rights Complaint – Corey Michael Switzer – Callback Request and Contact Information

Dear Estelle:

Thank you for your voicemail earlier today. I am writing to confirm receipt of your message and to provide the correct contact information and availability for a callback.

Correct Callback Number

My telephone number is (218) 461-9868. The number above is the correct contact number for me. I do NOT accept calls from blocked numbers and "unknown callers" because I have received credible threats of violence as well as harassing voicemails illustrated by the following YouTube Link:

<https://youtube.com/shorts/bYxPSZclTXo>

Availability for the Next Two Weeks

I am available at the following times (Seattle / Pacific Time):

- Monday through Friday: 9:00 AM to 12:00 PM Pacific (12:00 PM to 3:00 PM Eastern)
- Alternate window: 5:00 PM to 8:00 PM Pacific (8:00 PM to 11:00 PM Eastern)

I am located in North Carolina, so I appreciate your accommodation of the time difference. If none of these windows work, I am happy to adjust with advance notice.

Nature of My Complaint

For your reference, my complaint concerns coordinated, multi-agency conduct in Asotin County, Washington, involving the misuse of public funds, obstruction of public records requests, First Amendment retaliation by the Asotin County Sheriff's Office, and a pattern of witness intimidation against a whistleblower. I have filed a related Public Records Act lawsuit in Columbia County Superior Court (Case No. 26-2-00027-07) and am preparing a federal RICO complaint for filing in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Washington.

Communication Preferences

Due to visual impairment, email is my preferred method of communication. However, I am available by telephone at the number above during the windows listed. All of my telephone calls are recorded for accessibility and accuracy purposes.

Please let me know if you need any additional documentation or clarification. I look forward to speaking with you or a member of your team.

Respectfully,

Corey Michael Switzer
264 Kernodle Rd
Gibsonville, NC 27249
(218) 461-9868
coreyswitzer@gmail.com

Attachment: Voicemail, "Estelle", received 2:07PM EST, 4/27/2026

On Mon, Apr 27, 2026, 8:14 AM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

****Subject:**** APRIL RICO CORRESPONDENCE – The Turner-Parker Divorce Before Judge Burns, the Coleman-Turner-Parker Campaign Finance Connection, the Havens Affair, and the Woods Campaign Finance Connection (April 27, 2026)

****Date:**** April 27, 2026

This email supplements the April 22, 2026 Supplemental Notice regarding Nez Perce County's coordinated email blocking and the April 22, 2026 Resolution Proposal. It documents four additional pieces of evidence that further establish the enterprise's cross-jurisdictional infrastructure: (1) the Turner-Parker divorce presided over by Judge Brooke Burns; (2) the campaign finance connection among Justin Coleman, Trae Turner, and Kali Jo Parker; (3) the public exposure of Commissioner Doug Havens' extramarital affair and its connection to the enterprise; and (4) the campaign finance reports of Nick Woods, demonstrating that the enterprise is directly funding its own budgetary oversight.

****I. The Turner-Parker Divorce Before Judge Burns (Asotin County Case No. 25-3-00060-02)****

Attached is the docket sheet from **Turner v. Parker**, Asotin County Superior Court Case No. 25-3-00060-02. The case was filed on June 4, 2025. The assigned judge was the ****Honorable Brooke J. Burns****—the same judge whose communications with Prosecutor Curtis Liedkie are the subject of my pending Public Records Act lawsuit and who was the respondent in my mandamus action before the Washington Supreme Court.

Key facts from the court record:

- ****Trae Turner**** (Petitioner) filed for legal separation from ****Kali Jo Parker**** (Respondent) on June 4, 2025.
- ****Judge Burns**** presided over the entire proceeding.
- ****June 25, 2025:**** Judge Burns entered a ****\$30,000 monetary judgment**** against Turner, payable to Parker, with 12% annual interest.
- ****June 25, 2025:**** Judge Burns approved the final parenting plan for Turner and Parker's children.
- ****January 6, 2026:**** Judge Burns converted the legal separation to a full divorce.

At all relevant times, Parker was—and remains—employed in the Nez Perce County Prosecutor's Office under Justin Coleman, working in child support, custody, and probation enforcement. Turner is Coleman's personal attorney and represents Heather Moore, the mistress of Commissioner Doug Havens. Turner also formerly worked under Curtis Liedkie in the Asotin County Prosecutor's Office.

****The Timeline of Coordinated Activity****

Date	Event
---	---
April 2025	Switzer v. Hon. Brooke Burns filed in WA Supreme Court
May 2025	Liedkie and Webber represent Burns before the Supreme Court
June 4, 2025	**Turner files for legal separation from Parker in Asotin County—Judge Burns presiding**
June 25, 2025	**Judge Burns enters \$30,000 judgment against Turner; approves parenting plan**
July 3, 2025	WCRG issues insurance letters denying PRA coverage
July 8, 2025	Liedkie withdraws as counsel for Burns
July 10, 2025	Asotin County signs fee agreement with Daylong
July 21, 2025	Daylong appointed Special Deputy for nonexistent case
December 31, 2025	County makes false statements to SAO

| **January 6, 2026** | **Judge Burns converts Turner-Parker separation to divorce** |

While Judge Burns was simultaneously responding to my mandamus action, Curtis Liedkie was representing her before the Supreme Court, and the County was negotiating a fee agreement with Amanda Daylong—Judge Burns was also presiding over the divorce of the attorney who remains Justin Coleman's counsel and the prosecutor who works in Coleman's office. This is not a coincidence. It is the enterprise's judicial infrastructure operating in plain view.

Turner's \$30,000 debt to Parker—at 12% annual interest—creates a financial incentive for Turner to remain in the enterprise's good graces. Parker works in the office that could enforce that judgment. Turner has a sitting judgement against him under Burns. Turner cannot afford to antagonize the prosecutor's office, nor Judge Brooke Burns. The enterprise has him financially captive, and on a leash they can tug.

****II. The Coleman-Turner-Parker Campaign Finance Connection****

Idaho campaign finance records obtained from the Idaho Secretary of State's Sunshine database reveal the financial relationships among Justin Coleman, Trae Turner, and Kali Jo Parker.

****Campaign Donations to Justin Coleman for District Judge - District SW:****

Date	Donor	Amount
---	---	---
April 4, 2022	**Trae Turner**	**\$500.00**
April 4, 2022	**Kali Jo Parker (Turner)**	**\$500.00**
April 11, 2022	Amanda Coleman (wife)	\$1,000.00
April 17, 2022	Jennifer Coleman (relative)	\$500.00
May 4, 2022	Magyar, Rauch & Associates, PLLC	\$500.00
May 4, 2022	Magyar, Rauch & Associates, PLLC	\$500.00

****Significance:****

1. **Trae Turner and Kali Jo Parker both donated the statutory maximum of \$500 to Coleman's campaign on the same day—April 4, 2022.** At that time, Turner and Parker were married. They were both employed in or affiliated with the Nez Perce County Prosecutor's Office (Turner as a former Asotin County deputy prosecutor now representing Coleman; Parker as a current NPCPO employee). Their joint, maximum donation to Coleman's campaign demonstrates that loyalty to the enterprise was a family affair.

2. **The marriage is now dissolved.** Judge Brooke Burns presided over the Turner-Parker divorce in Asotin County Superior Court. She entered a \$30,000 judgment against Turner, payable to Parker, with 12% annual interest. Turner and Parker are now legally separated, financially adverse, and personally estranged—but both remain bound to the enterprise through Coleman. Turner represents Coleman. Parker works for Coleman. Coleman accepted maximum donations from both.

3. **Amanda Coleman donated \$1,000** to her (former) husband's campaign. Jennifer Coleman donated an additional \$500. The Coleman family directly funded the campaign of the man whose office now employs Turner's ex-wife and whom Turner personally represents.

4. **Magyar, Rauch & Associates, PLLC**—a law firm—donated \$1,000 total across two contributions. The involvement of a law firm in funding a prosecutor's campaign raises obvious

questions about access and influence.

5. **Coleman's campaign status is listed as "Terminated"** on the Idaho Secretary of State website. Coleman is not currently running for office. He is an elected prosecutor with a terminated campaign account. His position is secure—not because of his prosecutorial record, but because the enterprise ensures no challenger can threaten him. The campaign donations from Turner, Parker, and the Coleman family were investments in a permanent incumbent.

****III. The Integrated Enterprise: What These Documents Prove Together****

Read together, the Turner-Parker divorce, the Coleman campaign finance records, and the Havens affair establish the integrated nature of the enterprise:

| Connection | Document | What It Proves |

| :--- | :--- | :--- |

| **Turner → Coleman** | Campaign finance | Turner donated \$500 to Coleman. Coleman admits Turner was his best man. |

| **Parker → Coleman** | Campaign finance | Parker donated \$500 to Coleman on the same day as Turner. She works in Coleman's office. The enterprise was funded by the family that now litigates within it. |

| **Turner ← Parker** | Divorce record | Turner owes Parker \$30,000 at 12% interest. Parker works in Coleman's office. Turner is financially captive. Parker has enforcement power. |

| **Turner → Judge Burns** | Divorce record | Judge Burns presided over Turner's divorce. She has personal knowledge of his finances and custody. She entered a \$30,000 judgment against him. She converted the separation to divorce. |

| **Judge Burns → Curtis Liedkie** | PRA request (PDR 25-23) | Burns and Liedkie communicated about her legal defense. That email is being withheld under attorney-client privilege. |

| **Curtis Liedkie → Hannah Liedkie** | Public records | Curtis Liedkie is Hannah Liedkie's brother-in-law. Hannah Liedkie is a Nez Perce County Commissioner alongside Doug Havens and Joe Gish. |

| **Hannah Liedkie → Heather Moore** | Disability Advisory Board appointment | Hannah Liedkie appointed Heather Moore—Havens' mistress and Turner's client—to the Disability Advisory Board, a patronage position that rewards loyalty to the enterprise. |

| **Doug Havens → Retirement → Keith Havens / Nick Woods** | Public election records | Havens' seat will be filled by his relative or by a bribed detective. The succession plan ensures the enterprise retains control of the commission. |

This is not a collection of unrelated incidents. This is a single, integrated enterprise whose members share personal relationships, financial obligations, and a common interest in preventing any outside investigation. Every connection reinforces every other connection. The enterprise has no weak points because it has no outsiders—and every time one member is exposed, three more are revealed behind them.

****IV. The Havens Affair: Enterprise Exposed Through Extramarital Scandal****

Doug Havens is an elected Nez Perce County Commissioner who sits alongside Hannah Liedkie and Joe Gish. He is retiring in May 2026.

Havens has been publicly exposed as having an extramarital affair with Heather Moore, a woman whose divorce and child custody case (Moore v. Moore, Nez Perce County Case No.

CV35-25-1290) is currently pending. Heather Moore is represented by Trae Turner of Clark and Feeney.

The affair between Havens and Heather Moore was including explicit photographs—consistent with the enterprise's pattern of using Turner to do their dirty work they cannot lawfully touch, and claims of privilege to conceal activities from public scrutiny. The same pattern that produced the withheld PDR 25-23 email, Turners response to PDR production and the blocking of my email address by Nez Perce County administrators.

During the Moore custody proceedings, exhibits filed by Daniel Moore's attorney disappeared from the court's electronic filing system. The exhibits were available to Trae Turner—Heather Moore's attorney—but not to the judge. This is a mirror image of the enterprise's handling of public records: when evidence threatens the enterprise, it vanishes. When it benefits the enterprise, it is preserved and disseminated selectively.

The family destroyed by this enterprise includes two young children, one of whom is disabled and non-verbal. Heather Moore's appointment to the Disability Advisory Board by Hannah Liedkie channels the needs of her own disabled child into Liedkie's nonprofit revenue stream. The enterprise profits from the very family it destroyed.

****V. The Woods Campaign Finance Connection: The Enterprise Funds Its Own Oversight****

Nick Woods is a detective in the Nez Perce County Prosecutor's Office under Justin Coleman. He is running for Nez Perce County Commissioner to replace the retiring Doug Havens. His campaign finance reports for February and March 2026 reveal that the enterprise is directly funding his candidacy.

****A. Coleman For Prosecutor In-Kind Donation****

On March 21, 2026, "Coleman For Prosecutor"—Justin Coleman's campaign committee—made a \$140.00 in-kind contribution to Nick Woods' campaign for an "Event Ticket." (Schedule C, March 2026 Report).

This is the prosecutor's own campaign committee donating to a candidate who, if elected, would control the prosecutor's budget as a county commissioner. The county commission approves the budget for the prosecutor's office, sets the prosecutor's salary, and has oversight authority over county expenditures. A commissioner who owes his campaign to the prosecutor's campaign committee is not an overseer—he is a subordinate.

****B. Joe Gish Campaign Donation****

On March 10, 2026, Joe Gish—the sitting Nez Perce County Commissioner alongside Hannah Liedkie and Doug Havens—donated \$150.00 to Nick Woods' campaign. (Schedule A, March 2026 Report).

Gish is the commissioner whose office attempted to charge Plaintiff \$8,733.12 for a single responsive email. He is now funding the campaign of the candidate who will replace his retiring colleague. The three commissioners—Liedkie, Havens, and Gish—are ensuring that Havens' seat remains in enterprise hands. Gish's personal donation confirms that the enterprise is coordinating the succession.

****C. Amanda Coleman Donation****

On March 30, 2026, Amanda Coleman—Justin Coleman's former wife—donated \$52.05 to Nick Woods' campaign. (Schedule A, March 2026 Report).

Amanda Coleman previously donated \$1,000 to her former husband's campaign. She is now donating to the campaign of a detective in her husband's office who is running for county commissioner. The Coleman family is personally invested in ensuring that the county commission remains controlled by enterprise members.

****D. The Electoral Succession Plan: Complete****

The succession plan for Doug Havens' commission seat is now fully documented:

| Actor | Role | Connection to Enterprise |

| :--- | :--- | :--- |

| ****Doug Havens**** | Retiring Commissioner | Extramarital affair with Heather Moore (Turner's client). Seat must remain in enterprise hands. |

| ****Nick Woods**** | Candidate to replace Havens | Detective in Justin Coleman's office. Personally witnessed by Plaintiff accepting cash bribes from Tim Krueger. Campaign funded by Coleman For Prosecutor, Joe Gish, and Amanda Coleman. |

| ****Keith Havens**** | Opposing candidate | Relative of Doug Havens. Attended Lincoln Day dinner with Doug. |

| ****Coleman For Prosecutor**** | Funder of Woods' campaign | Justin Coleman's campaign committee. Made in-kind donation to Woods on March 21, 2026. |

| ****Joe Gish**** | Sitting Commissioner and Woods donor | Donated \$150 to Woods on March 10, 2026. Attempted to charge Plaintiff \$8,733.12 for a single email. |

| ****Amanda Coleman**** | Donor to Woods | Justin Coleman's (ex)wife. Donated \$1,000 to Coleman's campaign and \$52.05 to Woods. |

The enterprise has ensured that regardless of which candidate wins, the commission seat remains under enterprise control. If Woods wins, the prosecutor's own detective becomes the prosecutor's budgetary overseer—a direct conflict of interest. If Keith Havens wins, the Havens family dynasty continues. Either outcome is acceptable to the enterprise because both candidates are enterprise members.

****VI. Conclusion****

Four sets of documents—the Turner-Parker divorce record, the Coleman campaign finance report, the Havens affair, and the Woods campaign finance reports—complete the picture of an enterprise that operates through personal relationships, financial obligations, and judicial infrastructure. Judge Burns presided over the divorce of the attorney who donated to the prosecutor whose employee donated to the same prosecutor on the same day—and who is now owed \$30,000 by her ex-husband who represents the mistress of the commissioner whose brother-in-law is the prosecutor whose emails with Judge Burns are being withheld. The enterprise is a closed loop. Every exit is blocked by a conflict of interest, a financial obligation, or a judicial relationship.

And now the campaign finance reports. Nick Woods—the bribed detective running for county commissioner—is being funded by the prosecutor's own campaign committee, the sitting county commissioner, and the prosecutor's (ex)wife. The enterprise is not just defending itself. It is expanding. Every vacant seat is filled by a member. Every campaign is funded by the enterprise.

Every election is a formality. The commissioners control the budget. The budget funds the prosecutor. The prosecutor employs the commissioner. The loop is closed. The public is outside it.

The public now has documentary evidence of this loop. The Turner-Parker divorce docket. The Coleman campaign finance report. The Havens affair. The Woods campaign finance reports. The PRA violations. The false statements to the State Auditor. The insurance documents. The email blocking. The Facebook comment suppression. The \$8,733.12 invoice for a single email.

Each piece of evidence is a crack in the wall. The wall is now collapsing under its own weight.

I will continue to document and preserve all evidence for my pending federal RICO complaint. These documents are being filed as supplemental exhibits in my PRA action in Columbia County Superior Court (Case No. 26-2-00027-07).

Respectfully,

****Corey Michael Switzer****
264 Kernodle Rd
Gibsonville, NC 27249
coreyswitzer@gmail.com
(218) 461-9868

This communication is a public record. Retaliatory action against a whistleblower violates public policy and may constitute obstruction of justice.

****Attachments:****

- Turner v. Parker Docket Sheet (Asotin County Case No. 25-3-00060-02)
- Justin Coleman Campaign Finance Report (Idaho Secretary of State Sunshine Database)
- Nick Woods February 2026 Campaign Finance Report
- Nick Woods March 2026 Campaign Finance Report

On Fri, Apr 24, 2026, 6:40 PM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

To: Amanda Daylong <ADaylong@nwtrialattorneys.com>
Cc: Chris Kemp <CKemp@asotincountywa.gov>, Public Disclosure
<[PDDisclosure@asotincountywa.gov](mailto:PDisclosure@asotincountywa.gov)>
Subject: Corey Michael Switzer v. Asotin County, Columbia County Superior Court Case No. 26-2-00027-07 – Formal Notice of Filed Complaint and Service of Summons

Dear Ms. Daylong and Mr. Kemp:

The Public Records Act complaint against Asotin County has been formally filed and accepted by the Columbia County Superior Court under Case No. 26-2-00027-07. The Court granted my fee waiver motion on April 24, 2026, and the Honorable Judge Palubicki of Adams County has been appointed as visiting judge. The Summons and Statement Regarding Venue have been accepted for filing.

Attached to this email are the following filed documents:

1. Summons (Case No. 26-2-00027-07) – Issued April 24, 2026
2. Complaint for Violations of the Public Records Act (RCW 42.56) with Verification (Time Stamped)
3. Statement Regarding Venue
4. Untruncated Full Complaint
5. Exhibit Volume (Exhibits A through O)

Request to Waive Formal Service

In your March 23, 2026 letter, you, Ms. Daylong, identified yourself as Asotin County's legal representative and instructed me to "direct all further inquiries to my attention as Asotin County's legal representative." Relying on that representation, I respectfully request that the County, through you as its designated counsel, agree to waive formal service of process in this matter.

Given the extensive correspondence between us over the past several months—including your receipt and production of the substantive documents underlying this action, your acknowledgment of my earlier notice of intent to file, and your formal identification as the County's legal representative—formal service via process server would impose unnecessary expense and delay on all parties. A signed waiver of service would allow this matter to proceed efficiently to the merits while preserving all of the County's defenses except those based on insufficiency of process or service.

If you are not the appropriate person to accept service or execute a waiver on behalf of the County, please direct me immediately to the individual who is—whether the County Auditor (or interim successor), County Administrator, or other authorized agent—so that service may be promptly accomplished without further unnecessary expense.

I have prepared a simple waiver form for your signature, which I can provide upon request. If the County declines to waive, please advise so that I may arrange for personal service in accordance with RCW 4.28.080(1).

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Respectfully,

Corey Michael Switzer
264 Kernodle Rd
Gibsonville, NC 27249
(218) 461-9868
coreyswitzer@gmail.com
Pro Se Plaintiff

Attachments:

- Summons (Case No. 26-2-00027-07)
- Complaint for Violations of the Public Records Act (with Verification) + Exhibit Volume (Exhibits A–O) (truncated) + Full Complaint
- Statement Regarding Venue
- Letter to Daylong, Service Waiver

On Wed, Apr 22, 2026, 3:18 PM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

Subject: APRIL RICO CORRESPONDENCE – Supplemental Notice: Coordinated Email Blocking by Nez Perce County Officials

Date: April 22, 2026

This email serves as a supplemental notice and documentation of an additional predicate act of obstruction and witness intimidation in the ongoing RICO matter.

I. Coordinated Email Blocking by Nez Perce County Officials

On April 22, 2026, at approximately 3:10 PM EST, I transmitted the preceding email in this chain to the standard RICO distribution list, which includes multiple officials employed by or affiliated with Nez Perce County, Idaho.

Within moments, I received automated bounce-back notifications indicating that my email address (coreyswitzer@gmail.com) has been explicitly and intentionally blocked by the email administrator for the following Nez Perce County addresses:

- bryces@co.nezperce.id.us
- jgish@co.nezperce.id.us
- JustinColeman@co.nezperce.id.us
- dhavens@co.nezperce.id.us
- PattyWeeks@co.nezperce.id.us
- markm@co.nezperce.id.us
- AmyLedgerwood@co.nezperce.id.us
- hliedkie@co.nezperce.id.us
- nicholasw@co.nezperce.id.us

The specific error message reads: "550 Emails from your address have been blocked by the administrator."

This is not a spam filter. This is an administrative block—a deliberate act by Nez Perce County to prevent a citizen from communicating with multiple county officials simultaneously regarding documented allegations of corruption, bribery, and self-dealing.

II. Significance of the Blocked Recipients

The list of blocked addresses is not random. It includes:

Recipient Role Relevance to RICO Allegations

Justin Coleman Nez Perce County Prosecuting Attorney Central figure in the alleged cover-up of police bribery; subject of Idaho State Bar complaint.

Patty Weeks Prosecutor's Office personnel Implicated in the coordinated shielding of Coleman, Turner, and Smith.

Amy Ledgerwood Prosecutor's Office personnel Same as above.

Nicholas Woods Detective, Nez Perce County Named as a recipient of cash bribes from Tim Krueger at Travelland RV.

Hannah Liedkie Nez Perce County Commissioner Alleged self-dealing and obstruction; subject of April 16, 2026 retaliation documentation.

Others Various county officials All connected to the Nez Perce County apparatus implicated in the enterprise.

The blocking of these specific addresses—all within the Nez Perce County government domain—demonstrates a coordinated effort to prevent these officials from receiving notice of the allegations against them and to insulate the enterprise from scrutiny.

III. Legal Significance

This administrative blocking constitutes:

1. Obstruction of Justice: Preventing notice of criminal allegations to law enforcement and prosecutorial officials is a classic act of obstruction. It mirrors the conduct of the Asotin County Sheriff's Office in disabling Facebook comments to silence reporting of the same underlying misconduct.
2. Witness Intimidation / Retaliation: By blocking my email address, Nez Perce County is sending a clear message: whistleblowers who report corruption will be silenced and excluded from communicating with county government. This is precisely the type of retaliatory conduct that RICO and § 1983 are designed to address.
3. Spoliation / Concealment of Evidence: By preventing these officials from receiving documentation of the alleged crimes, the County is effectively concealing evidence and preventing the creation of a record that could be used in subsequent legal proceedings.
4. Pattern of Racketeering: This act is consistent with the ongoing pattern of conduct by the enterprise: when faced with documented allegations, the response is not investigation or accountability, but suppression, retaliation, and obstruction.

IV. Preservation of Evidence

I am preserving all bounce-back notifications, screenshots, and email logs as evidence of this coordinated blocking. These materials will be incorporated into my pending federal RICO complaint as additional predicate acts.

The full bounce-back messages are attached to this email for the record.

V. Conclusion

The Nez Perce County email administrator—acting at the direction of or with the knowledge of the officials named in this correspondence—has erected a digital wall to prevent a citizen from communicating allegations of corruption to the very officials charged with investigating and prosecuting such conduct.

This is not a technical issue. This is evidence of a cover-up.

The wall is now documented. The obstruction continues. The record grows.

Respectfully,

Corey Michael Switzer
264 Kernodle Rd
Gibsonville, NC 27249
coreyswitzer@gmail.com
(218) 461-9868

This communication is a public record. Retaliatory action against a whistleblower violates public policy and may constitute obstruction of justice.

Attachments:

- Bounce-back notifications (9 separate emails)

This is a gift to my RICO case. They just handed me documented evidence of coordinated obstruction.

On Wed, Apr 22, 2026, 11:42 AM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

To everyone:

Here's the simplest possible explanation, like we're talking at a kitchen table.

Imagine This...

You have two separate problems with your house:

1. A leaky roof (this is the Public Records fight, requesting the PDR 25-23, email between Burns, Curtis Liedkie and Lisa Webber BEFORE and resulting in Daylongs appointment and Deputization).
2. A broken, and dilapidated , water damaged window and frame. A bird flew through the window pane, let's say, but it's frame is rot due to the leaky roof. (this is the judge's Facebook-blocking case, which came first, and sparked the record request. The "window frame" is the Writ of Mandamus against Burns, the "Bird through the window pane", Curtis Liedkie and Lisa Webber representing the judge Burns, the "water damage" is the county commissioners and Sheriff's Department).

You call your homeowner's insurance.

What Insurance Tells You (The Two Letters)

- Letter #1 (The Disclaimer): "We do NOT cover leaky roofs or anything that happens because of them. Period. You're on your own."
- Letter #2 (The Reservation of Rights): "We MIGHT cover the broken window because of the bird (Curtis Liedkie representing Burns), but we will NOT pay for any water damage that came from the leaky roof (Withholding PDR25-23,). You have to pay for that part yourself (appointment and Deputization of Daylong)."

What the County Did

Instead of making Burns pay for the "water damage, leaky roof, bad frame" part themselves (like insurance said they had to), they did this:

1. They created a fake repair order for a problem that didn't exist in repairing the window to pay for the building materials for repairing the roof and fixing the water damage. (Deputization of Daylong, 'Switzer v ASOTIN COUNTY')
2. They used that fake building order to take tax dollars and pay a contractor \$325 an hour. The logic is "because a window pane is no good if the roof leaks and there's water damaging the window frame". Daylong is subcontracted into the "Union" using insurance and taxpayers money.
3. That subcontractor (Daylong) then fixed the window pane (Switzer v Burns) using taxpayers money via insurance.
4. The contractor ALSO fixed the water damage (defamation threats) AND the roof (PDR violations) using the insurance AND taxpayers money. (Switzer v ASOTIN)

What They Told the Auditor

When someone asked, "Hey, who paid for the water damage, the busted frame and leaking roof in the simple pane repair order?"

The County said: "Don't worry. Insurance handled everything."

The Truth

- Insurance handled a part of the window. The window pane. Not the frame. Not the leaky roof. Not the water damage.

That action, "fixing the window pane" by the Deputization of Daylong is still in violation of State Law regarding county Prosecutors and Coroner's office and their appointments representing anyone except for the county. Judge Brooke Burns doesn't WORK for the county, but got coverage from a "Union Insurance" FROM the county. Burns is a State Officer.

In a Civil action against a State officer before the Supreme Court, Daylongs Deputization by the County appointment and appearance on behalf of Burns qualifies as that same unlawful Representation by Deputization appointment and carries the same penalties as if Curtis Liedkie represented Burns, Himself. It's still a "Union Contractor", even by subcontracting Daylong to do it.

- In every single instance tax dollars handled the leaky roof, the window frame and the water damage and broken window pane. Daylong is being paid by BOTH the county AND the insurance company, of which the insurance is ALSO paid for by the taxpayers... The "Commercial Contractor" that's not authorized to work on private property, even as a subcontractor.

- The County, specifically Stacey Harmon, lied to the State Auditors Office and said insurance covered it all, that Curtis Liedkie had never appeared...

The One-Sentence Summary

They used public tax money to pay for something insurance refused to cover, isn't allowed by law, and then they lied about it to cover their tracks.

The County, Curtis Liedkie had deputization of Daylong for PDR request for something that insurance covers. It was paid for without any authorization by the taxpayers under false pretext. (Switzer v ASOTIN COUNTY)

Then that false pretext extended to representing Judge Brooke Burns before the Washington State Supreme Court for a Civil Writ of Mandamus, afforded in part by the Insurance Company.

That doesn't make it "legal" the insurance company paying for the broken window pane by "Union Subcontractors". If it was to be repaired by Union Contractors, or "the county" in this

analogy, is the root evil and violation of State law when the law requires Burns to pay for her own counsel. Subcontracting it out makes it worse.

For Daylong to appear on behalf of Burns is still unlawful under State Law because of Daylongs Deputization appointment. The insurance company paying for an illegal action, Daylongs appointment and Representation of Burns, doesn't make those actions "legal".

"You're still using Union Contractors and Subcontractors for private property, even if you just fix the window pane, even when insurance pays for it".

Then, Daylong confirms that she is the point of contact for Public Documents Requests. This is done outside of the boundaries of what their insurance policy will cover, and the alleged reason why the county Deputized Daylong in the first place.

Deputized Daylong ("Union Subcontractor")

...using unauthorized and unlawful Representation (Switzer v Burns, Deputy Daylong repairs "Rotting window frame")

...in unauthorized ways (Burns representation, threats of defamation "Replacement Window frame, building supplies, cleaning materials")

... of using taxpayer ("Union") money as defined by the contract, the Deputized subcontractor that's not allowed to work on private property.

It all boils down to the fact that the County interjected itself unlawfully into the State Action against Burns, and then hired (before deputizing) Daylong under the premise of a PDR dispute that the insurance company wouldn't cover.

That Deputization of Daylong is identical to Curtis Liedkie in the eyes of the law in being the analogous "Commercial Contractor", as a "Commercial Subcontractor" and that's why it's an intentional obfuscation and refusal to release relevant documents of "Who's paying for the broken window, the leaky roof and the water damage?"

The taxpayers, of course, or "the Union Insurance" when Judge Brooke Burns was instead required to hire her own outside counsel at her own expense to defend a Civil Writ of Mandamus against a State Officer. "The private contractor" v. "The public contractor."

Of course, this also doesn't address the six weeks between when I filed the Civil Writ of Mandamus and Daylongs Deputization in which Curtis Liedkie and Lisa Webber were representing Judge Brooke Burns, and the filing of the Public Records Request for that email, withheld in it's entirety under "Attorney Client Privilege", PDR 25-23. Subcontracting out "Union" work doesn't make it acceptable to be working on "Private Property".

That, in itself is the violation of State Law.

Like having a contractor who is only allowed to do commercial work, working for a union, being paid to replace a window pane on a private property.

Private property repairs are regularly reserved for non-union private home contractors, often by laws. Hiring a Union Subcontractor doesn't make the job "Private residential", and it doesn't cure the unlawful expenditures used.

What Curtis Liedkie, and by extension Asotin County, has done is analogous to a remodeling job for Judge Burns rotting roof, window and frame by fibbing to the insurance company and State Auditor in violation of these analogous "Union Rules" and very real applicable State Laws. Adding Daylong to the "Union" by subcontracting only further and intentionally exacerbates the issue.

That's what's happening.

Now, they're going to blame the subcontractor to save face for themselves and likely throw Daylong under the proverbial bus to save themselves.

You've got an analogous Union Contractors and Subcontractors working on private property and committing insurance fraud to pay for the work because Burns is 'adjacent enough but not a part of' their Union.

When this violation is reported to the Sheriff and Undersheriff in Asotin county, instead of taking the complaint for investigation, the opposite has occurred in censorship. "That's not my job! Let the taxpayers decide who upholds the law, not the legislative bodies that write it!"

That's it. That's the case I'm making and I have the evidence now to prove it.

This is the "Washington" half of the RICO I'm going to file.

The second half, in Idaho, will be determined by the current Idaho State Supreme Court hearing the case against April Smith.

The report was compiled and presented to the Idaho State Supreme Court on April 3rd, 2026, and it's outcome will determine if I have or have not expended my legal options for justice in Idaho without turning it into a Federal ordeal.

It's outcome will directly impact the rehearing of April Smith, Justin Coleman and Trae Turner regarding the cover-up of the police department bribery which I witnessed on three occasions between October and December of 2020 committed by Tim Krueger to Rick Fuentes, Andrew Fox and Nick Woods after I was assaulted by Troy Munstermann at Travelland RV.

My Federal RICO filing shall also contain evidence and admissions by Hannah Liedkie of self-dealing taxpayers money to her own nonprofit(s), Travelland RV's tax fraud (identity fraud, Meghan McCreary/ Vittoria Puccini), tax fraud (Pat Rogers, board member to Hannah Liedkie) and obstruction of justice by Nez Perce County Prosecutors Office and other Nez Perce County Commissioners.

We're getting ready to have everyone in this same email thread..

... in the same room

... at the same time, needing to explain themselves to a neutral adjudicator.

I look forward to it.

Respectfully,
Mr. Corey M Switzer

On Wed, Apr 22, 2026, 8:03 AM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

Subject: FINAL CONSOLIDATED NOTICE OF DEFICIENCIES AND NOTICE OF INTENT TO LITIGATE - Amanda Daylong and Asotin County (SAO Hotline H-25-795 / PRA Violations / Ultra Vires Acts)

Date: April 22, 2026

To: Amanda D. Daylong <ADaylong@nwtrialattorneys.com>

Cc: Chris Kemp <CKemp@asotincountywa.gov>; Public Disclosure <PDisclosure@asotincountywa.gov>; Alisha Shaw (SAO) <shawas@sao.wa.gov>; Nick Brown (AGO) <nick.brown@atg.wa.gov>; Intake <intake@wsba.org>; [Standard Media/Oversight Distribution List]

Ms. Daylong and Mr. Kemp,

This correspondence serves as a final consolidated record of the legal and procedural deficiencies attributable to Asotin County and its deputized counsel, Amanda Daylong. Despite multiple notices and expired deadlines (April 5, April 16, and April 18, 2026), the County has failed to cure these violations.

As of this writing, the County's strategy of silence and extra-record document production confirms bad faith. This email summarizes the current state of non-compliance and serves as the final notice before the filing of additional actions in Columbia County Superior Court and the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Washington.

I. The Core Unlawful Scheme: Laundering Public Funds for Judge Burns' Defense

The documentary record—including documents produced by Ms. Daylong on April 21, 2026, outside the PRA process—conclusively establishes the following scheme:

1. Insurance Excluded PRA Coverage: On July 3, 2025, WCRG/Clear Risk Solutions issued a Disclaimer Letter stating coverage was not afforded for Public Records Act (PRA) claims.
2. County Hired Private Counsel Anyway: On July 10, 2025, Asotin County entered into a Fee Agreement with Floyd, Pflueger, Kearns, Nedderman & Gress, P.S. (Daylong's firm) at \$325/hour for "Public Records Act Litigation and Consulting, Switzer v. Asotin County, et al."
3. The Legal Fiction Appointment: On July 21, 2025, Prosecutor Curtis Liedkie signed a Special Deputy Prosecuting Attorney Appointment for Ms. Daylong for the purpose of representing Asotin County in a lawsuit that did not exist (Switzer v. Asotin County, et al. was never filed).
4. The Actual Representation: Ms. Daylong substituted for Curtis Liedkie as counsel for Judge Brooke Burns in Switzer v. Hon. Brooke Burns (No. 104080-6), a personal capacity First Amendment action.

Conclusion: The County manufactured the "Special Deputy" appointment to route taxpayer funds through the Prosecutor's budget to pay for Judge Burns' private defense—a purpose for which insurance coverage was expressly denied. This constitutes misuse of public funds under RCW 42.20.010.

II. Specific Deficiencies of Amanda Daylong and Asotin County

The following is a complete list of outstanding deficiencies as of April 22, 2026.

A. Public Records Act (PRA) Violations (RCW 42.56)

PRA Request Deficiency / Violation Legal Authority

PDR 25-23 Withheld Email: Email withheld in entirety under RCW 5.60.060(2)(a). No lawful exemption log provided. The one-line description fails to explain how privilege applies or confirm segregable portions were considered. RCW 42.56.210(3); *Sanders v. State*

PDR 26-01 Unlawful Scanning Fee: County charged \$10.20 for scanning electronic records, a fee prohibited for born-digital records. Deficient Log: Redactions performed by Ms. Daylong (conflicted counsel) are accompanied by a spreadsheet lacking the required specific explanation. RCW 42.56.120(2); RCW 42.56.210(3)

PDR 26-10 Unreasonable Timeline & Withholding: The County's estimate of 93 days (June 8, 2026) for electronic records violates the "prompt" response requirement. The records remain wholly unproduced and no proper exemption log has been provided. RCW 42.56.520

Extra-Record Production Concealment: Ms. Daylong produced the WCRG Insurance Disclaimer and Memorandum of Coverage outside the PRA process on April 21, 2026. These documents were responsive to PDR 26-01 and were willfully withheld from the official production. RCW 42.56.550(4) (Bad Faith Penalty)

B. Misuse of Public Funds and Ultra Vires Acts

Actor Deficiency / Violation Legal Authority

Amanda Daylong Ultra Vires Threat: March 23, 2026 letter threatening a "defamation" lawsuit against a whistleblower. This act is outside the scope of the Special Deputy Appointment (limited to PRA litigation) and constitutes a misuse of county resources and intimidation. RCW 42.20.010; RCW 4.24.510 (Anti-SLAPP)

Asotin County False Statements to SAO: December 16, 2025 email to State Auditor claiming "No funds have been expended" and "Coverage was provided under insurance." These statements are materially false based on the July 2025 Fee Agreement and Insurance Disclaimer. RCW 9A.76.175 (False Statement to Public Servant)

Curtis Liedkie / Lisa Webber Unauthorized Practice / Private Practice: Prosecutor Liedkie and Coroner Webber (statutorily barred from law practice) represented Judge Burns in a personal capacity suit before the Supreme Court. RCW 36.27.060; RCW 36.24.170; RCW 2.48.200

C. First Amendment Retaliation (Sheriff's Office)

Actor Deficiency / Violation Legal Authority

Sheriff Hilderbrand / Undersheriff Richards Viewpoint Discrimination: Disabling Facebook comments on official county pages immediately after I reported potential criminal conduct by Liedkie and Webber. The temporary restoration of comments does not cure the retaliatory intent. *Lindke v. Freed*, 601 U.S. 187 (2024); First Amendment

D. Open Public Meetings Act (OPMA) Violation

Actor Deficiency / Violation Legal Authority

Board of Commissioners Refusal to Hold Hearing: My December 16, 2025 formal complaint regarding the misuse of public funds has never been placed on a public meeting agenda. RCW 42.30 (OPMA)

III. The Significance of the April 21, 2026 Production

On April 21, 2026, Ms. Daylong forwarded the WCRG Disclaimer Letter and Memorandum of Coverage. This action confirms two critical facts:

1. PRA Violation: Asotin County possessed these responsive public records and failed to produce them in response to PDR 26-01. This is a per se violation of the PRA and evidence of bad faith concealment.
2. Admission of the Scheme: The Disclaimer Letter proves the County knew PRA matters were excluded from insurance coverage as of July 3, 2025. The subsequent Fee Agreement (July 10) and Special Deputy Appointment (July 21) were deliberate acts to circumvent the insurance exclusion using taxpayer money.

IV. Procedural Status in Columbia County Superior Court

As you are aware, the PRA Complaint was filed in Columbia County Superior Court. Because Judge Brooke Burns is the sole elected Superior Court Judge for Columbia County and is a central figure in the underlying facts of this dispute, she is statutorily disqualified under CJC Rule 2.11(A).

The Court has appointed the Honorable Roger S. Sandberg (Whitman County) as a visiting judge to review the Fee Waiver Motion (GR 34). On April 21, 2026, I filed a Notice of Disqualification (Affidavit of Prejudice) against Judge Sandberg pursuant to RCW 4.12.040 and RCW 4.12.050. This filing is a statutory right exercised prior to any discretionary ruling and is not a finding of actual bias.

Once the disqualification is processed and a new judge is assigned, the Fee Waiver Motion will be adjudicated, and the Complaint will be formally docketed for service.

V. Notice of Intent and Final Demands

The deadlines of April 5, April 16, and April 18, 2026, have passed without a legally sufficient response. The County's silence is noted and will be treated as a waiver of defenses and an admission of liability.

I will be proceeding with the following actions:

1. Columbia County Superior Court: Upon acceptance of the filing and resolution of the judicial assignment, this PRA lawsuit will proceed seeking penalties (up to \$100/day per violation), attorney fees, and an order compelling compliance with all outstanding demands.
2. U.S. District Court (Eastern District of Washington): Amendment of the pending § 1983 and RICO complaint to include the additional First Amendment retaliation by the Sheriff's Office and the ultra vires defamation threat as predicate acts.

Final Opportunity to Mitigate Damages:

To avoid the immediate filing of supplemental pleadings and the pursuit of maximum statutory penalties, the County must, by 5:00 PM PST on April 24, 2026:

1. Produce the full, unredacted PDR 25-23 email (or a properly redacted version with a detailed, lawful exemption log explaining any redactions).
2. Issue a refund check for \$10.20 payable to Corey Switzer for the unlawful scanning fee associated with PDR 26-01.
3. Provide full electronic production of all responsive records for PDR 26-10, with a proper exemption log for any withheld or redacted content.

4. Provide written confirmation that my December 16, 2025 formal complaint regarding the misuse of public funds will be placed on the agenda of the next public meeting of the Asotin County Board of Commissioners, with remote participation permitted.
5. Issue a written retraction of the March 23, 2026 defamation threat, confirming that no public funds will be used to pursue any defamation action against me.

Failure to meet this final deadline will result in the immediate filing of all available motions and complaints, and I will seek the maximum penalties available under law.

Respectfully,

Corey Michael Switzer
264 Kernodle Rd
Gibsonville, NC 27249
coreyswitzer@gmail.com
(218) 461-9868

This communication is a public record. Retaliatory action against a whistleblower violates public policy and may constitute obstruction of justice.

On Tue, Apr 21, 2026, 8:21 PM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

In layman's terms...

Curtis Liedkie and Lisa Webber represented Judge Brooke Burns before the Washington State Supreme Court in May of 2025.

At some point, likely after I filed a grievance against Curtis Liedkie and Lisa Webber with the Washington State Bar, and requested that Public Document between two elected officials they decided that their insurance policy would cover her writ of Mandamus. Not her Public Documents Requests.

To do so, they Deputized Daylong using county resources under the false pretense of a PDR request, my PDR request 25-23, requesting that email conversation Burns had asking Liedkie and Webber for representation.

Instead, Daylong represented Judge Brooke Burns after Liedkie withdrew before the Washington State Supreme Court.

Under the deputization of Daylong for and payment of Daylong for PDR request by the county, (remember, explicitly prohibited by their insurance,) Daylong used county resources to defend the Judge AND Prosecutors Office by Deputization, an action prohibited by law in a State action against a Superior Court Judge for a civil rights violation.

Stacey Harmon happened to lie to the State Auditors Office to cover it up. She resigned two weeks later.

That's why Daylong took a brave step towards threatening me with defamation.

No.

This corruption is now exposed and I intend to follow this to it's conclusion.

On Tue, Apr 21, 2026, 7:48 PM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

Subject: APRIL RICO CORRESPONDENCE – Daylong's Production of Withheld Insurance Documents Confirms PRA Violations and Laundering of Public Funds; Columbia County Filing Update

Date: April 21, 2026

This email serves as an update to the April 17, 2026 FORMAL REFERRAL and the April 21, 2026 SUPPLEMENT regarding Blake Richards' lawsuit against SB 5974. It documents a significant development: Amanda Daylong's extra-record production of insurance documents that Asotin County willfully withheld from my Public Records Act requests—documents that confirm the County's insurance excludes all PRA coverage and that taxpayer money was used to fund a defense the insurer refused to cover.

I. Daylong's Extra-Record Production of Withheld Insurance Documents

On April 21, 2026, Amanda Daylong forwarded to me, outside the Public Records Act process, three documents that the County failed to produce in response to previously redacted PDR 26-01:

1. Clear Risk Solutions' July 3, 2025 Reservation of Rights letter (Claim W1756);
2. The full 159-page Memorandum of Coverage between Asotin County and Washington Counties Risk Group; and
3. Clear Risk Solutions' July 3, 2025 Disclaimer letter expressly denying coverage for PRA claims.

These documents are indisputably public records under RCW 42.56. They are responsive to my pending requests. They were not listed on any exemption log. The County's failure to disclose them through the PRA process constitutes a per se violation of RCW 42.56.210(3).

Daylong's voluntary production of these documents outside the PRA process does not cure the violation. It confirms that the County possessed responsive records it willfully withheld. I am preserving these documents and will supplement my pending PRA complaint to include this additional violation as evidence of bad faith warranting maximum penalties under RCW 42.56.550(4).

II. The Insurance Documents Confirm the Laundering Scheme

The newly produced documents confirm what I have alleged from the outset: Asotin County's insurance policy excludes all PRA claims, fines, penalties, and attorney fees. Exclusion 14 of the Wrongful Act Liability Coverage Part states unequivocally that coverage does not apply to "any Claims, fines, or penalties, including attorney fees arising out of the Washington Public Records Act, Open Public Meetings Act, or any other similar act or law."

The timeline is dispositive:

- July 3, 2025: WCRG issues two letters. The Disclaimer letter states coverage is "not afforded" for PRA claims. The Reservation of Rights letter states coverage is subject to exclusions and reserves all rights.
- July 8, 2025: Curtis Liedkie withdraws as counsel for Judge Brooke Burns in *Switzer v. Hon. Brooke Burns* (No. 104080-6).
- July 10, 2025: Asotin County enters into a fee agreement with Daylong's firm at \$325/hour for "Public Records Act Litigation and Consulting."
- July 21, 2025: Liedkie signs a Special Deputy appointment naming Daylong "for the purpose of representing Asotin County in Public Records Act Litigation and Consulting, *Switzer v. Asotin County, et al.*"—a case that did not exist.

The sequence is clear. The County learned on July 3 that insurance would not cover PRA matters. Within weeks, it manufactured a Special Deputy appointment to funnel public funds through the prosecutor's budget to pay private counsel for a defense the insurer refused to cover. The appointment was a transparent artifice to launder taxpayer money.

Despite this, on December 31, 2025, the County told the State Auditor's Office: "Coverage was provided under our insurance policy and assigned legal counsel." That statement was false when made. The County afforded outside Deputized counsel, not for a PRA request but for representing Judge Brooke Burns.

III. The Two Attachments That Prove the Laundering

Two documents, standing alone, establish the scheme:

1. July 10, 2025 Fee Agreement – Asotin County agrees to pay Daylong's firm \$325/hour for "Public Records Act Litigation and Consulting, *Switzer v. Asotin County, et al.*" This is a direct commitment of public funds for a purpose insurance refused to cover.
2. July 21, 2025 Special Deputy Prosecuting Attorney Appointment – Liedkie appoints Daylong "for the purpose of representing Asotin County in Public Records Act Litigation and Consulting, *Switzer v. Asotin County, et al.*" No such case existed. The appointment was a legal fiction designed to make Daylong's work appear to be a function of the prosecutor's office, allowing the County to pay her from the prosecutor's budget for a Public Documents Requests without specific legislative authorization to represent Judge Burns before the Washington State Supreme Court.

These two documents—read together with the WCRG Disclaimer letter denying PRA coverage—prove that the County knowingly used public funds for a purpose insurance excluded, then concealed that fact from the SAO.

IV. The False Statements to the State Auditor – Updated Table

The County's December 16, 2025 representations to the SAO were materially false:

County's Statement to SAO Truth (from County's Own Documents)
 "No funds have been expended for this purpose." July 10, 2025 fee agreement obligates County to pay \$325/hour.

"The County did not hire and pay a private law firm." Fee agreement and Special Deputy appointment prove the County did.
"Coverage was provided under our insurance policy and assigned legal counsel."
WCRG letters (July 3, 2025) show PRA coverage was denied and excluded.
"Mr. Liedkie never filed 'Notice of Appearance'..." July 8, 2025 substitution notice shows Liedkie withdrew as counsel for Judge Burns. Daylong also admits this, despite concealing her deputization.

These false statements materially misled the SAO and were part of a deliberate strategy to shield the misuse of public funds from scrutiny.

This is exacerbated by Daylongs reliance upon an appellate review of Neil, in which addresses a public documents request and NOT a Civil Writ of Mandamus against a State Officer.

V. Columbia County PRA Filing – Procedural Status

On April 20, 2026, I electronically filed a Public Records Act complaint against Asotin County in Columbia County Superior Court (Envelope No. 784957) It was closed and I needed to file a fee waiver motion under GR 34.

The fee waiver motion was initially referred to the sole Superior Court judge for the Asotin-Garfield-Columbia judicial district—the Honorable Brooke Burns. Because Judge Burns is the subject of the underlying PRA request and is implicated in the factual allegations giving rise to this dispute, she is statutorily disqualified from ruling on any matter in this case under CJC Rule 2.11(A). Her recusal was automatic and proper.

The Court has since assigned visiting judge Roger S. Sandberg of Whitman County to review the fee waiver motion. As of this writing, no discretionary ruling has been issued, and the Complaint awaits acceptance for filing pending resolution of the fee waiver. This is a routine procedural step, and I have no reason to believe the delay reflects anything other than the ordinary time required to secure a visiting judge for a matter involving a judicial conflict.

I have filed a Notice of Disqualification (Affidavit of Prejudice) against Judge Sandberg pursuant to RCW 4.12.040 and RCW 4.12.050. This filing is a statutory right, not an accusation of actual bias. It simply preserves my ability to request a different neutral judicial officer. A copy of the notice has been provided to counsel for the County.

Once the fee waiver order is signed and a case number is assigned, I will refile the Complaint and address service of process.

VI. Blake Richards' Lawsuit Against SB 5974

As documented in my April 21, 2026 SUPPLEMENT, Undersheriff Blake Richards—a candidate for Asotin County Sheriff—has filed a lawsuit challenging SB 5974, the newly enacted sheriff standards law. Richards seeks to block the very accountability mechanisms that could hold him responsible for his documented misconduct:

silencing a citizen's report of potential corruption by disabling Facebook comments, and failing to fulfill his statutory duty under RCW 36.28.011 to investigate or refer that report.

Richards' lawsuit is not a principled stand for local control. It is the latest maneuver in a coordinated scheme to avoid accountability. His conduct is documented in WSCJTC Case Nos. 2026-0000213 and I shall be CERTAIN to bring it up the moment Undersheriff Richards gets his certification.

VII. Outstanding PRA Violations – No Cure

As of this writing, the County has still not:

- Produced the PDR 25-23 email withheld in its entirety, with a lawful exemption log;
- Provided a proper exemption log for PDR 26-01 redactions;
- Produced PDR 26-10 records or provided a reasonable timeline;
- Refunded the unlawful \$10.20 scanning fee;
- Scheduled my December 16, 2025 formal complaint for a public hearing.

The deadlines set in my April 13 and April 17 correspondence have passed without a legally sufficient response. The County's silence is noted and will be treated as a waiver of defenses and an admission of liability in all pending and forthcoming legal actions. I have repeatedly given you adequate notice.

VIII. Conclusion

The insurance documents produced by Daylong confirm what the record already showed: no insurance coverage for PRA defense, taxpayer money funding that defense, and false statements to the State Auditor to conceal both. The County's own documents break the cover-up.

The two attachments that most clearly demonstrate the laundering of public funds are the July 10, 2025 Fee Agreement and the July 21, 2025 Special Deputy Prosecuting Attorney Appointment. Read together with the WCRG Disclaimer letter denying PRA coverage, they establish that the County knowingly used taxpayer money for a purpose insurance excluded, then lied to the SAO about it.

The procedural posture in Columbia County—a fee waiver motion awaiting review by a visiting judge following a proper judicial recusal—is not evidence of corruption. It is the system working as designed to route a conflicted matter to a neutral decision-maker. I am confident the fee waiver will be adjudicated fairly once the procedural steps are complete.

I will continue to document and preserve all evidence for my pending federal civil rights and RICO complaint, and for the PRA action once the fee waiver is granted and the case is docketed.

The record is complete. The cover-up is exposed. The process continues.

Respectfully,

Corey Michael Switzer
264 Kernodle Rd
Gibsonville, NC 27249
coreyswitzer@gmail.com
(218) 461-9868

This communication is a public record. Retaliatory action against a whistleblower violates public policy and may constitute obstruction of justice.

Attachments (available upon request):

- Exhibit F: July 10, 2025 Fee Agreement (showing \$325/hour commitment of public funds)
- Exhibit G: July 21, 2025 Special Deputy Prosecuting Attorney Appointment (showing laundering mechanism)
- WCRG Disclaimer Letter (July 3, 2025) (showing PRA coverage denied)
- Notice of Disqualification (filed April 21, 2026)

1. Exhibit F – July 10, 2025 Fee Agreement
 - Shows the County committed public funds (\$325/hour) for "Public Records Act Litigation and Consulting."
 - Proves expenditure of taxpayer money.
2. Exhibit G – July 21, 2025 Special Deputy Prosecuting Attorney Appointment
 - Shows the mechanism: Liedkie deputized Daylong for a case that didn't exist to route the payment through the prosecutor's budget.
 - Proves the laundering vehicle.

These two documents, standing alone, establish the scheme. The WCRG Disclaimer letter provides the motive (insurance wouldn't cover it), but the Fee Agreement and Special Deputy Appointment are the smoking guns.

On Tue, Apr 21, 2026, 7:09 PM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

To: Amanda Daylong <ADaylong@nwtrialattorneys.com>
Cc: Alisha Shaw (SAO) <shawa@sao.wa.gov>, Public Disclosure <PDisclosure@asotincountywa.gov>
Subject: Re: Formal Notice: Misuse of Public Funds – Acknowledgment of Receipt and Notice of PRA Violation

Ms. Daylong:

I acknowledge receipt of your April 21, 2026 email forwarding correspondence from Clear Risk Solutions, including the Reservation of Rights letter, the Memorandum of Coverage, and the Disclaimer letter regarding Claim No. W1756.

These documents are public records under RCW 42.56. They are responsive to my pending Public Records Act requests, PDR 26-01 unredacted and sent via email. They were not produced in response to those requests, nor were they listed on any exemption log.

Your voluntary production of these documents outside the PRA process does not cure the County's ongoing PRA violations. It confirms that the County possessed

responsive records that it failed to disclose timely, unredacted, and without unlawful fees assessed for their production.

I am preserving these documents and will supplement my pending PRA complaint in Columbia County Superior Court to include this additional violation.

Nothing in this email waives any rights or remedies available under the PRA.

Please CC the public documents request in response to these records, as they are responsive to PDR26-10.

My original demands for production of the unredacted PDR25-23 and unredacted PDR26-10 remain unresolved in addition to the timely hearing before the Asotin County Commissioners regarding the unlawful expenditures of public funds and resources for the Asotin County Prosecutor Curtis Liedkie, and Asotin County Coroner Lisa Webber, the expenditures of taxpayers resources for the unlawful Representation of Judge Brooke Burns.

Respectfully,

Corey Michael Switzer

On Tue, Apr 21, 2026, 6:56 PM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

To: Amanda Daylong <adaylong@nwtrialattorneys.com>
Cc: Chris Kemp <CKemp@asotincountywa.gov>, Public Disclosure <PDisclosure@asotincountywa.gov>
Subject: Corey Michael Switzer v. Asotin County – Procedural Status and Disqualification Process

Dear Ms. Daylong:

Thank you for your email. I am writing to clarify the procedural posture of this matter and to address your question regarding service of process.

I. Current Procedural Posture

The Public Records Act complaint was submitted for electronic filing in Columbia County Superior Court on April 20, 2026, along with a Motion and Declaration for Waiver of Civil Fees and Surcharges under GR 34. The Court has not yet accepted the filing. The fee waiver motion remains pending before the Honorable Roger S. Sandberg, who was assigned as a visiting judge. As of this writing, no discretionary ruling has been made on the fee waiver motion, and no case number has been assigned.

Formal service of process cannot be completed until the Complaint is accepted for filing and a case number is assigned. Once that occurs, I will address service in accordance with the Rules.

II. Distinction Between Disqualification at the Fee Waiver Stage and After a Ruling

Under Washington law, the method for disqualifying a judge depends on the stage of the proceeding.

A. Before a Discretionary Ruling: Notice of Disqualification (Affidavit of Prejudice)

RCW 4.12.050 provides a party with the right to disqualify a judge as a matter of right by filing a notice of disqualification—historically referred to as an affidavit of prejudice—before the judge has made any discretionary ruling. The statute is mandatory: "Notice of disqualification must be filed and called to the attention of the judge before the judge has made any discretionary ruling in the case". Once a proper and timely notice of disqualification is filed, the judge is divested of authority to hear the matter, and the presiding judge must transfer the action to another department or call in a visiting judge. This is a low-bar, procedural mechanism; the party need not prove actual bias, only file the notice before a discretionary ruling is made.

B. After a Discretionary Ruling: Motion to Recuse Under CJC 2.11(A)

If a discretionary ruling has already been made—for example, if the fee waiver order is signed before the notice of disqualification is filed—the statutory right under RCW 4.12.050 is lost. At that point, the party must move for recusal under CJC 2.11(A), which requires a showing that "the judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned". This is a higher bar; the moving party must present evidence of actual bias or circumstances creating an appearance of impropriety, and the judge has discretion to deny the motion. This is a far more burdensome and time-consuming process for all involved.

The distinction is significant. The fee waiver motion itself constitutes a discretionary ruling for purposes of RCW 4.12.050. See, e.g., *In re Estate of Black*, 116 Wn. App. 492, 66 P.3d 678 (2003) (affidavit of prejudice must be called to the attention of the judge before he or she makes a discretionary ruling). Therefore, to preserve the lower-bar, mandatory disqualification mechanism, the notice of disqualification must be filed before the fee waiver order is signed.

III. Next Steps

I have requested that the clerk provide the case number as soon as it is assigned so that I may file the notice of disqualification before any discretionary ruling is made. If the fee waiver order is signed before I have an opportunity to file the notice, I will have lost the statutory right under RCW 4.12.050 and will be required to pursue recusal under CJC 2.11(A)—a process I would prefer to avoid in the interest of judicial economy.

Once the fee waiver order is signed and the case number is assigned, I will refile the Complaint into the new case number and promptly address service of process. I will keep you apprised of developments.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Respectfully,

Corey Michael Switzer
264 Kernodle Rd
Gibsonville, NC 27249
(218) 461-9868

coreyswitzer@gmail.com

Pro Se Plaintiff

On Tue, Apr 21, 2026, 6:42 PM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

To: Amanda Daylong <ADaylong@nwtrialattorneys.com>

Cc: Chris Kemp <CKemp@asotincountywa.gov>, Public Disclosure <PDisclosure@asotincountywa.gov>

Subject: Corey Michael Switzer v. Asotin County – Notice of Intent to File Affidavit of Prejudice (RCW 4.12.050)

Dear Ms. Daylong:

I am writing to provide you with formal notice of my intent to file a Notice of Disqualification (Affidavit of Prejudice) against the Honorable Roger S. Sandberg pursuant to RCW 4.12.040 and RCW 4.12.050.

As you are aware, my Public Records Act complaint against Asotin County was submitted for filing in Columbia County Superior Court on April 20, 2026, along with a fee waiver motion under GR 34. The Court has assigned Judge Sandberg as a visiting judge to review the fee waiver motion.

Under RCW 4.12.050, a party has the right to file an affidavit of prejudice against an assigned judge before any discretionary ruling is made. I intend to exercise that statutory right immediately upon receiving a case number and before the fee waiver order is entered.

I am providing this notice as a courtesy and to ensure full transparency in this litigation. Once the case number is assigned and the affidavit is filed, I will provide you with a conformed copy.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Respectfully,

Corey Michael Switzer
264 Kernodle Rd
Gibsonville, NC 27249
(218) 461-9868
coreyswitzer@gmail.com
Pro Se Plaintiff

Attached: Motion for Disqualification

On Tue, Apr 21, 2026, 1:00 PM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

Subject: SUPPLEMENT TO FORMAL REFERRAL: Blake Richards Sues to Block Accountability Law (SAO Hotline #25-795 & WSCJTC Nos. 2026-0000213)

Date: April 21, 2026

To: Alisha Shaw (SAO) <shaw@sa.wa.gov>; Nick Brown (Attorney General) <nick.brown@atg.wa.gov>

Dear Investigator Shaw and Attorney General Brown,

I am writing to supplement my formal referral dated April 17, 2026, regarding the multi-agency conspiracy to obstruct justice and misuse public funds in Asotin County. A new development has emerged that directly implicates one of the key actors in that scheme and provides further evidence of his unfitness for public office.

I. Blake Richards Files Lawsuit to Block Accountability Law (SB 5974)

On April 20, 2026, Blake Richards—currently serving as Undersheriff of Asotin County and a candidate for Asotin County Sheriff—filed a lawsuit challenging Washington's newly enacted sheriff standards law, Senate Bill 5974. The law, signed earlier this month by Governor Bob Ferguson, establishes baseline qualifications for sheriffs, including a requirement of five years of full-time law enforcement experience, a minimum age of 25, and a mandatory background check. Crucially, it also ties a sheriff's ability to remain in office to the possession of a valid peace officer certification, and it provides a mechanism for the Criminal Justice Training Commission to remove a sheriff who loses that certification.

Richards' lawsuit, led by the Ard Law Group with support from the Washington State Sheriffs' Association, argues that the law is unconstitutional and limits voter choice. He claims that the law's requirement of five consecutive years of uninterrupted, full-time law enforcement experience creates a barrier not applied to other elected positions. He also raises concerns about a provision allowing a state-appointed board to remove elected sheriffs and app

From: "Litts, Michael J. (ATG)" <michael.litts@atg.wa.gov>

To: "ATG MI Service Documents" <ServiceATG@atg.wa.gov>, "ATG MI LAL Oly EF" <LALOLyEF@ATG.WA.GOV>

Subject: RE: 104080-6 - Corey Michael Switzer v. Hon. Brooke Burns

Date: Tue, 08 Jul 2025 21:37:49 -0000

Importance: Normal

Good afternoon,

This is not an LAL thing, or an anybody else in the AGO thing. Here's what I received from one of our Section Chiefs:

"this is not for the AGO. We do not represent the Judge in Asotin County. This individual will need to serve probably the Asotin County prosecutor's office, whomever represents judges on behalf of their superior court.

Please let ATG MI Service Doc know that we've checked the WSSC docket, and there are no state agencies named in this case."

FWIW, the Asotin County Prosecutor was on the service list, so I think the petitioner got it where it needed to go, they just added us unnecessarily.

Thank you!
Mike

Michael Litts | Legal Assistant 1
Office of the Attorney General
Licensing and Administrative Law
PO Box 40110, Olympia, WA 98504

From: ATG MI Service Documents <ServiceATG@atg.wa.gov>
Sent: Monday, July 7, 2025 5:29 PM
To: ATG MI LAL Oly EF <LALOLyEF@ATG.WA.GOV>
Cc: ATG MI Service Documents <ServiceATG@atg.wa.gov>
Subject: FW: 104080-6 - Corey Michael Switzer v. Hon. Brooke Burns

LAL – for Commission on Judicial Conduct? Pls confirm, thx LD

From: ATG MI Service Documents <ServiceATG@atg.wa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 7:47 AM
To: ATG DL Solicitor General Support <SGsupport@ATG.WA.GOV>
Cc: ATG MI Service Documents <ServiceATG@atg.wa.gov>
Subject: FW: 104080-6 - Corey Michael Switzer v. Hon. Brooke Burns

SGO – does this belong to your division? Thanks-

Division Responsibility: It is the responsibility of the receiving division to provide an acknowledgment or response to the sender as soon as possible. This email address is a portal for service on the AG's office. Staff monitoring this email box are not authorized to acknowledge service.

Jamie Ferris | Public Records Officer | she/her
Office of the Attorney General
Public Records and Constituent Services
PO Box 40100, Olympia WA 98504
360-753-0543 | jamie.ferris@atg.wa.gov

From: Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 5:06 AM
To: ATG MI Service Documents <ServiceATG@atg.wa.gov>
Subject: Re: 104080-6 - Corey Michael Switzer v. Hon. Brooke Burns

[EXTERNAL]

Subject: SERVICE OF PROCESS: Switzer v. Burns - Case No. 104080-6

The Office of the Attorney General of Washington:

Pursuant to your published policy (<https://www.atg.wa.gov/contact-us>), I hereby serve the following documents via email to serviceATG@atg.wa.gov for the action against state official Judge Brooke Burns:

1. Summons to Hon. Judge Brooke Burns
2. Petition for Writ of Mandamus and Declaratory Relief (With Exhibits A-D)

****Case Details**:**

- Supreme Court Case No.: 104080-6
- Petitioner: Corey Michael Switzer
- Respondent: Hon. Brooke Burns, Asotin County Superior Court

Per your policy, I request formal acknowledgment of receipt by an Assistant Attorney General.

Respectfully,
Corey Michael Switzer
264 Kernodle Rd, Gibsonville, NC 27249
coreyswitzer@gmail.com | (218)-461-9868

Attachments:

- Summons.pdf (Burns)
- Petition_Mandamus_Burns.pdf (With Exhibits)

From: "Bancroft, Jennifer K. (ATG)" <jennifer.bancroft@atg.wa.gov>

To: "Petersen, Lisa M (ATG)" <lisa.petersen@atg.wa.gov>

Cc: "Litts, Michael J. (ATG)" <michael.litts@atg.wa.gov>

Subject: RE: 104080-6 - Corey Michael Switzer v. Hon. Brooke Burns

Date: Tue, 08 Jul 2025 17:43:46 -0000

Importance: Normal

I've pulled up the Supreme Court documents in this case and we can discuss. I believe this service email is in response to the court's latest letter order dated 07/01/25 ordering proof of personal service on the parties by 07/31/25. The other party listed in the letter order is the Asotin County Prosecutor, so they are already involved.

Stay tuned Mike! 😊

Jen

From: Petersen, Lisa M (ATG) <lisa.petersen@atg.wa.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 9:19 AM

To: Litts, Michael J. (ATG) <michael.litts@atg.wa.gov>; Bancroft, Jennifer K. (ATG) <jennifer.bancroft@atg.wa.gov>

Subject: RE: 104080-6 - Corey Michael Switzer v. Hon. Brooke Burns

So, I'm thinking this needs to go to the Asotin County Prosecutor. It doesn't name the CJC or address that any action has been taken against this Judge through the CJC. But let me think on this. Jen, anything else in the court record that you see that would help inform us?

From: Litts, Michael J. (ATG) <michael.litts@atg.wa.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 7:43 AM

To: Petersen, Lisa M (ATG) <lisa.petersen@atg.wa.gov>; Bancroft, Jennifer K. (ATG) <jennifer.bancroft@atg.wa.gov>

Subject: FW: 104080-6 - Corey Michael Switzer v. Hon. Brooke Burns

Good morning,

Is this an LAL thing? This petitioner is a North Carolina resident who is suing an Asotin county superior court judge because she blocked him on facebook.

This is the darkest timeline.

Mike

From: ATG MI Service Documents <ServiceATG@atg.wa.gov>

Sent: Monday, July 7, 2025 5:29 PM

To: ATG MI LAL Oly EF <LALOLyEF@ATG.WA.GOV>

Cc: ATG MI Service Documents <ServiceATG@atg.wa.gov>

Subject: FW: 104080-6 - Corey Michael Switzer v. Hon. Brooke Burns

LAL – for Commission on Judicial Conduct? Pls confirm, thx LD

From: ATG MI Service Documents <ServiceATG@atg.wa.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 7:47 AM

To: ATG DL Solicitor General Support <SGsupport@ATG.WA.GOV>

Cc: ATG MI Service Documents <ServiceATG@atg.wa.gov>

Subject: FW: 104080-6 - Corey Michael Switzer v. Hon. Brooke Burns

SGO – does this belong to your division? Thanks-

Division Responsibility: It is the responsibility of the receiving division to provide an acknowledgment or response to the sender as soon as possible. This email address is a portal for service on the AG's office. Staff monitoring this email box are not authorized to acknowledge service.

Jamie Ferris | Public Records Officer | she/her
Office of the Attorney General
Public Records and Constituent Services
PO Box 40100, Olympia WA 98504
360-753-0543 | jamie.ferris@atg.wa.gov

From: Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 5:06 AM

To: ATG MI Service Documents <ServiceATG@atg.wa.gov>

Subject: Re: 104080-6 - Corey Michael Switzer v. Hon. Brooke Burns

[EXTERNAL]

Subject: SERVICE OF PROCESS: Switzer v. Burns - Case No. 104080-6

The Office of the Attorney General of Washington:

Pursuant to your published policy (<https://www.atg.wa.gov/contact-us>), I hereby serve the following documents via email to serviceATG@atg.wa.gov for the action against state official Judge Brooke Burns:

1. Summons to Hon. Judge Brooke Burns
2. Petition for Writ of Mandamus and Declaratory Relief (With Exhibits A-D)

****Case Details**:**

- Supreme Court Case No.: 104080-6
- Petitioner: Corey Michael Switzer
- Respondent: Hon. Brooke Burns, Asotin County Superior Court

Per your policy, I request formal acknowledgment of receipt by an Assistant Attorney General.

Respectfully,
Corey Michael Switzer
264 Kernodle Rd, Gibsonville, NC 27249
coreyswitzer@gmail.com | (218)-461-9868

Attachments:

- Summons.pdf (Burns)
- Petition_Mandamus_Burns.pdf (With Exhibits)

From: "Petersen, Lisa M (ATG)" <lisa.petersen@atg.wa.gov>

To: "Litts, Michael J. (ATG)" <michael.litts@atg.wa.gov>, "Bancroft, Jennifer K. (ATG)" <jennifer.bancroft@atg.wa.gov>

Subject: RE: 104080-6 - Corey Michael Switzer v. Hon. Brooke Burns

Date: Tue, 08 Jul 2025 21:32:39 -0000

Importance: Normal

Hi Mike, this is not for the AGO. We do not represent the Judge in Asotin County. This individual will need to serve probably the Asotin County prosecutor's office, whomever represents judges on behalf of their superior court.

Please let ATG MI Service Doc know that we've checked the WSSC docket, and there are no state agencies named in this case.

Thank you!!

From: Litts, Michael J. (ATG) <michael.litts@atg.wa.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 7:43 AM

To: Petersen, Lisa M (ATG) <lisa.petersen@atg.wa.gov>; Bancroft, Jennifer K. (ATG) <jennifer.bancroft@atg.wa.gov>

Subject: FW: 104080-6 - Corey Michael Switzer v. Hon. Brooke Burns

Good morning,

Is this an LAL thing? This petitioner is a North Carolina resident who is suing an Asotin county superior court judge because she blocked him on facebook.

This is the darkest timeline.

Mike

From: ATG MI Service Documents <ServiceATG@atg.wa.gov>

Sent: Monday, July 7, 2025 5:29 PM

To: ATG MI LAL Oly EF <LALOLyEF@ATG.WA.GOV>

Cc: ATG MI Service Documents <ServiceATG@atg.wa.gov>

Subject: FW: 104080-6 - Corey Michael Switzer v. Hon. Brooke Burns

LAL – for Commission on Judicial Conduct? Pls confirm, thx LD

From: ATG MI Service Documents <ServiceATG@atg.wa.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 7:47 AM

To: ATG DL Solicitor General Support <SGsupport@ATG.WA.GOV>

Cc: ATG MI Service Documents <ServiceATG@atg.wa.gov>

Subject: FW: 104080-6 - Corey Michael Switzer v. Hon. Brooke Burns

SGO – does this belong to your division? Thanks-

Division Responsibility: It is the responsibility of the receiving division to provide an acknowledgment or response to the sender as soon as possible. This email address is a portal for service on the AG's office. Staff monitoring this email box are not authorized to acknowledge service.

Jamie Ferris | Public Records Officer | she/her
Office of the Attorney General

Public Records and Constituent Services
PO Box 40100, Olympia WA 98504
360-753-0543 | jamie.ferris@atg.wa.gov

From: Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 5:06 AM
To: ATG MI Service Documents <ServiceATG@atg.wa.gov>
Subject: Re: 104080-6 - Corey Michael Switzer v. Hon. Brooke Burns

[EXTERNAL]

Subject: SERVICE OF PROCESS: Switzer v. Burns - Case No. 104080-6

The Office of the Attorney General of Washington:

Pursuant to your published policy (<https://www.atg.wa.gov/contact-us>), I hereby serve the following documents via email to serviceATG@atg.wa.gov for the action against state official Judge Brooke Burns:

1. Summons to Hon. Judge Brooke Burns
2. Petition for Writ of Mandamus and Declaratory Relief (With Exhibits A-D)

****Case Details**:**

- Supreme Court Case No.: 104080-6
- Petitioner: Corey Michael Switzer
- Respondent: Hon. Brooke Burns, Asotin County Superior Court

Per your policy, I request formal acknowledgment of receipt by an Assistant Attorney General.

Respectfully,
Corey Michael Switzer
264 Kernodle Rd, Gibsonville, NC 27249
coreyswitzer@gmail.com | (218)-461-9868

Attachments:

- Summons.pdf (Burns)
- Petition_Mandamus_Burns.pdf (With Exhibits)

From: "Petersen, Lisa M (ATG)" <lisa.petersen@atg.wa.gov>

To: "Reiko Callner" <rcallner@cjc.state.wa.us>

Subject: [atty-client privilege] FW: 104080-6 - Corey Michael Switzer v. Hon. Brooke Burns

Date: Tue, 08 Jul 2025 16:30:44 -0000

Importance: Normal

Attachments: -_1040806_-_Public_-_Brief_-_Petitioners_-_4-9-2025.pdf; Summons.pdf

Good morning, this came into our service email. Upon review, I believe this should go to the Asotin County Prosecutor, because it doesn't name any action that the CJC took and names the Judge. Do you agree?

Thank you for your time,

Lisa

From: Litts, Michael J. (ATG) <michael.litts@atg.wa.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 7:43 AM

To: Petersen, Lisa M (ATG) <lisa.petersen@atg.wa.gov>; Bancroft, Jennifer K. (ATG) <jennifer.bancroft@atg.wa.gov>

Subject: FW: 104080-6 - Corey Michael Switzer v. Hon. Brooke Burns

Good morning,

Is this an LAL thing? This petitioner is a North Carolina resident who is suing an Asotin county superior court judge because she blocked him on facebook.

This is the darkest timeline.

Mike

From: ATG MI Service Documents <ServiceATG@atg.wa.gov>

Sent: Monday, July 7, 2025 5:29 PM

To: ATG MI LAL Oly EF <LALOLyEF@ATG.WA.GOV>

Cc: ATG MI Service Documents <ServiceATG@atg.wa.gov>

Subject: FW: 104080-6 - Corey Michael Switzer v. Hon. Brooke Burns

LAL – for Commission on Judicial Conduct? Pls confirm, thx LD

From: ATG MI Service Documents <ServiceATG@atg.wa.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 7:47 AM

To: ATG DL Solicitor General Support <SGsupport@ATG.WA.GOV>

Cc: ATG MI Service Documents <ServiceATG@atg.wa.gov>

Subject: FW: 104080-6 - Corey Michael Switzer v. Hon. Brooke Burns

SGO – does this belong to your division? Thanks-

Division Responsibility: It is the responsibility of the receiving division to provide an acknowledgment or response to the sender as soon as possible. This email address is a portal for service on the AG's office. Staff monitoring this email box are not authorized to acknowledge service.

Jamie Ferris | Public Records Officer | she/her

Office of the Attorney General

Public Records and Constituent Services

PO Box 40100, Olympia WA 98504
360-753-0543 | jamie.ferris@atg.wa.gov

From: Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 5:06 AM
To: ATG MI Service Documents <ServiceATG@atg.wa.gov>
Subject: Re: 104080-6 - Corey Michael Switzer v. Hon. Brooke Burns

[EXTERNAL]

Subject: SERVICE OF PROCESS: Switzer v. Burns - Case No. 104080-6

The Office of the Attorney General of Washington:

Pursuant to your published policy (<https://www.atg.wa.gov/contact-us>), I hereby serve the following documents via email to serviceATG@atg.wa.gov for the action against state official Judge Brooke Burns:

1. Summons to Hon. Judge Brooke Burns
2. Petition for Writ of Mandamus and Declaratory Relief (With Exhibits A-D)

****Case Details**:**

- Supreme Court Case No.: 104080-6
- Petitioner: Corey Michael Switzer
- Respondent: Hon. Brooke Burns, Asotin County Superior Court

Per your policy, I request formal acknowledgment of receipt by an Assistant Attorney General.

Respectfully,
Corey Michael Switzer
264 Kernodle Rd, Gibsonville, NC 27249
coreyswitzer@gmail.com | (218)-461-9868

Attachments:

- Summons.pdf (Burns)
- Petition_Mandamus_Burns.pdf (With Exhibits)

IN THE WASHINGTON STATE SUPREME COURT

EN BANC

Case No.: [To Be Assigned]


Corey Michael Switzer,

Petitioner, Pro Se,

v.

The Honorable Brooke Burns, Judge of the Asotin County Superior Court,

Respondent.



PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS AND DECLARATORY RELIEF
JURISDICTION

This Court has original jurisdiction under RCW 2.04.010 and State ex rel. Evergreen Freedom Found. v. Washington State Supreme Court, 200 Wn.2d 342 (2022), which affirms authority over judicial officers for constitutional violations.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

1. Respondent's Social Media as a Public Forum:

- Respondent's Facebook profile (Exhibit D) identifies her as "Superior Court Judge" and posts campaign updates tied to official duties (e.g., advocating for judicial resources).
- On March 27, 2025, Petitioner posted a comment (Exhibit B) asking: "As a Judge, would you consider this an example of obstruction of justice?"
- On March 28, 2025, Respondent blocked Petitioner after follow-up inquiries, suppressing critical speech (Exhibit C).

LEGAL CLAIMS

1. First Amendment Violation (Viewpoint Discrimination):

- Under *Lindke v. Freed*, 601 U.S. 187 (2023), Respondent's Facebook constitutes state action due to her official role and use of state authority.
- Blocking Petitioner based on critical inquiry violates *Knight First Amendment Inst. v. Trump*, 928 F.3d 226 (2d Cir. 2019).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

1. Issue a Writ of Mandamus compelling Respondent to unblock Petitioner.
2. Declare Respondent's actions unconstitutional under the First Amendment.

ATTACHMENTS

- Exhibit A: Email from Mayor Dan Johnson (August 11, 2023).
- Exhibit B: Screenshot of March 27, 2025, Facebook comment.
- Exhibit C: Blocked post (March 28, 2025).
- Exhibit D: Respondent's Facebook profile.

VERIFICATION

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF GUILFORD

I, Corey Michael Switzer, declare under penalty of perjury that these facts are true.

Signed 

Corey Michael Switzer

Date 4/02/2025
April 2nd, 2025

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO before me this 2nd day of April, 2025.

Siera Owens

[Notary Public Name, Printed]

Siera Owens

[Notary Public Name, Signed]

Commission Expires: 5/19/2029

[Date] 4/02/2025

[Notary Seal]




EXHIBIT A

Email from Mayor Dan Johnson (August 11, 2023)

Annotation: "Mayor Johnson dismissed police misconduct claims, prompting Petitioner to seek judicial review. Respondent's subsequent censorship impeded transparency."

EXHIBIT B

Screenshot of March 27, 2025, Facebook Comment

Annotation: "Petitioner's inquiry about obstruction of justice (highlighted) on Respondent's official campaign post."

EXHIBIT C

Screenshot of Blocked Post (March 28, 2025)

Annotation: "Facebook's notification of removal, confirming Respondent's retaliatory block."

EXHIBIT D


Respondent's Facebook Profile

Annotation: "Respondent's profile lacks disclaimers and uses judicial title to solicit public support."

AFFIDAVIT OF AUTHENTICITY

I, Corey Switzer, certify under penalty of perjury that Exhibits A–D are true and unaltered copies.

Signed,


Corey Switzer
April 2, 2025

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO before me this 2nd day of April, 2025.

Siera Owens
[Notary Public Name, Printed]

Siera Owens
[Notary Public Name, Signed]

Commission Expires: 5/19/2029
[Date]





Exhibit A







Exhibit B






Exhibit C

facebook

Open app

Log in

Exhibit D



Re-Elect Brooke Burns Superior Court Judge

Mar 14 · 🌐

Thank you so much to the **Lewis Clark Valley Chamber of Commerce** for having Columbia County Prosecuting Attorney Dale Slack and me present the need for a second Superior Court Judge in our judicial circuit of Asotin, Garfield, and Columbia counties. We appreciate your willingness to have us. 🙏



👍 Kaitlyn Jones and 4 others

👍 5

💬 4

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON STATE BAR ASSOCIATION
OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL
DECLARATION OF COMPLAINT AGAINST JUDGE BROOKE BURNS

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

1. Engagement with Mayor Dan Johnson:

- On August 11, 2023, Mayor Johnson dismissed Petitioner's police misconduct allegations (Exhibit A).
- Respondent's subsequent blocking of Petitioner (March 28, 2025) obstructed judicial accountability.

2. Public Inquiry on Respondent's Facebook Page:

- On March 27, 2025, Petitioner questioned Respondent's impartiality via Facebook (Exhibit B).
- Respondent blocked Petitioner within 24 hours, confirming censorship (Exhibit C).

3. Respondent's Social Media Use:

- Respondent's Facebook profile lacks disclaimers and uses judicial title to solicit public support (Exhibit D).

LEGAL BASIS

1. CJC Rule 2.9(A): Ex parte communication by suppressing Petitioner's inquiry without due process.
2. CJC Rule 1.2: Undermining public confidence via retaliatory censorship.

REQUEST FOR RELIEF

1. Investigate under ELC 10.1.
2. Impose sanctions, including ethics training.

ATTACHMENTS


- Exhibit A: Email from Mayor Dan Johnson (August 11, 2023).
- Exhibit B: Screenshot of March 27, 2025, Facebook comment.
- Exhibit C: Screenshot of blocked post (March 28, 2025).
- Exhibit D: Respondent's Facebook profile.

VERIFICATION

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF GUILFORD

I, Corey Switzer, declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true.

Signed 

Corey Switzer

April 2nd, 2025

4/02/2025

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO before me this 2nd day of April, 2025.

Siera Owens


[Notary Public Name]

Siera Owens

Commission Expires:

[Date] 5/19/2029

[Notary Seal]



Benj M. Switzer
2640 Kennedy Rd
Sibsonville, NC 27249

CERTIFIED MAIL®



9589 0710 5270 2383 0634 19

Retail



RDC 99



98504

U.S. POSTAGE PAID
FCM LG ENV
REIDSVILLE, NC 27320
APR 02, 2025

\$6.89

S2322P500331-08

Washington State Supreme Court Clerk
P.O. Box 40929
Olympia, WA 98504

SUPREME COURT OF WASHINGTON

FOR)

COREY MICHAEL SWITZER,)

Plaintiff,)

No. 104080-6

v.)

HON JUDGE BROOKE BURNS,)

SUMMONS (20 days)

Defendant.)


TO THE DEFENDANT: A lawsuit has been started against you in the above entitled court by COREY MICHAEL SWITZER, plaintiff. Plaintiff's claim is stated in the written complaint, a copy of which is served upon you with this summons.

In order to defend against this lawsuit, you must respond to the complaint by stating your defense in writing, and by serving a copy upon the person signing this summons within 20 days after the service of this summons, excluding the day of service, or a default judgment may be entered against you without notice. A default judgment is one where plaintiff is entitled to what she or he asks for because you have not responded. If you serve a notice of appearance on the undersigned person, you are entitled to notice before a default judgment may be entered.

You may demand that the plaintiff file this lawsuit with the court. If you do so, the demand must be in writing and must be served upon the person signing this summons. Within 14 days after you serve the demand, the plaintiff must file this lawsuit with the court, or the service on you of this summons and complaint will be void.

If you wish to seek the advice of an attorney in this matter, you should do so promptly so that your written response, if any, may be served on time.

This summons is issued pursuant to rule 4 of the Superior Court Civil Rules of the State of Washington.

 (signed)
Corey Michael Switzer, Plaintiff

264 Kernodle Rd

Gibsonville NC, 27249

(218)-461-9868 (Cell phone)

July 2nd, 2025 (date)

From: "Krueger, Jessica (ATG)" </O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=17BFAC6376C04A3FA8B9CFC7E66AF46E-D2C3F228-CC>

To: "Corey Switzer" <coreyswitzer@gmail.com>

Subject: RE: Acknowledgement of Public Records Request - PRR-2026-0223

Date: Mon, 16 Mar 2026 16:40:58 -0000

Importance: Normal

Thank you for your email.

My apologies, here is the current link: <https://fortress.wa.gov/atg/formhandler/ago/PublicRecordsRequest.aspx>

Sincerely,

Jessica Krueger

Jessica Krueger | Public Records Officer
Public Records & Constituent Services
WA State Attorney General's Office

From: Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, March 16, 2026 8:58 AM

To: Krueger, Jessica (ATG) <jessica.krueger@atg.wa.gov>

Cc: ATG WWW Public Records Requests <PublicRecords@ATG.WA.GOV>

Subject: Re: Acknowledgement of Public Records Request - PRR-2026-0223

[EXTERNAL]

Also, Miss Krueger, the link you have provided for "Option #3", via Web Portal does not exist.

I have attached that page to this email for your convenience.

Respectfully,

Mr. Corey M Switzer

On Mon, Mar 16, 2026, 11:35 AM Krueger, Jessica <Jessica.Krueger@atg.wa.gov> wrote:

Dear Corey Switzer,

This correspondence is to acknowledge your public records request received in our office on March 13, 2026. We assigned the file number above to your request. Please reference that number on any future correspondence regarding this request. You requested the following:

Dear Mrs. Kemp,

I am writing in response to your March 13, 2026 correspondence regarding PDR #26-10. Your letter contains several material inaccuracies regarding my request and the County's obligations under the Washington Public Records Act (RCW 42.56). Please allow me to correct the record:

1. Mischaracterization of Requested Records

Your letter states: "We will research whether or not these records exist, and if they do, whether we are allowed to disclose the records."

Correction: My March 7, 2026 request sought records that demonstrably exist. As you are aware from PDR #26-01 (currently in production), the County has already identified and processed communications responsive to substantially similar requests. The individuals named (Judge Brooke Burns, Curtis Liedkie, Lisa Webber) are current County officials whose emails are presumptively public records under RCW 42.56.010(3). No "research" is needed to confirm their existence—only a reasonable search of the County's email systems.

2. Incorrect Fee Structure Cited

Your letter states: "the County is obliged to charge you \$0.15 per page for any copies we generate."

Correction: This statement is legally incorrect on multiple grounds:

First, RCW 42.56.120(2) establishes the following fee structure, which you have misstated:

Service Statutory Rate Your Statement

Photocopies (paper to paper) \$0.15/page ✓ Correctly cited

Scanning (paper to electronic) \$0.10/page Omits this rate entirely

Electronic upload (email/cloud) \$0.05 per 4 files Omits this rate entirely

Transmission \$0.10 per gigabyte Omits this rate entirely

Second, my request seeks emails and other electronic records that already exist in digital format. The \$0.15/page photocopy rate applies only to paper copies of paper records—not to electronic records delivered electronically.

Please provide to me the emails requested in electronic format delivered to my email.

Third, as I documented extensively in PDR #26-01 correspondence (February 20-23, 2026), the County cannot lawfully apply paper-copy rates to electronic records. I trust you will not repeat the errors that required multiple corrective emails in that matter.

3. Unlawful "Review and Redaction" Fees Implied

Your letter states: "Sometimes we need to review the records and black out some information that cannot be disclosed."

Correction: While review and redaction are necessary for exempt information, RCW 42.56.120(2) does not authorize agencies to charge requesters for staff time spent reviewing records or applying redactions. Your letter implies that such costs may be passed to requesters, which would violate the Act. I trust the County will absorb its own administrative costs as the statute requires.

4. Unreasonable Response Timeline

Your letter states: "You can expect a response by June 8, 2026."

Correction: RCW 42.56.520 requires agencies to respond within five business days by either: (a) providing the records; (b) acknowledging receipt and providing a reasonable estimate of the cost, and of when records will be available; or (c) denying the request with explanation.

Ninety-three (93) days is not a reasonable estimate for records that consist primarily of emails from identified officials over a defined time period. This is particularly unreasonable given:

- The County has already processed PDR #26-01 (102 pages produced in approximately 60 days)*
- The requested records are electronic and searchable*
- The scope is narrowly tailored (emails among three officials concerning specified topics)*

Demand: Please provide a revised, reasonable timeline for production—not to exceed 30 days from today.

5. Ongoing Violations of Previous Requests

Your letter does not address the following outstanding matters:

PDR #26-01: You previously stated the next installment would be completed by April 3, 2026. Is the County on track to meet this deadline? Please confirm with an estimate of the cost of electronic production.

PDR 25-23: This request remains unresolved. Please provide a status update and production timeline.

Exemption Log Sufficiency: The exemption log for PDR #26-01 (received March 6, 2026) fails to comply with RCW 42.56.210(3), which requires "a brief explanation of how the exemption applies to the record withheld." The log provides only statutory citations, no explanations, and fails to identify which specific portions of which documents were redacted. This is legally insufficient and must be corrected.

...

Summary of Demands

Please provide by March 20, 2026 (within five business days):

- 1. Acknowledgment of PDR #26-10 with corrected statutory citations*
- 2. Revised timeline for production not to exceed 30 days*
- 3. Clarification of which records will be provided electronically*
- 4. Corrected fee structure applying the \$0.05 per 4 files rate (or waiver) for electronic records*
- 5. Status update on PDR #26-01 (April 3 deadline) and PDR 25-23*
- 6. Corrected exemption log for PDR #26-01 with individualized explanations*

Thank you for contacting the Washington State Attorney General's Office. In response to your letter dated March 13, 2026, received in our office on March 13, 2026, the records you are seeking are not records that the Office of the Attorney General (AGO) maintains. It appears that you were attempting to request documents from the Asotin County.

All governmental agencies in Washington State have a Public Records Officer that is responsible for responding to requests regarding records they may hold. You can find contact information for their Public Records Officer at the following link: <https://www.asotincountywa.gov/168/Public-Records-Request>.

The Office of the Attorney General (AGO) does not purport to answer on behalf of any other entity other than the AGO. All county and local governments maintain, and are responsible for, their own records.

If your intent was to make a request to the Office of the Attorney General, please let us know right away by submitting your request in one of the following manners:

Option #1 – via letter

Mail to: Attorney General's Office
Public Records Unit
PO Box 40100
Olympia, WA 98504-0100

Option #2 – via e-mail: publicrecords@atg.wa.gov

Option #3 – via online form: <http://www.atg.wa.gov/OpenGovernment/RequestAGOREcords.aspx>

Otherwise, this Office will take no further action on this request.

Your request is now closed, and this is our final response. The AGO does not intend to further address the request, and the Public Records Act's one-year statute of limitations to seek judicial review has started to run as of the date of this correspondence.

Please contact me by e-mail or at Office of the Attorney General, Public Records & Constituent Services, P.O. Box 40100, Olympia, WA 98504-0100, if you have any questions.

Thank you.

Jessica Krueger

Jessica Krueger | Public Records Officer
Public Records & Constituent Services
Jessica.Krueger@atg.wa.gov

From: Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com>

To: "Krueger, Jessica" <Jessica.Krueger@atg.wa.gov>

Cc: publicrecords@atg.wa.gov

Subject: Re: Acknowledgement of Public Records Request - PRR-2026-0223

Date: Mon, 16 Mar 2026 11:57:47 -0400

Importance: Normal

Attachments: Page_not_found___Washington_State.pdf

[EXTERNAL]

Also, Miss Krueger, the link you have provided for "Option #3", via Web Portal does not exist.

I have attached that page to this email for your convenience.

Respectfully,

Mr. Corey M Switzer

On Mon, Mar 16, 2026, 11:35 AM Krueger, Jessica <Jessica.Krueger@atg.wa.gov> wrote:

Dear Corey Switzer,

This correspondence is to acknowledge your public records request received in our office on March 13, 2026. We assigned the file number above to your request. Please reference that number on any future correspondence regarding this request. You requested the following:

Dear Mrs. Kemp,

I am writing in response to your March 13, 2026 correspondence regarding PDR #26-10. Your letter contains several material inaccuracies regarding my request and the County's obligations under the Washington Public Records Act (RCW 42.56). Please allow me to correct the record:

1. Mischaracterization of Requested Records

Your letter states: "We will research whether or not these records exist, and if they do, whether we are allowed to disclose the records."

Correction: My March 7, 2026 request sought records that demonstrably exist. As you are aware from PDR #26-01 (currently in production), the County has already identified and processed communications responsive to substantially similar requests. The individuals named (Judge Brooke Burns, Curtis Liedkie, Lisa Webber) are current County officials whose emails are presumptively public records under RCW 42.56.010(3). No "research" is needed to confirm their existence—only a reasonable search of the County's email systems.

2. Incorrect Fee Structure Cited

Your letter states: "the County is obliged to charge you \$0.15 per page for any copies we generate."

Correction: This statement is legally incorrect on multiple grounds:

First, RCW 42.56.120(2) establishes the following fee structure, which you have misstated:

Service Statutory Rate Your Statement

Photocopies (paper to paper) \$0.15/page ✓ Correctly cited

Scanning (paper to electronic) \$0.10/page Omits this rate entirely

Electronic upload (email/cloud) \$0.05 per 4 files Omits this rate entirely

Transmission \$0.10 per gigabyte Omits this rate entirely

Second, my request seeks emails and other electronic records that already exist in digital format. The \$0.15/page photocopy rate applies only to paper copies of paper records—not to electronic records delivered electronically.

Please provide to me the emails requested in electronic format delivered to my email.

Third, as I documented extensively in PDR #26-01 correspondence (February 20-23, 2026), the County cannot lawfully apply paper-copy rates to electronic records. I trust you will not repeat the errors that required multiple corrective emails in that matter.

3. Unlawful "Review and Redaction" Fees Implied

Your letter states: "Sometimes we need to review the records and black out some information that cannot be disclosed."

Correction: While review and redaction are necessary for exempt information, RCW 42.56.120(2) does not authorize agencies to charge requesters for staff time spent reviewing records or applying redactions. Your letter implies that such costs may be passed to requesters, which would violate the Act. I trust the County will absorb its own administrative costs as the statute requires.

4. Unreasonable Response Timeline

Your letter states: "You can expect a response by June 8, 2026."

Correction: RCW 42.56.520 requires agencies to respond within five business days by either: (a) providing the records; (b) acknowledging receipt and providing a reasonable estimate of the cost, and of when records will be available; or (c) denying the request with explanation.

Ninety-three (93) days is not a reasonable estimate for records that consist primarily of emails from identified officials over a defined time period. This is particularly unreasonable given:

- The County has already processed PDR #26-01 (102 pages produced in approximately 60 days)*
- The requested records are electronic and searchable*
- The scope is narrowly tailored (emails among three officials concerning specified topics)*

Demand: Please provide a revised, reasonable timeline for production—not to exceed 30 days from today.

5. Ongoing Violations of Previous Requests

Your letter does not address the following outstanding matters:

PDR #26-01: You previously stated the next installment would be completed by April 3, 2026. Is the County on track to meet this deadline? Please confirm with an estimate of the cost of electronic production.

PDR 25-23: This request remains unresolved. Please provide a status update and production timeline.

Exemption Log Sufficiency: The exemption log for PDR #26-01 (received March 6, 2026) fails to comply with RCW 42.56.210(3), which requires "a brief explanation of how the exemption applies to the record withheld." The log provides only statutory citations, no explanations, and fails to identify which specific portions of which documents were redacted. This is legally insufficient and must be corrected.

...

Summary of Demands

Please provide by March 20, 2026 (within five business days):

- 1. Acknowledgment of PDR #26-10 with corrected statutory citations*
- 2. Revised timeline for production not to exceed 30 days*
- 3. Clarification of which records will be provided electronically*
- 4. Corrected fee structure applying the \$0.05 per 4 files rate (or waiver) for electronic records*
- 5. Status update on PDR #26-01 (April 3 deadline) and PDR 25-23*
- 6. Corrected exemption log for PDR #26-01 with individualized explanations*

Thank you for contacting the Washington State Attorney General's Office. In response to your letter dated March 13, 2026, received in our office on March 13, 2026, the records you are seeking are not records that the Office of the Attorney General (AGO) maintains. It appears that you were attempting to request documents from the Asotin County.

All governmental agencies in Washington State have a Public Records Officer that is responsible for responding to requests regarding records they may hold. You can find contact information for their Public Records Officer at the following link: <https://www.asotincountywa.gov/168/Public-Records-Request>.

The Office of the Attorney General (AGO) does not purport to answer on behalf of any other entity other than the AGO. All county and local governments maintain, and are responsible for, their own records.

If your intent was to make a request to the Office of the Attorney General, please let us know right away by submitting your request in one of the following manners:

Option #1 – via letter

Mail to: Attorney General's Office
Public Records Unit
PO Box 40100
Olympia, WA 98504-0100

Option #2 – via e-mail: publicrecords@atg.wa.gov

Option #3 – via online form: <http://www.atg.wa.gov/OpenGovernment/RequestAGORecords.aspx>

Otherwise, this Office will take no further action on this request.

Your request is now closed, and this is our final response. The AGO does not intend to further address the request, and the Public Records Act's one-year statute of limitations to seek judicial review has started to run as of the date of this correspondence.

Please contact me by e-mail or at Office of the Attorney General, Public Records & Constituent Services, P.O. Box 40100, Olympia, WA 98504-0100, if you have any questions.

Thank you.

Jessica Krueger

Jessica Krueger | Public Records Officer

Public Records & Constituent Services

Jessica.Krueger@atg.wa.gov

[Home \(/\)](#) | **Page Not Found**

Page not found

The requested page could not be found.

From: Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com>

To: Chris Kemp <CKemp@asotincountywa.gov>, Public Disclosure
<PDisclosure@asotincountywa.gov>, "Shaw, Alisha (SAO)" <shawa@sao.wa.gov>

Cc: Trae Turner <trae@clarkandfeeney.com>, kelleyp@co.nezperce.id.us, Justin Coleman
<JustinColeman@co.nezperce.id.us>, Jessica Kline <jkline@isb.idaho.gov>, Joseph Pirtle
<jpirtle@isb.idaho.gov>, Lori Ostertag <lostertag@isb.idaho.gov>, Judahluke7@gmail.com,
Lisa Webber <LWebber@asotincountywa.gov>, hliedkie@co.nezperce.id.us,
jgish@co.nezperce.id.us, dhavens@co.nezperce.id.us, thirteentwelveforever@proton.me,
info@southdakotatruth.com, 08mad10@gmail.com, city@lmtribune.com,
Civil.Fraud@usdoj.gov, idahoauditors@gmail.com, tips@nbcuni.com, tips@inlander.com,
news@theregister.com, news@kpbx.org, Newsdesk@krem.com, newsroom@idahopress.com,
news@bigcountry977.com, News4@kxly.com, Ada Eldridge <Adaeldridge@hotmail.com>,
brennonlleafty@gmail.com, "SUEANNSMITH32@YAHOO.COM"
<sueannsmith32@yahoo.com>, lmccann@house.idaho.gov,
nancececcarelli@co.nezperce.id.us, Monte Schmidt <monte.schmidt@itd.idaho.gov>,
jklein@cityoflewiston.org, Representative Brandon Mitchell <bmittchell@house.idaho.gov>,
bryces@co.nezperce.id.us, ISPPPIO@isp.idaho.gov, Brooke Burns <BBurns@co.asotin.wa.us>,
Stephanie Cuddihy <StephanieC@co.nezperce.id.us>, Dispatch LPD
<dispatch@cityoflewiston.org>, Jason Kuzik <jkuzik@cityoflewiston.org>, Amy Ledgerwood
<AmyLedgerwood@co.nezperce.id.us>, Constituent Mailbox <AGLabrador@ag.idaho.gov>,
Ombuds AGO <AGOOmbuds@atg.wa.gov>, tsparks@clarkstonpolice.org,
"AprilS@co.nezperce.id.us" <AprilS@co.nezperce.id.us>, Dan Johnson
<danjohnson@cityoflewiston.org>, Patty Weeks <PattyWeeks@co.nezperce.id.us>, Brian
Shinn <BShinn@asotincountywa.gov>, Mariel Gates <Mariel.Gates@tax.idaho.gov>, Chris
Seubert <cseubert@asotincountywa.gov>, Charles Whitman
<CWhitman@asotincountywa.gov>, Curt Liedkie <CLiedkie@asotincountywa.gov>, Intake
<intake@wsba.org>, Amanda Daylong <ADaylong@nwtrialattorneys.com>,
apearce@nwtrialattorneys.com, Karen Carlisle <kcarlisle@isb.idaho.gov>,
legal@libertasfunding.com, Investigations Info Requests
<InvestigationsInfoRequests@isp.idaho.gov>, dmckay@asotincountywa.gov,
rlynch@asotincountywa.gov, Stacey Harman <SHarman@asotincountywa.gov>,
usdemsocialists@gmail.com, objectionoverruled2@gmail.com,
whistleblower@startribune.com, Kevin Munstermann <kevin@travelland-rv.com>,
Tricia.McLaughlin@hq.dhs.gov, doswald@idahostatesman.com, Nicholas Woods
<nicholasw@co.nezperce.id.us>, news@spokesman.com, andreat@chooseclear.com,
publicrecords@atg.wa.gov, justin rodriguez <jrodspeaks@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: March RICO Correspondence, PDR26-10

Date: Fri, 13 Mar 2026 17:07:50 -0400

Importance: Normal

[EXTERNAL]

Subject: URGENT - THIRD DEMAND: Public Hearing Before Asotin County Board of Commissioners (Formal Complaint Dec 16, 2025)

To: Chris Kemp <CKemp@asotincountywa.gov>

Cc: Asotin County Commissioners <commissioners@asotincountywa.gov>, Public Disclosure
<PDisclosure@asotincountywa.gov>, Brian Shinn <BShinn@asotincountywa.gov>, Charles Whitman

<CWhitman@asotincountywa.gov>, Alisha Shaw (SAO) <shawa@sao.wa.gov>, publicrecords@atg.wa.gov,
news@lmtribune.com, news@spokesman.com

Date: March 13, 2026

Dear Mr. Kemp and Members of the Asotin County Board of Commissioners:

I am writing to follow up on my FORMAL DEMAND FOR PUBLIC HEARING submitted on December 16, 2025, and renewed most recently on March 6, 2026 and March 7, 2026. To date, the Board has provided no response, no acknowledgment, and no hearing date.

This is my third formal demand. The Board's continued silence is a violation of the Open Public Meetings Act (RCW 42.30), Asotin County's own public meeting procedures (Resolution #25-07), and the public's fundamental right to transparent government.

Background

On December 16, 2025, I filed a formal complaint with the Asotin County Board of Commissioners regarding:

1. The unlawful withholding of public records in response to PDR 25-23; and
2. The unauthorized expenditure of public funds for the legal defense of Judge Brooke Burns (SAO Hotline Case H-25-795, PDR #26-01)

Since that date:

Date Event

Dec 16, 2025 Formal complaint filed

Dec 16, 2025 (9:00 AM) Judge Burns forwards my complaint to private counsel (since redacted)

Dec 22, 2025 Private strategy meeting held with county officials, outside counsel, and insurer

March 6, 2026 FIRST RENEWAL of demand for public hearing

March 7, 2026 SECOND RENEWAL of demand for public hearing

March 13, 2026 THIRD DEMAND – Still no response

The Board has now had nearly three months to schedule this matter. It has instead chosen to meet privately with attorneys and insurers to discuss strategy—while ignoring the public's right to address these issues in open session.

Legal Obligations

Under RCW 42.30.070, the Board must provide an opportunity for public comment at regular meetings. Under your own Resolution #25-07, you have established procedures for public participation, including Zoom access.

More fundamentally, the matters raised in my complaint—whether public funds were unlawfully spent, whether records were unlawfully withheld, and whether county officials coordinated to conceal these facts—are quintessentially matters for public, not private, discussion.

The secret December 22, 2025 "SAO Complaint meeting" (attended by Chris Kemp, Amanda Daylong, and Clear Risk Solutions) is precisely the kind of backroom deliberation the Open Public Meetings Act was designed to prevent.

Immediate Demand

Effective immediately, I demand that the Board:

1. Confirm in writing by March 18, 2026 that my formal complaint has been placed on the agenda of the next available public meeting of the Asotin County Board of Commissioners.
2. Provide the date, time, and location (including Zoom access information as provided in Resolution #25-07) for that meeting.
3. Produce all records of communications among county officials, counsel, and Clear Risk Solutions regarding the decision not to schedule this hearing—including any strategy discussions about delaying or avoiding public accountability.

If the Board refuses to schedule this hearing, please state that refusal in writing so that I may adjust my pending filings accordingly, including:

- My pending RICO complaint (U.S. District Court)
- My supplemental submission to the Washington State Auditor (SAO Hotline Case H-25-795)
- My public records lawsuit concerning PDR 25-23 and PDR #26-01

The Record Speaks

The Board cannot claim ignorance. The record now includes:

- PDR #26-01 production (102 pages of internal communications)
- The Exemption Log 26-01 (proving Judge Burns personally forwarded my complaint to her attorney Amanda Daylong)
- The December 22, 2025 meeting records (confirming coordinated strategy)
- My three formal demands (December 16, 2025; March 6, 2026; March 7, 2026; and now this one)

The question is no longer whether these issues deserve public discussion. The question is whether the Board will continue to violate the law by refusing to hold one.

Response Required

Please respond to each of the demands above by close of business on March 18, 2026.

If I do not receive a substantive response by that date, I will have no choice but to:

1. File a complaint with the Washington State Attorney General's Office regarding OPMA violations;
2. Amend my federal complaint to include these refusals as further evidence of bad faith and conspiracy to obstruct public accountability; and
3. Notify all media outlets currently copied on this correspondence that the Board is actively concealing these matters from the public.

Respectfully,

Corey Michael Switzer
264 Kernodle Rd
Gibsonville, NC 27249
coreyswitzer@gmail.com
(218) 461-9868

This communication is a public record. Retaliatory action against a person exercising their rights violates RCW 42.56.550(4).

On Fri, Mar 13, 2026, 5:02 PM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

Subject: RE: PDR #26-10 - Correction of Inaccuracies & Statutory Compliance Requirements

To: Chris Kemp <CKemp@asotincountywa.gov>

Cc: Public Disclosure <PDisclosure@asotincountywa.gov>, Alisha Shaw (SAO) <shaw@sa.wa.gov>, publicrecords@atg.wa.gov

Date: [Current Date]

Dear Mrs. Kemp,

I am writing in response to your March 13, 2026 correspondence regarding PDR #26-10. Your letter contains several material inaccuracies regarding my request and the County's obligations under the Washington Public Records Act (RCW 42.56). Please allow me to correct the record:

1. Mischaracterization of Requested Records

Your letter states: "We will research whether or not these records exist, and if they do, whether we are allowed to disclose the records."

Correction: My March 7, 2026 request sought records that demonstrably exist. As you are aware from PDR #26-01 (currently in production), the County has already identified and processed communications responsive to substantially similar requests. The individuals named (Judge Brooke Burns, Curtis Liedkie, Lisa Webber) are current County officials whose emails are presumptively public records under RCW 42.56.010(3). No "research" is needed to confirm their existence—only a reasonable search of the County's email systems.

2. Incorrect Fee Structure Cited

Your letter states: "the County is obliged to charge you \$0.15 per page for any copies we generate."

Correction: This statement is legally incorrect on multiple grounds:

First, RCW 42.56.120(2) establishes the following fee structure, which you have misstated:

Service	Statutory Rate	Your Statement
Photocopies (paper to paper)	\$0.15/page	✓ Correctly cited
Scanning (paper to electronic)	\$0.10/page	Omits this rate entirely
Electronic upload (email/cloud)	\$0.05 per 4 files	Omits this rate entirely
Transmission	\$0.10 per gigabyte	Omits this rate entirely

Second, my request seeks emails and other electronic records that already exist in digital format. The \$0.15/page photocopy rate applies only to paper copies of paper records—not to electronic records delivered

electronically.

Please provide to me the emails requested in electronic format delivered to my email.

Third, as I documented extensively in PDR #26-01 correspondence (February 20-23, 2026), the County cannot lawfully apply paper-copy rates to electronic records. I trust you will not repeat the errors that required multiple corrective emails in that matter.

3. Unlawful "Review and Redaction" Fees Implied

Your letter states: "Sometimes we need to review the records and black out some information that cannot be disclosed."

Correction: While review and redaction are necessary for exempt information, RCW 42.56.120(2) does not authorize agencies to charge requesters for staff time spent reviewing records or applying redactions. Your letter implies that such costs may be passed to requesters, which would violate the Act. I trust the County will absorb its own administrative costs as the statute requires.

4. Unreasonable Response Timeline

Your letter states: "You can expect a response by June 8, 2026."

Correction: RCW 42.56.520 requires agencies to respond within five business days by either: (a) providing the records; (b) acknowledging receipt and providing a reasonable estimate of the cost, and of when records will be available; or (c) denying the request with explanation.

Ninety-three (93) days is not a reasonable estimate for records that consist primarily of emails from identified officials over a defined time period. This is particularly unreasonable given:

- The County has already processed PDR #26-01 (102 pages produced in approximately 60 days)
- The requested records are electronic and searchable
- The scope is narrowly tailored (emails among three officials concerning specified topics)

Demand: Please provide a revised, reasonable timeline for production—not to exceed 30 days from today.

5. Ongoing Violations of Previous Requests

Your letter does not address the following outstanding matters:

PDR #26-01: You previously stated the next installment would be completed by April 3, 2026. Is the County on track to meet this deadline? Please confirm with an estimate of the cost of electronic production.

PDR 25-23: This request remains unresolved. Please provide a status update and production timeline.

Exemption Log Sufficiency: The exemption log for PDR #26-01 (received March 6, 2026) fails to comply with RCW 42.56.210(3), which requires "a brief explanation of how the exemption applies to the record withheld." The log provides only statutory citations, no explanations, and fails to identify which specific portions of which documents were redacted. This is legally insufficient and must be corrected.

6. Fee Waiver Request (Renewed)

I renew my request that all fees be waived in the public interest under RCW 42.56.120(2). This request seeks records concerning:

- Expenditure of public funds for judicial defense
- County response to a formal complaint before the State Auditor's Office (SAO Hotline Case H-25-795)
- Coordination between County officials and private counsel regarding public records

These are matters of core governmental transparency. The minimal administrative cost of email delivery is far outweighed by the public interest in disclosure.

7. Preservation Obligation

Please take notice that this correspondence serves as a formal request that the County preserve all records potentially responsive to PDR #26-10, PDR #26-01, and PDR 25-23, including all emails, attachments, metadata, and communications with third parties (including Amanda Daylong, NW Trial Attorneys, Clear Risk Solutions, and any insurance adjusters). Destruction of potentially responsive records pending litigation would violate RCW 42.56.100 and common law spoliation rules.

Summary of Demands

Please provide by March 20, 2026 (within five business days):

1. Acknowledgment of PDR #26-10 with corrected statutory citations
2. Revised timeline for production not to exceed 30 days
3. Clarification of which records will be provided electronically
4. Corrected fee structure applying the \$0.05 per 4 files rate (or waiver) for electronic records
5. Status update on PDR #26-01 (April 3 deadline) and PDR 25-23
6. Corrected exemption log for PDR #26-01 with individualized explanations

This communication is a public record. Retaliatory action against a person exercising their rights violates RCW 42.56.550(4).

Respectfully,

Corey Michael Switzer
264 Kernodle Rd
Gibsonville, NC 27249
coreyswitzer@gmail.com
(218) 461-9868

Attachments:

- Previous PDR #26-01 correspondence (Feb 20-23, 2026)
- PDR 25-23 original request (for reference)

On Mon, Mar 9, 2026, 7:31 PM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

JR,

That's being too generous.

Travelland RV doesn't OFFER any service in writing, as illustrated by their most recent complaint.

<https://maps.app.goo.gl/NsQ5e28GrcCkQVEn6>

On Sun, Mar 8, 2026, 11:28 PM Justin Rodriguez <jrodspeaks@gmail.com> wrote:

This video randomly showed up on my youtube landing page a little while ago.

I have questions for Travelland RV. You should, too.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=g2y1XMsKieQ>

-J

On 3/8/2026 6:49 AM, Corey Switzer wrote:

Subject: FOLLOW-UP: Unanswered Questions & New Documentary Evidence (March 8, 2026)

March 8, 2026

To:

Trae Turner <trae@clarkandfeeney.com>

Dear Mr. Turner,

Thank you again for your March 7, 2026 response to my public records request. The YouTube link —"How about No"—has been archived, timestamped, and added to the evidentiary record. It joins your other professional correspondence in what is, and has always been a rather colorful collection of insults from you in response to lawful questions, notwithstanding telling a Federal Labor Investigator falsely that I had been Convicted of Solicitation of a Juvenile, a charge which does not, nor has ever existed in my record.

Since you've chosen not to answer any of the substantive questions posed in my previous email, I thought I'd provide you with some additional documentary evidence—courtesy of the Idaho Secretary of State, the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Washington, and the Asotin County District Court—to help refresh your memory and perhaps prompt a more substantive response this time.

1. Your Client, Vittoria Paxe Puccini (f/k/a Meghan McCreary)

You've had since March 7 to address the rather obvious discrepancy between your client's corporate role and her disability claims. Silence is not a defense, so let's lay it out more explicitly.

Idaho Secretary of State Records (Travelland RV, Inc. File #0003747721):

Filing Date Document Secretary Listed

01/15/2020 Articles of Incorporation Meghan McCreary

12/04/2020 Annual Report Meghan McCreary

12/07/2021 Annual Report Meghan McCreary

12/06/2022 Annual Report Meghan McCreary

01/08/2024 Annual Report Meghan McCreary

01/03/2025 Annual Report Meghan McCreary

12/29/2025 Annual Report Meghan McCreary

Asotin County District Court (Case No. CI0018767):

- 07/07/2021: Meghan Joellen McCreary legally changes her name to Vittoria Paxe Puccini.

U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Washington (Case No. 2:25-cv-00010-EFS):

- Alleged Onset Date of Disability: August 21, 2021
- Disability Claim Basis: Bipolar disorder, depression, anxiety, OCD, panic attacks, migraine headaches—allegedly preventing any full-time work.
- Treatment Notes (PMHNP Rowland, August 15, 2023): Your client reported she was seeking a new provider because her previous one "did not support her disability application."
- ALJ Decision (Affirmed July 9, 2025): Benefits denied. The Court found the ALJ properly considered that your client's mental status examinations, and in spite of Kevin Munstermann's supporting letter of disability, were "predominantly within normal limits and unremarkable" throughout the relevant period.

The Inconvenient Question:

How does someone serve as the Secretary of a corporation, specifically Travelland RV,—a role with fiduciary duties, requiring active participation in corporate governance, filing annual reports, and maintaining corporate records—for five consecutive years (2020-2025), while simultaneously claiming to be totally disabled and unable to work?

More pointedly: How does her attorney—you—ethically represent her in litigation arising from that very corporation (Travelland RV) while she is potentially defrauding the State of Idaho for false Secretary of State filings, the State of Washington for receiving Supplemental Nutritional Aid -and- the federal government Social Security Disability Income?

And how do you then justify representing Justin Coleman before the Idaho State Bar, given you were married to Kali Jo Parker at the same time?

And how does that attorney then turn around and involve himself in a plea against the lawful release of requested Washington public records dispute on behalf of... whom, exactly, Mr. Turner?

The Idaho State Bar's Rules of Professional Conduct might have something to say about that. So does the Washington State Bar Association. But then again, we've seen how that process works.

You've got Patty Weeks, County Clerk and Bar Association Commissioner for two districts in Idaho and Katie Hawkins of Clark and Feeney as a Commissioner in Washington State, besides formerly working under Todd Richardson, acting City Attorney in Troy, ID, and Justin Coleman was the best man at your wedding?

2. Your Role in Asotin County (Still Unexplained)

You still haven't answered the jurisdictional question. Let me make it simpler:

- You are an Idaho attorney that has lived in Clarkston.
- You are admitted to practice law in both in Idaho State and in Washington State (to my knowledge).
- You have no clients in Asotin County aside from Kevin Munstermann and Vittoria Puccini located at the same address in Clarkston, Washington (that you've disclosed).
- You are not counsel of record for Judge Brooke Burns (Amanda Daylong is).
- You are not counsel for the Asotin County Commissioners (Chris Kemp, Amanda Daylong and county counsel handle that).

And yet, here you are—inserting yourself into a Washington public records dispute, responding to requests directed to Washington officials, and apparently monitoring the distribution list closely enough to fire off a YouTube link within hours.

The only logical explanation is that you are acting as a mouthpiece and informal gatekeeper for a network of officials who would prefer these records not see the light of day. The December 22, 2025 "SAO Complaint meeting"—attended by county officials, outside counsel, and the county's insurer—suggests a coordinated strategy.

Were you on that call? Were you consulted? Did you advise anyone in Asotin County on how to respond to my records requests or the State Auditor's investigation like you advised Coleman, and received information from him to assist Puccini in filing an erroneous police report in Clarkston? Please, please say yes.

If so, you have discoverable records.

If not, please explain your objections to illicit your involvement on these emails,
Or lets focus on the people who actually have authority to respond to the request for documentation...
Or include documents that directly refute and rebut these facts.

3. The Geagley Indictment & Your Client's Embezzlement Nightmare

On March 4, 2026, the State of Idaho began prosecuting Di Ann R. Geagley for embezzling **\$554,000** from Travelland RV between 2021 and 2025—claiming nearly half of which (\$233,000) went to online gambling debts.

Your client, Travelland RV, was the victim.

Your client, Kevin Munstermann, was the President.

Your client, Meghan McCreary (Vittoria Puccini), was the Secretary during the entire alleged embezzlement period while she claimed total disability as illustrated.

You represented Travelland RV in litigation against me during that same period alleged, throughout 2022 and "as a courtesy" to represent Puccini for K.Munstermann in 2023.

Your wife, (until January of 2026), Kali Parker, is a deputy prosecutor underneath Justin Coleman in the same office now prosecuting the case against your Clients employee, the Embezzling I have been reporting for 5 years.

Your close associate, Justin Coleman, is the elected prosecutor overseeing that office.

You, Mr. Turner, Justin Coleman and April Smith all have had inside knowledge of this indictment since at least October of 2025, throughout each hearing in December, January, as reported by the regional newspaper February 3rd and by Travelland RV themselves, February 4th.

And now, public records from the Idaho Secretary of State confirm what I've been saying for years: Travelland RV was drowning in tax liens, UCC filings, substantial judicial claims registered against them, and financial chaos throughout this period.

Liens Against Travelland RV, Inc. (2020-2026):

- 03/11/2020: UCC filings with Timothy & Susan Krueger (lapsed)
- 03/25/2020: UCC filing with Twin River Bank (active)
- 10/22/2021: Two Idaho Department of Labor liens (released)
- 10/25/2022: Idaho State Tax Commission lien (released)
- 11/28/2022: Five Idaho State Tax Commission liens (released)
- 12/09/2022: Two Idaho State Tax Commission liens (released)
- 03/07/2023: Idaho State Tax Commission lien (released)
- 04/28/2023: Idaho State Tax Commission lien (released)
- 05/31/2023: Idaho State Tax Commission lien (released)
- 06/13/2023: Idaho State Tax Commission lien (released)
- 07/28/2023: Idaho State Tax Commission lien (released)
- 08/08/2023: UCC filing with C T Corporation System (active—Libertas Funding)
- 09/29/2023: Two Idaho State Tax Commission liens (released)
- 12/20/2024: Idaho State Tax Commission lien (released)
- 07/29/2025: Idaho State Tax Commission lien (released)
- 08/29/2025: Idaho State Tax Commission lien (released)
- 09/12/2025: Two Idaho State Tax Commission liens (released)
- 09/26/2025: Idaho State Tax Commission lien (released)
- 10/28/2025: Idaho State Tax Commission lien (released)
- 11/04/2025: Idaho State Tax Commission lien (released)
- 12/01/2025: Idaho State Tax Commission lien (released)
- 12/09/2025: Idaho State Tax Commission lien (released)
- 2026: Multiple additional filings (ongoing)

Liens Against Kevin M. Munstermann (Personal):

- 05/12/2023: Four Idaho State Tax Commission liens (released)
- 08/22/2023: Idaho State Tax Commission lien (released)
- 10/11/2023: Idaho State Tax Commission lien (released)
- 03/12/2024: Idaho State Tax Commission lien (released)

This is not the profile of a well-managed, financially stable business. This is the profile of an enterprise under continuous financial distress, with tax liens filed, judgement against your Client for immediately defaulting on a receipt loan, and released in a timely cycle—coinciding almost perfectly with the period when your client's bookkeeper was allegedly stealing over half a million dollars. I have been saying the same thing for over 5 years.

And you knew this because that's exactly what I posted, embezzling, fraud, Forgery and tax evasion on the Nez Perce County Prosecutors Office page which elicited Coleman to urge you to have Puccini (McCreary) file charges against me in Clarkston Washington WHILE Puccini claiming total disability benefits. The charges against me you tried to file were nested deep within the same cache of evidence I (have previously and) now provide in the following link:

https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1GpJN_qarcqORIFCZsPmBUKDCY3HMTw61

It's the reason why I received harassment from former Lewiston City Council President Hannah Liedkie and led me to find her relationship with Tim Krueger through the Calem Shriners and Hannah Liedkie's OWN self-dealing taxpayers money.

There's no "should have known" Or "chose not to know".

These crimes committed by your clients at Travelland RV were ignored investigation because of your demonstrably close relationship to the Nez Perce County Prosecutors Office and elected City of Lewiston Officials.

4. The Washington Connection (PDR 25-23 & PDR #26-01)

My public records requests to Asotin County seek communications involving Judge Brooke Burns, Curtis Liedkie, and Lisa Webber regarding the unauthorized use of public funds for Judge Burns' legal defense. The PDR #26-01 production already confirms:

- December 16, 2025: Within hours of my formal complaint, Chris Kemp forwarded the matter to Andrea Tsivgadellis of Clear Risk Solutions (Claim No. W1756).
- December 22, 2025: A private "SAO Complaint meeting" was held with county officials, outside counsel Amanda Daylong, and the insurer to attempt to mitigate liability for unlawful Representation by Curtis Liedkie and Lisa Webber of Judge Brooke Burns.
- 15 communications are now withheld entirely under claims of attorney-client privilege.

Your name appears NOWHERE throughout the published email chains. You are looped into ZERO published strategy discussions. You are cc'd on ZERO published communications with the insurer. You are, by any and ALL reasonable measure, NOT involved.

So again: On whose behalf? On what grounds? And why?

If you have no responsive records, say so.

If you are not acting as counsel to anyone in Asotin County, say so.

If your involvement is purely as a concerned observer, say so. But "How about No" is not a legal response. It's not a professional response. It's the response of someone who knows the questions, who knows the answers and shows that you are uncomfortable with both questions and answers and hopes mockery and instigation will make me go away.

It hasn't. It won't.

It's going to crescendo to the Washington SAO Audit this fall, and address the documented unlawful expenditures used to represent Judge Burns by Curtis Liedkie, Lisa Webber, authored by Chris Kemp and Employed Amanda Daylong at the behest of the insurance company. It is already further compounded by a private attorney, Amanda Daylong redacting her own communication regarding the SAO Audit strategy for her replacement for Curtis Liedkie.

5. What Happens Next

Your response—or continued silence—will be noted in:

- This Public Document Request
- My pending federal RICO complaint
- My communications with the Washington State Auditor (SAO Hotline Case H-25-795)

- My communications with the U.S. Department of Justice (Civil.Fraud@usdoj.gov already copied)
- My ongoing public records litigation in Washington state

The evidentiary record now includes:

- Idaho Secretary of State filings confirming Meghan McCreary's continuous role as Secretary of Travelland RV (2020-2025)
- Federal court records affirming the repeated denial of her disability claim
- Asotin County name change records
- Lien histories for Travelland RV and Kevin Munstermann
- Your YouTube link

If you have something to say—something substantive with receipts, something that addresses the questions above with legal justification—now would be that exact time.

If you'd prefer to send another YouTube link, or add another colorful insult I'm sure the Internet has plenty. I'll be sure to add it to the collection.

The very literal moment I have the Geagley matter court case number, please have every single expectation of receiving a supplemental filing to the Nez Perce County Prosecutors Office, to the Honorable Judge Porter, and to you regarding your clients, including your client before the Idaho State Bar, Justin Coleman.

I hope you also take notice that Judge Kelley Porter and Nez Perce County Prosecutor Justin Coleman is intentionally CC'd.

Until we address the assault by Troy Munstermann and robbery by Wynter Spencer,

Until we firmly address the bribery of Captain Rick Fuentes, Andrew Fox and Nick Woods by Tim Krueger,

Until we firmly address the extortion by sales Manager of Travelland RV, Shawn Whitmore,

Until we firmly address the Forgery of the Title Application by Puccini at Travelland RV in Idaho to be registered to Munstermann's address in Clarkston, Washington,

And...

Until we address this tax evasion, tax fraud, and subsequent obstruction of justice by the above and herein named,

Have every single expectation that I shall remain a persistent thorn in the proverbial legal side of unresolved justice in the Lewiston Clarkston Valley, for myself and for others like Sue Ann Meyers.

Resign, like Stacey Harmon, Asotin County Clerk after the SAO Audit was mentioned, before it gets too late for you to do anything else, Mr. Turner.

Respectfully,

Corey Michael Switzer
[264 Kernodle Rd](#)
[Gibsonville, NC 27249](#)
coreyswitzer@gmail.com
218-461-9868

Note: This communication is a public record. Retaliatory action against a person exercising their rights violates RCW 42.56.550(4).

Attachments:

1. Idaho Secretary of State - Travelland RV Lien Search Results
2. Idaho Secretary of State - Kevin Munstermann Lien Search Results
3. Puccini v. Bisignano, No. 2:25-cv-00010-EFS (Order Affirming Denial of Benefits, July 9, 2025)
4. Asotin County District Court - Name Change (CI0018767)
5. SOS Filing Links (2020-2025 Annual Reports)
6. B1077-0232 (2025 Annual Report - Travelland RV)
7. B0977-2389 (2025 Annual Report - Travelland RV)
8. B0872-1191 (2024 Annual Report - Travelland RV)
9. B0760-0784 (2022 Annual Report - Travelland RV)
10. B0667-0593 (2021 Annual Report - Travelland RV)
11. B0558-1058 (2020 Annual Report - Travelland RV)
12. B0462-9644 (Articles of Incorporation - Travelland RV, 01/15/2020)
13. Travelland RV v Libertas Funding judgement (02/06/2024)
<https://cases.justia.com/new-york/other-courts/2024-2024-ny-slip-op-30415-u.pdf>
14. Gmail - ISB, Coleman notifies of his attorney, Trae Turner.

On Sat, Mar 7, 2026, 11:30 AM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:
Mr. Turner,

Thank you for your thoughtful and substantive response to my public records request. The YouTube link—"How about No"—has been received and will be preserved as evidence of your professional correspondence in this matter.

I appreciate you taking time out of your busy schedule to demonstrate, in such a clear and public manner, exactly the kind of dismissive obstruction that has been documented throughout these proceedings. Your response is noted.

A Few Clarifications, Since You've Chosen to Engage:

1. Jurisdiction – You are responding to a public records request directed to Asotin County, Washington. You have no clients there. You have no office there. You are admitted to practice in Washington state (to my knowledge). And yet, here you are, interjecting yourself into a Washington public records matter on behalf of... whom, exactly?

- Judge Brooke Burns? She has private counsel (Amanda Daylong).
- Curtis Liedkie? He's the Asotin County Prosecutor—surely he can speak for himself.
- The Asotin County Commissioners? They have a Chief Operating Officer and legal counsel.

So I must ask: Who are you representing here? And why is an Idaho attorney, whose practice is conducting business limited to Idaho, involving himself in a Washington county's public records compliance? The appearance is that you are functioning as an informal gatekeeper for a network of officials who would prefer these records not see the light of day.

2. Conflicts of Interest – You currently represent Travelland RV. You have represented Nez Perce County Prosecutor Justin Coleman. You are married to Kali Parker, a deputy prosecutor in that same office. And now, on March 4, 2026, the State of Idaho is prosecuting Di Ann Geagley for embezzling \$554,000 from Travelland RV—the very crimes I reported years ago, the very crimes your client's

business was victimized by, and the very crimes your close associate Justin Coleman's office is now finally prosecuting.

You understand how this looks, yes? The public will.

3. Your Client, Vittoria Paxe Puccini (f/k/a Meghan McCreary) – Since you seem to have time for YouTube links, perhaps you could explain the following to the many people copied on this email:

- How is it that your client, Vittoria Puccini, has been listed as the Secretary of Travelland RV in every single Idaho Secretary of State filing from 2020 to the present—including the 2023 and 2024 filings—while simultaneously claiming total disability and receiving (or attempting to receive) Social Security benefits based on her inability to work?
- How does someone function as the corporate secretary of a multi-million dollar RV dealership while simultaneously being too disabled to hold any job?
- And how does an attorney—you—ethically represent a client in active litigation (the Travelland RV matters, the disputes with me, the police report in Clarkston) while that client is potentially defrauding the federal government?

These are not rhetorical questions. The Idaho Secretary of State's website is public. The Social Security Administration's docket is public (see Puccini v. King, Case No. 2:23-cv-00218). The timing of her disability claims and her continued corporate role are now part of the record.

4. Tangential Blowback – You don't want to be involved in Asotin County matters. I understand why. The records being requested in PDR 25-23 and PDR #26-01 involve communications between Judge Brooke Burns, Curtis Liedkie, and Lisa Webber—individuals connected, by marriage and by professional association, to people and entities in your orbit. You don't want your name in those emails. You don't want deposition questions about what you knew and when. You don't want to explain to a federal judge why you inserted yourself into a Washington public records dispute.

But here's the problem: I bet your name is already in those emails. The PDR #26-01 production already shows Amanda Daylong copying people on strategy discussions. The December 22, 2025 "SAO Complaint meeting" included outside counsel and the county insurer—and are you looped in? You are not an innocent bystander. You are documented.

Demand (Reiterated):

To the extent you are acting as counsel or advisor to any Asotin County official or employee regarding these matters, please confirm that role in writing. If you are not, please explain your involvement and produce any records responsive to PDR 25-23 that are in your possession or control, as required by law.

If your "How about No" is intended as a formal refusal, please state that clearly so I may adjust my filings accordingly—including my supplemental submission to the Idaho Supreme Court, my pending RICO draft, and my communications with the Washington State Auditor and the Department of Justice.


Respectfully,

Corey Michael Switzer
[264 Kernodle Rd](#)
[Gibsonville, NC 27249](#)
coreyswitzer@gmail.com
218-461-9868

Note: This communication is a public record. Retaliatory action against a person exercising their rights violates RCW 42.56.550(4).

P.S. – The YouTube link has been archived and preserved. It will make an excellent exhibit.

On Sat, Mar 7, 2026, 11:08 AM Trae Turner <trae@clarkandfeeney.com> wrote:



Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 7, 2026, at 5:55 AM, Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

Subject: FOLLOW-UP: Outstanding Public Records (PDR #26-01 & PDR 25-23) & Demand for Public Hearing Schedule

March 7, 2026

To:

Chris Kemp <CKemp@asotincountywa.gov>
Amanda Daylong <ADaylong@nwtrialattorneys.com>
Andrea Tsivgadellis <andreat@chooseclear.com>

Cc:

Public Disclosure <PDisclosure@asotincountywa.gov>
Brian Shinn <BShinn@asotincountywa.gov>
Charles Whitman <CWhitman@asotincountywa.gov>
Chris Seubert <CSeubert@asotincountywa.gov>
Lisa Webber <LWebber@asotincountywa.gov>
Curt Liedkie <CLiedkie@asotincountywa.gov>
Brooke Burns <BBurns@co.asotin.wa.us>
Shaw, Alisha (SAO) <shawa@sao.wa.gov>

Bcc: (Witness List)

Dear Mr. Kemp, Ms. Daylong, and Ms. Tsivgadellis,

I am writing to follow up on multiple pending matters regarding Asotin County's compliance with my lawful public records requests and your obligations to the public under Washington law.

1. Outstanding Records – PDR #26-01

On March 5, 2026, I acknowledged receipt of the first installment of records for PDR #26-01. In your March 5, 2026 correspondence, you stated that the next installment would be completed by April 3, 2026. This deadline is now less than four weeks away.

Please provide a status update on the processing of the remaining records. Specifically:

- Have all responsive records been identified and reviewed?
- Are you on track to meet the April 3 deadline for the next installment?
- Will the next installment be provided electronically, as requested, to minimize costs and delays?

If any delays are anticipated, please provide an immediate explanation and a revised timeline for full production.

2. Previous Public Records Request – PDR 25-23 (Supplemental)

Pursuant to the Washington State Public Records Act (RCW 42.56), I hereby submit the renewal of following formal request for records.

Requested Records:

All emails, including attachments and metadata, sent to, from, or copied to any of the following individuals during the period of June 1, 2025 through March 7, 2026:

- Judge Brooke Burns (bburns@co.asotin.wa.us)
- Curtis Liedkie (cliedkie@asotincountywa.gov)
- Lisa Webber (lwebber@asotincountywa.gov)

Scope of Search:

This request encompasses all communications among these individuals, of subject matter "Switzer", as well as any communications between any of these individuals and any third party (including but not limited to Amanda Daylong, NW Trial Attorneys, Clear Risk Solutions, Asotin County Commissioners, or county staff) concerning:

- The matter of Switzer v. Hon. Brooke Burns (WA Supreme Court Case #104,080-6)
- The defense or representation of Judge Brooke Burns
- Public records requests PDR 25-23 or PDR #26-01
- SAO Hotline Case H-25-795 or any related audit or investigation
- Any insurance claims, including Claim No. W1756 with Clear Risk Solutions
- Any strategy meetings, privileged communications, or exemption determinations regarding the above

Please Omit ALL extra pages sent by Corey M Switzer and only include the responses to them provided to reduce the cost and pages that originated from me and already exist in my possession.

Format: Electronic format preferred. If any records are withheld in whole or in part, please provide a detailed exemption log as required by RCW 42.56.210(3), specifying the statutory basis for each redaction or withholding and explaining why segregable portions cannot be disclosed.

Response Deadline: Under RCW 42.56.520, I expect immediate acknowledgment of this request March 9th, 2026, including an estimated timeline for production, estimation of expected costs, and proper electronic delivery costs applied.

3. Public Hearing on Formal Complaint (December 16, 2025)

On March 6, 2026, I renewed my formal demand for a public hearing before the Asotin County Board of Commissioners regarding:

- The unlawful withholding of records in response to PDR 25-23; and
- The unauthorized expenditure of public funds for the legal defense of Judge Brooke Burns (SAO Hotline Case H-25-795), ("PDR 26-01")

To date, I have received no response to this demand. The Board has now had nearly three months to schedule this matter for public discussion. Its continued refusal to do so violates the Open Public Meetings Act (RCW 42.30), Asotin County's own public meeting procedures, and the public's right to transparent government.

Please provide, by close of business on March 9th, 2026 (Monday):

- Confirmation that this matter has been placed on the agenda of the next available public meeting of the Board of Commissioners.
- The date, time, and location (including Zoom access information as provided in Resolution #25-07) for that meeting.
- Copies of any records, including communications among county officials, counsel, and Clear Risk Solutions, regarding the decision not to schedule this hearing or the strategy surrounding obstruction of it.

Conclusion

The public has a right to know how its tax dollars are being spent and whether its elected officials are complying with the law. The ongoing withholding of records, self redactions and refusal to hold a public hearing only deepen the appearance of obstruction.

I expect a complete response to each of the items above by March 9th, 2026.

Respectfully,

Corey Michael Switzer
[264 Kernodle Rd](#)
[Gibsonville, NC 27249](#)
coreyswitzer@gmail.com
218-461-9868

Note: This communication is a public record. Retaliatory action against a person exercising their rights violates RCW 42.56.550(4).

On Fri, Mar 6, 2026, 2:57 PM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

Subject: BREAKING: The Asotin County "Receipts" – PDR 26-01 Exemption Log Proves Coordinated Obstruction by Judge Burns and Her Attorney

March 6, 2026

To all parties, media outlets, oversight bodies, and witnesses copied herein:

This email serves as an urgent update to the March RICO Correspondence thread. Attached is the complete production from Asotin County in response to Public Records Request PDR 26-01, along with the Exemption Log 26-01 just received.

This document—102 pages of internal communications, now accompanied by an exemption log—confirms everything I have alleged about the coordinated effort to conceal the use of public funds for Judge Brooke Burns' legal defense and to obstruct public records requests. The paper trail is now complete. The cover-up is exposed.

I have said for months that Asotin County was hiding something. Now we have the proof, and the exemption log itself proves the bad faith.

THE EXEMPTION LOG: WHAT IT REVEALS

1. The redactions were performed by Amanda Daylong—the same attorney now representing Judge Burns. (Attached)

The exemption log lists multiple emails between Chris Kemp and Amanda Daylong that were redacted under claims of attorney-client privilege. Daylong is a partner at Floyd, Pflueger, Kearns, Nedderman & Gress, P.S.—the Seattle law firm hired to defend Judge Burns after the Asotin County Prosecutor's office withdrew. (See July 8-9, 2025 email chain, attached.)

This means the person making the redaction decisions is the same attorney representing the judge whose conduct is at issue. She is redacting her own communications with county officials about how to respond to my public records request—a request that seeks information about her own client's legal defense.

This is not privilege. This is a conflict of interest and a fraud on the public.

2. Judge Brooke Burns, Curtis Liedkie, Stacey Harmon and Chris Kemp are actively involved in concealing public records.

The exemption log confirms that on December 16, 2025, at 9:00 AM, Judge Burns herself forwarded my formal complaint to her attorney, Amanda Daylong, and that email was redacted under a claim of attorney-client privilege. (Exemption Log, p. 1, Document dated 12/16/2025, Author: Brooke Burns, Recipient: Amanda Daylong, Exemption: 5.60.060)

Let that sink in. A sitting Superior Court judge was personally forwarding a public records request—one that sought information about her own legal defense—to her private attorney, and that communication is now being withheld from the public. The judge is not the client of the county; she is the subject of the records request. This is an impermissible use of privilege to shield a public official's personal communications from public scrutiny.

3. The exemption log is legally insufficient on its face.

RCW 42.56.210(3) requires that when an agency withholds records, it must provide a "brief explanation of how the exemption applies to the record withheld." This log provides nothing but a statutory citation. No explanation of why the privilege applies. No identification of which specific portions were redacted. No showing that the privilege was properly invoked.

The log lists 16 separate redactions, nearly all under 5.60.060 (attorney-client privilege) and a handful under 42.56.290 (personal information). But it provides zero context, zero justification, and zero evidence that the privilege was properly asserted. A spreadsheet with dates and statutes is not an exemption log—it's an admission that they have no actual justification.

4. The timing proves coordination, not privilege.

Look at the sequence:

Date Event

Dec 16, 2025 (7:45 AM) I file formal complaint with Asotin County Board

Dec 16, 2025 (9:00 AM) Judge Burns forwards my complaint to Daylong (redacted)

Dec 16, 2025 (9:53 AM) Kemp forwards everything to insurance carrier

Dec 16, 2025 (12:56-1:08 PM) Kemp and Daylong begin coordinating response

Dec 18-22, 2025 Strategy meetings scheduled and held

The county cannot claim that emails discussing how to respond to a public records request—sent the same day the request was received—are privileged legal advice. They are administrative communications about public business. The privilege claim is pretextual.

5. Daylong's own emails confirm the cover-up.

In the July 9, 2025 email chain (attached), Daylong explicitly states that she is now "sole counsel of record" for Judge Burns. Yet the exemption log shows her communicating with county officials about strategy—communications that are now being withheld from the public. She cannot simultaneously serve as private counsel to a judge and participate in county strategy sessions about public records, then claim those communications are privileged.

6. Every single redacted communication involves public business, not private legal advice.

The emails redacted under 5.60.060 involve:

- A judge forwarding a public complaint to her attorney
- A COO coordinating with outside counsel about a public records response
- County officials scheduling meetings to discuss a whistleblower complaint
- Attorneys strategizing about how to respond to a State Auditor investigation

None of this is privileged. It is public business being conducted in secret, with an attorney now using privilege claims to hide it.

THE JULY 2025 EMAIL CHAIN: ADDITIONAL PROOF OF BAD FAITH

The attached July 8-9, 2025 email chain between myself and Amanda Daylong is critical context. In it:

- Daylong confirms that the Asotin County Prosecutor's office "has withdrawn" and that her firm is now "sole counsel of record" for Judge Burns.

- I raised concerns about Lisa Webber, the Asotin County Coroner, being included on service lists in violation of RCW 36.24.170, which bars coroners from practicing law.
- Daylong dismissed these concerns, claiming Webber was merely an "administrative assistant."
- I provided evidence—including Asotin County Commissioner Minutes—showing that Webber was approving prosecution contracts, which constitutes the unauthorized practice of law.

Now, months later, the exemption log shows that Daylong's own communications with county officials about this very matter are being redacted. The pattern is consistent: whenever public scrutiny threatens, the response is secrecy and privilege claims.

WHAT THIS PROVES

1. Judge Burns is not an impartial arbiter. She is a direct participant in the cover-up. Her decision to forward my complaint to her attorney and have that communication shielded by the county demonstrates that she viewed this as a personal legal matter, not a governmental transparency issue. Her subsequent blocking of me on social media—the subject of my federal complaint—was not an isolated act of pique. It was part of a coordinated strategy to silence a critic and hide the truth.
2. The county's PRA responses were never in good faith. The delay, the inflated cost estimates, the blanket privilege claims—all of it was coordinated. The exemption log proves that the county was not simply responding to requests; they were actively managing a crisis, with the judge's private attorney making redaction decisions to protect her own client.
3. The redactions were performed by someone with a direct interest in the outcome. Amanda Daylong is paid to defend Judge Burns. She cannot be trusted to neutrally apply public records exemptions to communications involving her own client. This is a structural due process violation.
4. The SAO investigation is more critical than ever. The county's internal discussions about "new/clean answers" for the SAO (PDR 26-01, p. 101) suggest they were actively shaping the narrative to present to auditors. The audit scheduled for Fall 2026 must now include a review of these internal communications, the role of outside counsel in making redaction decisions, and the county's coordination to limit disclosure.
5. This is part of the same pattern as Idaho. The coordinated obstruction I documented in Nez Perce County—the inflated cost estimates, the privilege claims, the delays—is mirrored here in Asotin County. The same tactics, the same actors (the Liedkie family, the prosecutors, the judges), and the same result: a wall of secrecy designed to protect public officials from accountability.

THE TIMELINE THAT MATTERS

Date Event

July 8-9, 2025 Daylong confirms she is sole counsel for Judge Burns; I raise Webber concerns
 Dec 10, 2025 I file SAO Hotline Complaint H-25-795
 Dec 15, 2025 SAO confirms audit for Fall 2026
 Dec 16, 2025 (7:45 AM) I file formal complaint with Asotin County Board
 Dec 16, 2025 (9:00 AM) Judge Burns forwards my complaint to Daylong (redacted)
 Dec 16, 2025 (9:53 AM) Kemp forwards everything to insurance carrier

Dec 16, 2025 (12:56-1:08 PM) Kemp and Daylong begin coordinating response
Dec 18, 2025 Meeting scheduled to strategize
Dec 22, 2025 Strategy meeting held
Dec 31, 2025 Harman responds with "no funds expended" claim
Jan 7-10, 2026 More coordination between Kemp, Daylong, and insurance
Feb 20, 2026 Kemp invoices me \$10.20 for 102 pages
Mar 2, 2026 I receive the production
Mar 6, 2026 I receive the Exemption Log

WHAT COMES NEXT

1. This document is now part of the federal record. It will be attached as an exhibit to my forthcoming § 1983 and RICO complaint in the U.S. District Court for the District of Idaho and or Eastern Washington. It proves conspiracy, obstruction, and bad faith by multiple defendants.
2. The SAO must expand its investigation. The audit scheduled for Fall 2026 must now include a review of these internal communications, the role of outside counsel in making redaction decisions, and the county's coordination with Daylong to limit disclosure.
3. Judge Burns faces renewed scrutiny. Her active participation in concealing records—while sitting as a Superior Court judge—raises profound ethical and constitutional questions. Her conduct violates the Code of Judicial Conduct, the Public Records Act, and the public trust.
4. The media now has the receipts. Every journalist copied on this email now has 102 pages of internal county

From: "ATG WWW Public Records Requests" <PublicRecords@ATG.WA.GOV>

To: "Damerow, Morgan B (ATG)" <morgan.damerow@atg.wa.gov>

Cc: "Drewry, Melissa (ATG)" <Melissa.Drewry@atg.wa.gov>

Subject: FW: URGENT: FORMAL COMPLAINT - OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE & PRA VIOLATIONS (PDR 25-23/25-24)

Date: Wed, 04 Jun 2025 22:47:41 -0000

Importance: Normal

Attachments: Gmail_-_URGENT_Formal_Demand_for_Compliance_&_Ombudsman_Intervention_-_PDR_25-23_&_25-24_Violations.pdf; Gmail_-_PDR_25-23_(3).pdf; PDR_25-23_Exempt_Log.pdf

Hi Morgan – This relates to the .530 forwarded to you earlier today.

From: Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, June 4, 2025 2:30 PM

To: Intake <intake@wsba.org>

Cc: Public Disclosure <PDisclosure@asotincountywa.gov>; AGO Ombuds <agoombuds@ATG.WA.GOV>; ATG WWW Public Records Requests <PublicRecords@ATG.WA.GOV>; SHarman@asotincountywa.gov; cliedkie@asotincountywa.gov; lwebber@asotincountywa.gov

Subject: Re: URGENT: FORMAL COMPLAINT - OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE & PRA VIOLATIONS (PDR 25-23/25-24)

[EXTERNAL]

****Subject:**** URGENT: FORMAL COMPLAINT - OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE & PRA VIOLATIONS (PDR 25-23/25-24)

****To:**** intake@wsba.org

****Cc:**** AGOombuds@atg.wa.gov, publicrecords@atg.wa.gov, SHarman@asotincountywa.gov, cliedkie@asotincountywa.gov, lwebber@asotincountywa.gov

****Attachments:****

- [PDR 25-23 Exemption Log.pdf]
- [URGENT_Formal_Demand_PDR_25-23_25-24.pdf]
- [PDR_25-24_NonCompliance.pdf]

Washington State Bar Association

****Intake Office****

intake@wsba.org

Re: Formal Complaint Against Curtis Liedkie, Lisa Webber, Brooke Burns & Asotin County Officials

Dear Ethics Counsel,

I file this formal complaint under ****Washington Rules for Enforcement of Lawyer Conduct (ELC) 5.3**** against:

1. ****Curtis Liedkie**** (Deputy Prosecutor)

2. **Lisa Webber** (County Official, not licensed to practice law)
3. **Judge Brooke Burns** (Superior Court)
4. **Stacey Harman** (Clerk/HR, Records Officer)

for **systemic obstruction of justice**, **abuse of public office**, and **conspiracy to violate the Public Records Act (RCW 42.56)** related to ongoing litigation (**Case #1040806**).

I. SUMMARY OF MISCONDUCT

A. **Fraudulent Records Processing**

- **PDR 25-23** (emails among Liedkie/Webber/Burns):
 - Withheld a responsive email under false "attorney-client privilege" (**RCW 5.60.060(2)(a)**) despite:
 - Communications involving **judicial misconduct** are **governmental functions**, not privileged (See **Sheehan v. Central Puget Sound Transit**).
 - No exemption log provided until complaint (attached).
- **PDR 25-24** (emails to/from Stacey Harman):
 - Produced **26 non-responsive documents** (May 30, 2025) while ignoring the narrowed scope.
 - Fraudulently declared request "closed."

B. **Conflict of Interest & Abuse of Authority**

- The Prosecutor's Office (Liedkie) represents **Judge Burns** in Case #1040806 while withholding records exposing her ethics violations (**CJC Rule 1.7**).
- Ms. Harman colluded in this obstruction by:
 - Ignoring **fee waiver requests** (**RCW 42.56.120(4)**).
 - Refusing **third-party oversight** (**RCW 42.56.210(3)**).
 - Expanding date ranges to conceal records.

C. **Retaliatory Timeline**

- Records produced **only** after:
 - June 2 formal demand to AG Ombudsman (attached).
 - Threat of federal litigation (18 U.S.C. § 241).

II. VIOLATIONS

| **Party** | **Violation** | **Rule/Statute** |

Liedkie/Webber	Conspiracy to obstruct PRA compliance	ELC 8.4(c)/(d)
Judge Burns	Using judicial office to shield misconduct records	CJC Rule 1.2, 2.9
Harman	Bad-faith records handling; false exemption claims	RCW 42.56.070(1)
All	Deprivation of rights under color of law	(42 U.S.C. § 1983) 18 U.S.C. § 242

III. DEMANDED ACTIONS

1. **Immediate suspension** of Liedkie/Webber's law licenses pending investigation.
2. **Forensic audit** of Asotin County records systems by the State Auditor.
3. **WSBA sanctions** for:
 - Knowingly making false statements (ELC 3.3).
 - Concealing evidence of judicial misconduct (ELC 8.4(g)).
4. **Referral** to the Commission on Judicial Conduct for Judge Burns' removal.

IV. EVIDENCE (See Attachments)

1. **PDR 25-23 Exemption Log**: Proof of false privilege claim.
2. **June 2 Formal Demand**: County's pattern of noncompliance.
3. **PDR 25-24 Production**: Irrelevant documents confirming obstruction.

> **Public Interest Certification**: This complaint serves the public interest under RCW 42.56.030.

Respectfully submitted,
Corey Michael Switzer
coreyswitzer@gmail.com | 218-461-9868
264 Kernodle Rd, Gibsonville, NC 27249

Copied to: WA AG Ombudsman, State Auditor, Judicial Conduct Commission

Attachments:
1. `PDR\_25-23\_Exemption\_Log.pdf`
2. `URGENT\_Formal\_Demand\_PDR\_25-23\_25-24.pdf`
3. `PDR\_25-24\_NonCompliance\_Production.pdf`

On Mon, Jun 2, 2025, 5:06 PM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

Subject: URGENT: Formal Demand for Compliance & Ombudsman Intervention - PDR 25-23 & 25-24
To: Stacey Harman (sharman@asotincountywa.gov), Public Disclosure (PDisclosure@asotincountywa.gov)
CC: AGOombuds@atg.wa.gov, publicrecords@atg.wa.gov, saopublicrecords@sao.wa.gov

Corey Michael Switzer
264 Kernodle Rd, Gibsonville, NC 27249
coreyswitzer@gmail.com | 218-461-9868
June 2, 2025

Stacey Harman
Asotin County Clerk to the Board of Commissioners/HR Specialist
Public Disclosure Office

Washington State Attorney General's Office
Public Records Ombudsman
Washington State Auditor

Re: Formal Demand for Statutory Compliance & Request for Ombudsman Intervention (PDR 25-23 & 25-24)

Dear Ms. Harman and Public Records Ombudsman,

This communication addresses Asotin County's **systemic violations** of the Washington Public Records Act (PRA) (**RCW 42.56**) regarding two requests involving judicial ethics violations:

1. ****PDR #25-23**** (Submitted April 25, 2025 | 38 Days Pending)
2. ****PDR #25-24**** (Submitted April 30, 2025 | 33 Days Pending)

Both requests seek records documenting misconduct related to ****Superior Court Judge Brooke Burns**** and ongoing litigation (****Case #1040806****), creating an irreconcilable conflict of interest in Asotin, Garfield, and Columbia counties.

I. Critical Violations Summary

****PDR 25-23****

-  ****Zero Records Produced**** despite narrowed scope (emails among ***Curt Liedkie, Lisa Webber, Judge Burns***)
-  ****Unlawful Fee Waiver Denial**** (RCW 42.56.120(4))
-  ****Missed 5-Day Deadline**** (RCW 42.56.520)

****PDR 25-24****

-  ****Non-Responsive Production**** (May 30: 26 irrelevant attachments)
-  ****Fraudulent Closure**** of request without compliance
-  ****Conflict of Interest**** in records processing

II. Immediate Compliance Demands

By ****5:00 PM PST on June 6, 2025****, provide:

| Request | Required Actions |

|-----|-----|

| ****PDR 25-23**** |

1. All emails (Jan 1, 2022–Apr 30, 2025) among Liedkie/Webber/Burns re: #1040806

2. Fee waiver approval |

| ****PDR 25-24**** |

1. Reprocessed emails ***to/from Stacey Harman*** (Apr 14–May 2, 2025) with keywords

2. Segregated as “Conflict of Interest Communications” |

| ****BOTH**** |

- Detailed exemption logs (RCW 42.56.210(3))

- Third-party oversight confirmation

Unredacted PDFs via email |

III. Request for Ombudsman Intervention

Pursuant to ****RCW 42.56.550(3)****, I request the Attorney General’s Office:

1. ****Investigate**** obstruction of justice in records processing
2. ****Compel immediate production**** by June 6 deadline
3. ****Appoint State Auditor**** as neutral arbitrator for exemption reviews

IV. Legal Consequences of Noncompliance

Failure to comply will compel:

- ****Writs of Mandamus**** filed in ****Thurston County Superior Court**** (Olympia) on June 7, 2025, seeking:
 - \$100/day penalties (\$5,600+ total liability)
 - Removal of conflicted parties from records processing
- ****Federal Complaints**** (18 U.S.C. §§ 241-242) for:
 - Obstruction of justice
 - Deprivation of rights under color of law
- ****Judicial Misconduct Complaints**** to:
 - Washington Commission on Judicial Conduct
 - Ninth Circuit Judicial Council

Attachments

1. PDR 25-23 Full Correspondence
2. PDR 25-24 Full Correspondence
3. Certification of Indigency

****CERTIFICATION OF INDIGENCY****

I declare under penalty of perjury that these requests serve the public interest.

****Corey Michael Switzer****

Electronic Signature

> *This communication is a public record. Retaliatory action violates RCW 42.56.550(4).*



URGENT: Formal Demand for Compliance & Ombudsman Intervention - PDR 25-23 & 25-24 Violations

1 message

Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com>

Mon, Jun 2, 2025 at 5:06 PM

To: Stacey Harman <SHarman@asotincountywa.gov>

Cc: Public Disclosure <PDisclosure@asotincountywa.gov>, AGOOmbuds@atg.wa.gov, publicrecords@atg.wa.gov, saopublicrecords@sao.wa.gov

****Subject:**** URGENT: Formal Demand for Compliance & Ombudsman Intervention - PDR 25-23 & 25-24

****To:**** Stacey Harman (sharman@asotincountywa.gov), Public Disclosure (PDisclosure@asotincountywa.gov)

****CC:**** AGOOmbuds@atg.wa.gov, publicrecords@atg.wa.gov, saopublicrecords@sao.wa.gov

****Corey Michael Switzer****

264 Kernodle Rd, Gibsonville, NC 27249

coreyswitzer@gmail.com | 218-461-9868

June 2, 2025

****Stacey Harman****

Asotin County Clerk to the Board of Commissioners/HR Specialist

****Public Disclosure Office****

****Washington State Attorney General's Office****

Public Records Ombudsman

****Washington State Auditor****

Re: Formal Demand for Statutory Compliance & Request for Ombudsman Intervention (PDR 25-23 & 25-24)

Dear Ms. Harman and Public Records Ombudsman,

This communication addresses Asotin County's ****systemic violations**** of the Washington Public Records Act (PRA) (****RCW 42.56****) regarding two requests involving judicial ethics violations:

1. ****PDR #25-23**** (Submitted April 25, 2025 | 38 Days Pending)
2. ****PDR #25-24**** (Submitted April 30, 2025 | 33 Days Pending)

Both requests seek records documenting misconduct related to ****Superior Court Judge Brooke Burns**** and ongoing litigation (****Case #1040806****), creating an irreconcilable conflict of interest in Asotin, Garfield, and Columbia counties.

I. Critical Violations Summary

****PDR 25-23****

-  ****Zero Records Produced**** despite narrowed scope (emails among *Curt Liedkie, Lisa Webber, Judge Burns*)
-  ****Unlawful Fee Waiver Denial**** (RCW 42.56.120(4))
-  ****Missed 5-Day Deadline**** (RCW 42.56.520)

****PDR 25-24****

-  ****Non-Responsive Production**** (May 30: 26 irrelevant attachments)
-  ****Fraudulent Closure**** of request without compliance
-  ****Conflict of Interest**** in records processing

II. Immediate Compliance Demands

By **5:00 PM PST on June 6, 2025**, provide:

| Request | Required Actions |

|-----|-----|

| **PDR 25-23** |

1. All emails (Jan 1, 2022–Apr 30, 2025) among Liedkie/Webber/Burns re: #1040806

2. Fee waiver approval |

| **PDR 25-24** |

1. Reprocessed emails *to/from Stacey Harman* (Apr 14–May 2, 2025) with keywords

2. Segregated as “Conflict of Interest Communications” |

| **BOTH** |

- Detailed exemption logs (RCW 42.56.210(3))

- Third-party oversight confirmation

Unredacted PDFs via email |

III. Request for Ombudsman Intervention

Pursuant to **RCW 42.56.550(3)**, I request the Attorney General’s Office:

1. **Investigate** obstruction of justice in records processing

2. **Compel immediate production** by June 6 deadline

3. **Appoint State Auditor** as neutral arbitrator for exemption reviews

IV. Legal Consequences of Noncompliance

Failure to comply will compel:

- **Writs of Mandamus** filed in **Thurston County Superior Court** (Olympia) on June 7, 2025, seeking:

- \$100/day penalties (\$5,600+ total liability)

- Removal of conflicted parties from records processing

- **Federal Complaints** (18 U.S.C. §§ 241-242) for:

- Obstruction of justice

- Deprivation of rights under color of law

- **Judicial Misconduct Complaints** to:

- Washington Commission on Judicial Conduct

- Ninth Circuit Judicial Council

Attachments

1. PDR 25-23 Full Correspondence

2. PDR 25-24 Full Correspondence

3. Certification of Indigency

CERTIFICATION OF INDIGENCY

I declare under penalty of perjury that these requests serve the public interest.

Corey Michael Switzer

Electronic Signature

> *This communication is a public record. Retaliatory action violates RCW 42.56.550(4).*

2 attachments



Gmail - RE_ Public Records Request (PDR 25-23).pdf

214 KB



Gmail - PDR 25-24.pdf

179 KB



PDR 25-23

2 messages

Stacey Harman <SHarman@asotincountywa.gov>
To: coreyswitzer@gmail.com <coreyswitzer@gmail.com>

Wed, Jun 4, 2025 at 11:44 AM

Good afternoon, Mr. Switzer,

The IT search of emails for PDR 25-23, per your request has been completed. The search yielded 1 responsive email "TO OR FROM OR CC CONTAINS: lwebber@co.asotin.wa.us OR lwebber@asotincountywa.gov OR cliedkie@co.asotin.wa.us OR cliedkie@asotincountywa.gov OR bburns@co.asotin.wa.us OR bburns@asotincountywa.gov AND DATES BETWEEN: 01-01-2022 AND 04-25-2025 AND ENTIRE MESSAGE CONTAINS: "Corey" OR "Switzer" OR "Corey Switzer" OR "Michael" OR "Corey Michael Switzer" OR "coreyswitzer@gmail.com" OR "1040806".

The email is exempt from disclosure Per RCW 42.56.070(1);RCW 5.60.060(2)(a).

RCW 42.56.070(1) Each agency, in accordance with published rules, shall make available for public inspection and copying all public records, unless the record falls within the specific exemptions of subsection (8) of this section, this chapter, or other statute which exempts or prohibits disclosure of specific information or records. To the extent required to prevent an unreasonable invasion of personal privacy interests protected by this chapter, an agency shall delete identifying details in a manner consistent with this chapter when it makes available or publishes any public record; however, in each case, the justification for the deletion shall be explained fully in writing.

RCW 5.60.060 (2)(a) An attorney or counselor shall not, without the consent of his or her client, be examined as to any communication made by the client to him or her, or his or her advice given thereon in the course of professional employment.

No other responsive records were found.

Please see attached you will find a PDF of the associated exemption log.

your request is now considered closed.

There is a one-year statute of limitations for judicial review of public records.

Please feel free to reach out if you have any questions or need any further information,

Sincerely,

Stacey Harman

Asotin County

Clerk to the Board of Commissioners/

Human Resources Specialist

sharman@co.asotin.wa.us

509-243-2060

Please note the updated email address: sharman@asotincountywa.gov



PDR 25-23 Exempt Log.pdf

166 KB

Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com>

Wed, Jun 4, 2025 at 11:52 AM

To: Stacey Harman <SHarman@asotincountywa.gov>

Cc: ** Public Disclosure <PDisclosure@asotincountywa.gov>, AGOOmbuds@atg.wa.gov, publicrecords@atg.wa.gov, Intake <intake@wsba.org>

****Subject:** FORMAL CHALLENGE TO UNLAWFUL WITHHOLDING & DEMAND FOR COMPLIANCE (PDR 25-23)**

****To:**** Stacey Harman <SHarman@asotincountywa.gov>

****Cc:**** Public Disclosure <PDisclosure@asotincountywa.gov>, AGOOmbuds@atg.wa.gov, publicrecords@atg.wa.gov, intake@wsba.org

****Attachments:****

Dear Ms. Harman,

I formally challenge Asotin County's unlawful withholding of the sole responsive record for ****PDR 25-23**** under ****RCW 42.56.070(1)**** and ****RCW 5.60.060(2)(a)****. This exemption claim is invalid for the following reasons:

1. ****Invalid Attorney-Client Privilege Assertion****

- ****RCW 5.60.060(2)(a)**** protects *legal advice*, not routine governmental functions. Communications involving judicial ethics violations (****Case #1040806****) or misuse of public office constitute ****official business****, not privileged legal counsel.

- The Prosecutor's Office cannot ethically shield records exposing misconduct by Judge Burns, whom it represents—a ****direct conflict**** violating ****CJC Rule 1.7****.

2. ****Failure to Segregate & Disclose Non-Exempt Content****

- ****RCW 42.56.070(1)**** requires agencies to redact only exempt portions and disclose the remainder. The County provided *no segregable content*, violating the PRA's core transparency mandate.

3. ****Fraudulent Closure of Request****

- Declaring PDR 25-23 "closed" without:

- Producing the exemption log (*attached but unprovided in your email*),
- Addressing the unresolved ****fee waiver**** (****RCW 42.56.120(4)****),
- Confirming ****third-party oversight**** for conflict-of-interest reviews (****RCW 42.56.210(3)****), constitutes ****bad-faith obstruction****.

****Immediate Demands****

By ****5:00 PM PST on June 6, 2025****, provide:

1. ****Unredacted Copy**** of the withheld email, with metadata proving its relevance to the scope.
2. ****Complete Exemption Log**** (per ****RCW 42.56.210(3)****) detailing:
 - Date, sender, recipient, and statutory basis for each redaction.
3. ****Written Confirmation**** of neutral third-party oversight for exemption reviews.
4. ****Fee Waiver Approval**** under ****RCW 42.56.120(4)****.

****Legal Consequences****

Failure to comply will compel:

- ****Writ of Mandamus**** (RCW 42.56.550) seeking \$100/day penalties.
- ****Ethics Complaints**** to the WSBA, Commission on Judicial Conduct, and U.S. DOJ for:
 - Obstruction of justice (18 U.S.C. § 241),
 - Conspiracy to conceal judicial misconduct.

This request remains ****OPEN**** until lawful compliance is achieved.

****CERTIFICATION OF INDIGENCY****

I declare under penalty of perjury that this request serves the public interest.

****Corey Michael Switzer****

coreyswitzer@gmail.com | 218-461-9868

264 Kernodle Rd, Gibsonville, NC 27249

> *This communication is a public record. Retaliatory action violates RCW 42.56.550(4).*

**Key Legal Citations**

1. ****RCW 42.56.070(1)****: Duty to segregate and disclose non-exempt content.
2. ****Sheehan v. Central Puget Sound Transit****, 155 Wn. App. 790 (2010): Limits attorney-client privilege to *legal advice*, not government operations.
3. ****RCW 42.56.210(3)****: Requires detailed exemption logs.

[Quoted text hidden]

2 attachments

 **Gmail - PDR 25-23.pdf**
102 KB

 **PDR 25-23 Exempt Log.pdf**
166 KB

Exemption Log

Prosecutors still
PDR 25.23

Document Type/Description	Date	Author	Recipient (including CC's)	Exemption/Explanation*	Pages
Email Subject: Judge Burns	4/24/25	Davud Risley	Curt Liedkie, Lisa Webber	RCW 42.56.070(1); RCW 5.60.060(2)(a)Communication to attorney from client for the purpose of obtaining legal advice	1-2

From: Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com>

To: serviceATG@atg.wa.gov

Subject: Re: 104080-6 - Corey Michael Switzer v. Hon. Brooke Burns

Date: Fri, 18 Jul 2025 15:06:30 -0400

Importance: Normal

Attachments: Proof_Of_Service.pdf

[EXTERNAL]

Please see attached proof of personal service on Hon. Judge Brooke Burns

On Wed, Jul 2, 2025, 8:05 AM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

Subject: SERVICE OF PROCESS: Switzer v. Burns - Case No. 104080-6

The Office of the Attorney General of Washington:

Pursuant to your published policy (<https://www.atg.wa.gov/contact-us>), I hereby serve the following documents via email to serviceATG@atg.wa.gov for the action against state official Judge Brooke Burns:

1. Summons to Hon. Judge Brooke Burns
2. Petition for Writ of Mandamus and Declaratory Relief (With Exhibits A-D)

****Case Details**:**

- Supreme Court Case No.: 104080-6
- Petitioner: Corey Michael Switzer
- Respondent: Hon. Brooke Burns, Asotin County Superior Court

Per your policy, I request formal acknowledgment of receipt by an Assistant Attorney General.

Respectfully,
Corey Michael Switzer
264 Kernodle Rd, Gibsonville, NC 27249
coreyswitzer@gmail.com | (218)-461-9868

Attachments:

- Summons.pdf (Burns)
- Petition_Mandamus_Burns.pdf (With Exhibits)

DECLARATION OF PERSONAL SERVICE

STATE OF WASHINGTON

COUNTY OF ASOTIN

I, ** Brennon Lake Leafly **

[Full Name of Process Server], declare:

1. I am over 18 years old and not a party to this action. My residence address is:

** 2432 14th Avenue ** (Street Address)

** ** (Apartment, Lot,)

** Lewiston, Idaho, 83501 ** (City, State, Zip)

2. On ** July 18th 2025 ** [Date] at ** 10:43 AM ** [Time], I personally served:

** The Honorable Brooke Burns **

At: ** Asotin County Superior Court **

135 2nd St, Asotin, WA 99402

3. I served the following documents related to *Corey Michael Switzer v. Brooke Burns*:

- ☒ ** Subpoena ** (1 page; dated June 2nd, 2025)
- ☒ ** Cover Letter ** (2 pages; dated April 2, 2025)
- ☒ ** Petition for Writ of Mandamus ** (2 pages)
- ☒ ** Exhibit Cover ** (1 page; dated April 3, 2025)
- ☒ ** Exhibits A-D ** (4 pages)

** Total pages served: 10 **.

4. Judge Burns was identified by:

** Introduced here, prior recognition **

[e.g., "judicial robes in courtroom", "court staff confirmation", "prior recognition"]

5. I handed the documents directly to Judge Burns at approximately ** 10:43 AM ** [Time].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of Washington that the foregoing is true.

[Signature]

** Signature of Process Server **

Date: ** 7/18/25 **

****NOTARY SECTION****

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO before me this ** 18 ** day of ** July **, 2025.

[Signature]

** Notary Public Signature **

*Printed Name: ** J. Tiller **

*Commission Expires ** 28 **

[NOTARY SEAL]



From: Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com>

To: serviceATG@atg.wa.gov

Subject: Re: 104080-6 - Corey Michael Switzer v. Hon. Brooke Burns

Date: Wed, 23 Jul 2025 15:41:19 -0400

Importance: Normal

Attachments: - _1040806_-_Public_-_Setting_Letter_-_Commissioners_Calendar_-_7_22_2025.pdf

[EXTERNAL]

Please see attached notice of Appearance of Public Setting.

On Fri, Jul 18, 2025, 3:06 PM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

Please see attached proof of personal service on Hon. Judge Brooke Burns

On Wed, Jul 2, 2025, 8:05 AM Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> wrote:

Subject: SERVICE OF PROCESS: Switzer v. Burns - Case No. 104080-6

The Office of the Attorney General of Washington:

Pursuant to your published policy (<https://www.atg.wa.gov/contact-us>), I hereby serve the following documents via email to serviceATG@atg.wa.gov for the action against state official Judge Brooke Burns:

1. Summons to Hon. Judge Brooke Burns
2. Petition for Writ of Mandamus and Declaratory Relief (With Exhibits A-D)

****Case Details**:**

- Supreme Court Case No.: 104080-6
- Petitioner: Corey Michael Switzer
- Respondent: Hon. Brooke Burns, Asotin County Superior Court

Per your policy, I request formal acknowledgment of receipt by an Assistant Attorney General.

Respectfully,
Corey Michael Switzer
264 Kernodle Rd, Gibsonville, NC 27249
coreyswitzer@gmail.com | (218)-461-9868

Attachments:

- Summons.pdf (Burns)
- Petition_Mandamus_Burns.pdf (With Exhibits)

THE SUPREME COURT

STATE OF WASHINGTON

SARAH R. PENDLETON
SUPREME COURT CLERK

REZA J. PAZOOKI
DEPUTY CLERK/
CHIEF STAFF ATTORNEY



TEMPLE OF JUSTICE
P.O. BOX 40929
OLYMPIA, WA 98504-0929

(360) 357-2077
e-mail: supreme@courts.wa.gov
www.courts.wa.gov

July 22, 2025

LETTER SENT BY E-MAIL ONLY

Corey Michael Switzer
264 Kernodle Road
Gibsonville, NC 27249
coreyswitzer@gmail.com

Amanda Dawn Daylong
Floyd, Pflueger, Kearns, Nedderman &
Gre
3101 Western Ave Ste 400
Seattle, WA 98121-3017
ADaylong@NWTrialAttorneys.com

Francis Stanley Floyd
Floyd, Pflueger, Kearns, Nedderman
& Gre
3101 Western Ave Ste 400
Seattle, WA 98121-3017
ffloyd@NWTrialAttorneys.com

Re: Supreme Court No. 1040806 – Corey Michael Switzer v. Hon. Brooke Burns

Counsel and Corey Switzer:

On July 7, 2025, the filing fee was paid and on July 21, 2025, proof of service of the petition was received.

The petition against state officer and the motion to disqualify counsel previously filed on April 21, 2025, have been tentatively set on the Supreme Court Commissioner's September 17, 2025, Motion Calendar for an initial determination as specified in RAP 16.2(d).

Any answer to the petition or motion should be served and filed by not later than **August 22, 2025**. Any reply to any answer should be served and filed by **September 5, 2025**.

Sincerely,

Reza J. Pazooki
Supreme Court Deputy Clerk

RJP:af