



FORMAL RESPONSE TO AGO INTERNAL RECORDS - RE: Switzer v. Asotin County (No. 26-2-00027-07), AGO Misconduct, and CJTC Case Nos. 2026-0000406 & 2026-0000213

1 message

Corey Switzer <coreyswitzer@gmail.com> Fri, Jul 17, 2026 at 4:02 PM
To: Nick.Brown <Nick.Brown@atg.wa.gov>, melanie.tratnik@atg.wa.gov, melissa.drewry@atg.wa.gov, Krueger, Jessica <Jessica.Krueger@atg.wa.gov>, morgan.damerow <morgan.damerow@atg.wa.gov>, lisa.petersen@atg.wa.gov, jennifer.bancroft@atg.wa.gov, michael.litts@atg.wa.gov, rick.griffith@atg.wa.gov, Angie.Adams@atg.wa.gov, publicrecords <publicrecords@atg.wa.gov>, AGO Ombuds <AGOombuds@atg.wa.gov>, Hullinger, Randy (CJTC) <randy.hullinger@cjtc.wa.gov>, Kimberly Braden <kimb@co.adams.wa.gov>, Shaw, Alisha (SAO) <shawa@sao.wa.gov>, Intake <intake@wsba.org>, Civil.Fraud <Civil.Fraud@usdoj.gov>, civilrights <civilrights@atg.wa.gov>
Cc: Amanda Daylong <ADaylong@nwtrialattorneys.com>, Tammy Bolte <tbolte@nwtrialattorneys.com>, Chris Kemp <CKemp@asotincountywa.gov>, Public Disclosure <PDisclosure@asotincountywa.gov>, Curt Liedkie <cliedkie@asotincountywa.gov>, Stacey Harman <SHarman@asotincountywa.gov>, Brian Shinn <bshinn@asotincountywa.gov>, Chris Seubert <cseubert@asotincountywa.gov>, Charles Whitman <cwhitman@asotincountywa.gov>
Bcc:

Subject: FORMAL RESPONSE TO AGO INTERNAL RECORDS - RE: Switzer v. Asotin County (No. 26-2-00027-07), AGO Misconduct, and CJTC Case Nos. 2026-0000406 & 2026-0000213

Date: July 17, 2026

To:

- *Nick Brown, Washington State Attorney General* <Nick.Brown@atg.wa.gov>
- *Melanie Tratnik, Assistant Attorney General* <melanie.tratnik@atg.wa.gov>
- *Melissa Drewry, Public Records Officer* <melissa.drewry@atg.wa.gov>
- *Jessica Krueger, Public Records Officer* <jessica.krueger@atg.wa.gov>
- *Morgan Damerow, AGO* <morgan.damerow@atg.wa.gov>
- *Lisa Petersen, AGO* <lisa.petersen@atg.wa.gov>
- *Jennifer Bancroft, AGO* <jennifer.bancroft@atg.wa.gov>
- *Michael Litts, AGO* <michael.litts@atg.wa.gov>
- *Rick Griffith, AGO* <rick.griffith@atg.wa.gov>
- *Angie Adams, AGO* <angie.adams@atg.wa.gov>
- *AGO Public Records* <publicrecords@atg.wa.gov>
- *AGO Ombuds* <agoombuds@atg.wa.gov>

Cc:

- *Amanda D. Daylong, Counsel for Asotin County* <ADaylong@nwtrialattorneys.com>
- *Tammy Bolte, Legal Assistant* <tbolte@nwtrialattorneys.com>
- *Chris Kemp, Asotin County COO* <CKemp@asotincountywa.gov>
- *Asotin County Public Disclosure* <PDisclosure@asotincountywa.gov>
- *Curt Liedkie, Asotin County Prosecutor* <CLiedkie@asotincountywa.gov>
- *Lisa Webber, Asotin County Coroner* <LWebber@asotincountywa.gov>
- *Stacey Harman (former Clerk)* <SHarman@asotincountywa.gov>
- *Brian Shinn, Commissioner* <BShinn@asotincountywa.gov>
- *Chris Seubert, Commissioner* <CSeubert@asotincountywa.gov>
- *Charles Whitman, Commissioner* <CWhitman@asotincountywa.gov>

Bcc; Witnesses and Media Outlets

CJTC:

Randy Hullinger, Case Review Manager <randy.hullinger@cjtc.wa.gov>

Court:

Hon. K. Peter Palubicki (via Kimberly Braden) <Kimb@co.adams.wa.gov>

Kriston Chapman, Columbia County Clerk <kriston_chapman@co.columbia.wa.us>

Adrianne Krull, Court Administrator <AKrull@asotincountywa.gov>

Media/Oversight:

Washington State Auditor's Office <shawa@sao.wa.gov>

WA State Bar Association <intake@wsba.org>

U.S. Department of Justice <Civil.Fraud@usdoj.gov>

*Washington State Attorney General, Civil Rights Division: <civilrights@atg.wa.gov>

RE: AGO PRODUCTION PRR-2026-0558 - INTERNAL EMAILS REVEAL BIAS, DISMISSIVENESS, AND DELIBERATE AVOIDANCE

- I. INTRODUCTION

This email constitutes a formal response to records recently produced by the Washington State Attorney General's Office (AGO) in response to Public Records Request PRR-2026-0558 (the "AGO Production"). The AGO Production reveals that the AGO's response to my formal criminal referral (March 16, 2026) was not a good-faith legal analysis, but rather a ****dismissive form letter**** sent by an office that:

1. **Deliberately avoided** addressing the merits of the complaint;
2. **Made internal jokes** about the allegations;
3. **Requested to filter my emails** to avoid receiving them; and
4. **Directed me to the very agency implicated** in the alleged misconduct.

This email responds to each claim made in the AGO Production and the internal communications revealed therein.

- II. RESPONSE TO THE AGO'S MARCH 16, 2026 LETTER

A. The AGO's Claim: "The Attorney General's Office is not a law enforcement agency."

Response: This is correct as a general statement, but irrelevant. The AGO has ****independent statutory authority**** to investigate and prosecute certain crimes, including official misconduct (RCW 42.20.010) and false statements to public servants (RCW 9A.76.175). More importantly, the AGO has authority under RCW 43.10.040 and RCW 36.27.040 to act ****when the county prosecutor is disqualified.**** Here, the county prosecutor (Curtis Liedkie) is a direct target of the criminal referral. The AGO cannot hide behind a general statement about its role while ignoring its specific statutory duties.

B. The AGO's Claim: "Please direct your concerns to the local law enforcement agency... the Asotin County Sheriff's Office."

Response: This is the most egregious error in the AGO's response. The Asotin County Sheriff's Office is actively intimately implicated in the alleged misconduct:

- **Undersheriff Blake Richards** disabled Facebook comments on August 12, 2025, immediately after I posted a report of criminal violations by Prosecutor Liedkie and Coroner Webber. He then blocked my personal account and the official business page of LCV Blotter after I published an article critical of his conduct immediately after his graduation from the CTJC. This is documented in CJTC Case No. 2026-0000406 and the Declaration of Corey Michael Switzer (filed June 14, 2026).

- **Sheriff John Hilderbrand** disabled comments on the Asotin County Sheriff's Office Facebook page on April 2, 2026, immediately after I posted the same report. This is documented in CJTC Case No. 2026-0000213.

- **Neither Richards nor Hilderbrand have fulfilled their mandatory statutory duty under RCW 36.28.011**, which provides: "it shall be the duty of all sheriffs to make complaint of all violations of the criminal law, which shall come to their knowledge, within their respective jurisdictions."

Directing a whistleblower to the Sheriff's Office—which has actively suppressed reports of the same criminal violations—is not a good-faith response. It is a ****knowing referral to an implicated agency.**** This is precisely the type of obstruction the Public Records Act and the whistleblower protection laws were designed to prevent.

C. The AGO's Claim: "Pursuant to RCW 43.10.232, the Office of the Attorney General does not have the authority to independently investigate possible criminal behavior."

Response: This statement is ****misleading**** because it omits the exceptions to RCW 43.10.232. The AGO has authority to act under:

- **RCW 43.10.040:** "The attorney general shall appear for and represent the state in all actions and proceedings ... in any case in which the prosecuting attorney of any county is disqualified."

- **RCW 36.27.040:** "If the prosecuting attorney is disqualified ... the court may appoint a special prosecuting attorney."

- **RCW 10.43.040:** The Attorney General may prosecute "whenever any prosecuting attorney is unable to perform the duties of his office" or "fails or refuses to perform such duties."

Here, the prosecuting attorney (Curtis Liedkie) is a target. He is ****disqualified**** from investigating or prosecuting himself. The AGO's failure to acknowledge this fundamental conflict constitutes a knowing misrepresentation of the applicable law.

D. The AGO's Claim: "The authority to pursue a criminal proceeding rests with the prosecutor of the county."

Response: This is ****circular reasoning**** that ignores the conflict of interest. The county prosecutor (Liedkie) cannot investigate himself. The AGO's response directs me to the very official who is a target of the complaint. This is not a good-faith legal response—it is a ****bureaucratic dodge**** designed to avoid accountability.

- III. RESPONSE TO INTERNAL AGO EMAILS

A. Melanie Tratnik's March 14, 2026 Email (Page 1)

Claim: "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."

Response: This statement reveals ****bias and dismissiveness****. Ms. Tratnik:

1. **Acknowledges** that I believe "everyone in Asotin County is cahoots"—a characterization she dismisses.
2. **Assumes** the Sheriff's Office is the "correct answer" without acknowledging the documented misconduct by the Sheriff's Office.
3. **Uses a form template** ("I used the 'civil and or criminal' template for this response"), confirming that no individualized legal analysis occurred.

The "cahoots" characterization is now documented. Asotin County Prosecutor Liedkie, Coroner Webber, and the Sheriff's Office (Richards and Hilderbrand) have all engaged in coordinated conduct to suppress reports of criminal activity. This is not a conspiracy theory—it is documented in:

- Exhibits F, G, H, I, L, P-Unredacted, Q, S-AB (filed in Switzer v. Asotin County);
- CJTC Case Nos. 2026-0000406 and 2026-0000213; and
- The Declaration of Corey Michael Switzer (June 14, 2026).

B. Nick Brown's April 27, 2026 Email (Page 7)

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

Response: The Attorney General of Washington personally requested to ****filter**** my emails. This is:

1. **Evidence of deliberate avoidance**—the Attorney General directed staff to prevent my communications from reaching him.
2. **A violation of constituent service obligations**—the Attorney General has a duty to respond to citizens, not to filter them.
3. **Potentially retaliatory**—under RCW 42.56.550(4), retaliatory action against a person who exercises their rights under the Public Records Act is prohibited. While this is not a PRA request, it is part of a pattern of retaliation against a whistleblower.

Nick Brown—you are the chief legal officer of the State of Washington. Your job is to uphold the law, not to filter the emails of citizens who report crimes by public officials. Your request to filter my emails speaks volumes about your office's commitment to justice.

C. The "Darkest Timeline" Email (Page 102)

Claim: "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."

Response: This statement reveals profound ignorance of the applicable law. The United States Supreme Court just decided **Lindke v. Freed**, 601 U.S. 187 (2024), which held that public officials who block critics on social media can be liable for First Amendment violations. This is not a trivial matter—it is a constitutional issue of national significance.

The "darkest timeline" comment is also disrespectful to a citizen who has reported serious crimes, including:

- Unauthorized practice of law by a prosecutor and coroner;
- Misuse of public funds;
- False statements to the State Auditor;
- Conspiracy to obstruct justice;
- Retaliation against a whistleblower.

The AGO's staff mocked these allegations internally. This is evidence of ****bad faith**** and ****institutional bias**** within the AGO of which I am exploring further legal options.

D. Michael Litts' "LAL Thing" Email (Page 102)

****Claim:**** "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."

****Response:**** Mr. Litts characterized my complaint as frivolous. The AGO's internal dismissal of my complaint is now part of the public record. This email demonstrates that the AGO ****never conducted a substantive legal analysis**** of the allegations, but instead passed the complaint around internally, making jokes at my expense.

E. Lisa Petersen's Confirmation (Page 102)

Claim: "This is not for the AGO. We do not represent the Judge in Asotin County."

Response: Ms. Petersen is correct that the AGO does not represent Judge Burns. But that is precisely why the AGO had no basis to dismiss the complaint. The AGO was not asked to defend Judge Burns—the AGO was asked to investigate the coordinated scheme involving Liedkie, Webber, Daylong, Kemp, and the Sheriff's Office. The AGO had independent statutory authority to do so and failed.

– IV. THE SHERIFF'S OFFICE CONFLICT - RESPONSE TO THE AGO'S REFERRAL

The AGO directed me to the Asotin County Sheriff's Office. The Sheriff's Office's own conduct disqualifies it from investigating this matter:

| Actor | Conduct | Evidence |

|-----|-----|-----|

| ****Undersheriff Blake Richards**** | Disabled comments on August 12, 2025 after I reported crimes | Declaration of Corey Michael Switzer (June 14, 2026) |

| ****Undersheriff Blake Richards**** | Blocked my personal account and LCV Blotter business page | Exhibit A to Declaration; CJTC Case No. 2026-0000406 |

| ****Sheriff John Hilderbrand**** | Disabled comments on ACSO page on April 2, 2026 | CJTC Case No. 2026-0000213 |

| ****Both**** | Failed to fulfill RCW 36.28.011 duty to "make complaint of all violations of the criminal law" | No action taken since August 2025 |

The Sheriff's Office is not a neutral investigative body. It is a participant in the alleged misconduct. Directing a whistleblower to an implicated agency is not a good-faith response—it is a ****knowing referral to the wrongdoers.****

– V. THE AGO'S STATUTORY OBLIGATIONS

The AGO had—and continues to have—statutory authority to act:

| Statute | Provision |

|-----|-----|

| **RCW 43.10.040** | "The attorney general shall appear for and represent the state in all actions and proceedings ... in any case in which the prosecuting attorney of any county is disqualified." |

| **RCW 36.27.040** | "If the prosecuting attorney is disqualified ... the court may appoint a special prosecuting attorney." |

| **RCW 10.43.040** | Attorney General may prosecute "whenever any prosecuting attorney is unable to perform the duties of his office" or "fails or refuses to perform such duties." |

| **RCW 42.20.010** | Official misconduct—Class B felony—AG can investigate and prosecute. |

| **RCW 9A.76.175** | False statement to public servant—AG can investigate and prosecute. |

The AGO had no legal basis to refuse to act. The AGO chose to send a form letter and direct me to an implicated agency. This is not a good-faith response—it is a **dereliction of duty.**

- VI. THE CJTC'S ROLE AND THE PATTERN OF RETALIATION

The CJTC has reviewed complaints against both Richards (2026-0000406) and Hilderbrand (2026-0000213). Both were administratively closed despite evidence of:

1. ****Viewpoint discrimination**** under *Lindke v. Freed*, 601 U.S. 187 (2024);
2. ****Violation of RCW 43.101.105(j)(iv)**** (conduct that "discredits the profession");
3. ****Failure to fulfill RCW 36.28.011**** (mandatory duty to report crimes).

The AGO's dismissive response to the criminal referral is part of the ****same pattern**** of official inaction that the CJTC complaints document. Every agency to which I have reported these crimes has either:

1. **Dismissed the complaint** without investigation (WSBA, AGO);
2. **Deferred action** to a later date (SAO);
3. **Administratively closed** the complaint (CJTC); or
4. **Ignored the complaint entirely** (Asotin County Sheriff's Office).

This pattern of inaction is itself evidence of a coordinated effort to protect public officials from accountability.

- VII. REQUEST FOR IMMEDIATE CORRECTIVE ACTION

A. To the Attorney General's Office:

1. **Withdraw the March 16, 2026 response** as legally deficient as a boilerplate template and factually inaccurate.
2. **Issue a new response** that:
 - Acknowledges the conflict of interest within the Asotin County Prosecutor's Office and Sheriff's Office;
 - Explains why the AGO has declined to exercise its authority under RCW 43.10.040, RCW 36.27.040, and RCW 10.43.040;

- Provides a substantive legal analysis of the criminal referral of Liedkie, Webber, and deputized appointment by Asotin County Amanda Daylong for their unlawful representation of Judge Brooke Burns before the Washington State Supreme Court

3. **Preserve all records** related to this matter, including the internal emails already produced.

4. **Cease any filtering** of my emails to the AGO. The Attorney General's Office serves the people of Washington—it does not filter them.

B. To the Asotin County Defendants:

1. **Produce all responsive records** as previously demanded.

2. **Cure all PRA violations** identified in the pending litigation.

3. **Cease the pattern of obstruction** documented in this email and the accompanying court filings.

C. To the CJTC:

1. **Reopen Case No. 2026-0000406 (Richards)** in light of:

- The criminal referral evidence;
- The AGO's internal emails (proving the Sheriff's Office is not a neutral party);
- The ongoing litigation in Switzer v. Asotin County.

2. **Reopen Case No. 2026-0000213 (Hilderbrand)** on the same grounds.

3. **Investigate the pattern of official inaction** documented in this email and the accompanying filings.

- VIII. NOTICE OF INTENT

Please take notice that:

1. The record of the AGO's internal communications—including the Attorney General's request to filter my emails, the "darkest timeline" comment, and the form-letter response—will be presented to the Court in Switzer v. Asotin County as evidence of:

- Exhaustion of administrative remedies;
- Bad faith by government officials;
- The need for a special prosecutor.

2. The AGO's failure to act will be presented to the U.S. Department of Justice as evidence of:

- A pattern of state-level obstruction;
- Potential civil rights violations (42 U.S.C. § 1983, § 1985);
- Wire fraud (18 U.S.C. § 1343) and obstruction of justice (18 U.S.C. § 1512).

3. I reserve all rights to:

- File a motion for sanctions against the AGO for its bad-faith response;
- File a bar complaint against the AGO attorneys involved;
- Amend the pending criminal referral to include the AGO's conduct as evidence of obstruction.

- IX. CONCLUSION

The AGO's internal records prove what I have alleged from the outset: government officials in Washington are engaged in a coordinated effort to protect each other from accountability. The Attorney General's Office sent a form letter, made jokes about my complaint, and directed me to an implicated agency. The Attorney General himself requested to filter my emails. The CJTC administratively closed complaints against Richards and Hilderbrand without addressing the merits. The Sheriff's Office suppressed reports of crimes. The County Prosecutor's Office and the Coroner engaged in unauthorized representation and misused public funds. The County's outside counsel proposed a retroactive retainer to "clear" the County.

The pattern is complete. The evidence is overwhelming. The only question is who will act.

I have exhausted all administrative remedies. No agency has acted. The Court in Switzer v. Asotin County is the only remaining forum for justice.

I trust this response clarifies the record and puts all parties on notice that this matter will not be dismissed or ignored.

Respectfully,

****Corey Michael Switzer, Pro Se****

264 Kernodle Rd

Gibsonville, NC 27249

(218) 461-9868

coreyswitzer@gmail.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on July 17, 2026, I served a true copy of this email and its attachments upon all recipients listed above via email.

/s/ Corey Michael Switzer

ATTACHMENTS

1. AGO Production PRR-2026-0558 (Excerpts)
2. Declaration of Corey Michael Switzer (June 14, 2026)
3. Motion to Compel Evidence of Retaliation (June 14, 2026)
4. Criminal Referral Amended (July 8, 2026)
5. CJTC Correspondence (Case Nos. 2026-0000406 and 2026-0000213)

5 attachments

-  **B1-PC_26-558.pdf**
9.5 MB
-  **DECLARATION OF COREY MICHAEL SWITZER.pdf**
93 KB
-  **MOTION TO COMPEL EVIDENCE OF RETALIATION.pdf**
767 KB
-  **CRIMINAL_REFERRAL_AMENDED.pdf**
1.1 MB
-  **Gmail - RE_ WSCJTC No. 2026-0000406.pdf**
648 KB