



Larry Shook <lwshook@gmail.com>

#1

1 message

Larry Shook <lwshook@gmail.com>

Sun, Aug 8, 2010 at 5:03 PM

To: Larry Shook <lwshook@gmail.com>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Donna McKereghan** <lady.socrates@comcast.net>

Date: Sun, Aug 1, 2010 at 1:47 AM

Subject: Re: Corruption, Judge Siddoway, and the Spokesman-Review

To: Larry Shook <lwshook@gmail.com>, Ron Wright <nar9350@gmail.com>

Cc: michaeldmcmillin@hotmail.com, ds@spowa.us, Stacey Cowles <staceyc@spokesman.com>, Gary Graham <GaryG@spokesman.com>, "Verner, Mary" <MVerner@spokanecity.org>, CityCouncil@spokanecity.org, e <TMielke@spokanecounty.org>, "Richard, Mark J." <MRichard@spokanecounty.org>, BMager@spokanecounty.org, stucker@spokanecounty.org, "Emacio, James" <jemacio@spokanecounty.org>, Anne Kirkpatrick <akirkpatrick@spokanepolice.org>, "Knezovich, Ozzie" <oknezovich@spokanesherriff.org>, Frank Harrill <fharrill@leo.gov>, "ken. wade" <Ken.Wade@wsp.wa.gov>, "Curley, Tom" <tcurlley@ap.org>, Ted McGregor <tedm@inlander.com>, scottm4@atg.wa.gov

Dear Larry et. al.

I might be able to shed some light on the issue. The Judicial cannons concern conduct judges are expected to uphold. Thus, a judge cannot engage in "mudslinging" and neither can he/she engage in conversations about possible illegal conduct - as that's unsubstantiated AND it could end up in the court of that particular judge or colleagues. A judge cannot engage in conversations about unethical conduct because that is not his/her issue to decide. It's not in a judge's jurisdiction. That would be the Board of Judicial conduct. Now IF someone has been FOUND to have violated the ethics codes by the body which has jurisdiction, that's a different matter. He/she can point out that fact - because it's a matter of public record. Period. These rules are put in place to prevent unsubstantiated allegations, just as is the case in the courts.

We have similar rules on the State Legislative Ethics Board (which is the counterpart to the Judicial Conduct Board and the Executive Ethics Board - legislative, judicial, executive branches of government). For me, that means I am not allowed to endorse candidates, much less voice my opinion about them - positive OR negative. Ultimately, the reason is that we are all State Officers. It undermines the Public's trust to hear State Officers speaking about some of these things. Inevitably, some would think we're using our authority to support or weaken other's positions - whether or not we were - so it's not allowed. Public trust is paramount - especially when you're responsible for the actions of others and most especially when you're expected to act in accordance with the ethics laws. Responsibility to the public is the very reason these laws exist. Further, it was the public that called for them to be put into place. If you believe they put a stranglehold on our elected and appointed officials, you are open to challenge those laws. However, I wouldn't think you'd have much success, given that the State Legislature continues to uphold these laws, even when other legislators introduce bills to try to dilute them.

There may be evidence of unethical or illegal actions on the part of a legislator, candidate, judge or executive, but until that evidence is weighed by the body that has jurisdiction, it should not be disseminated by anyone responsible under these laws, as if it had been. People have every right to voice their opinions, sometimes we even have a moral responsibility to do so, but when it comes to allegations of this kind, they have no place in an election until and unless they are found to be violations by the body that has jurisdiction in making such decisions.

I'm sure there were things that former Sheriff Bamonte knew "for a fact" that he was not allowed to share when he was in office. I'm sure there were things that Mary Verner knew from being a City Councilwoman that she could not use in her campaign for Mayor and the same would be true of Bonnie, Anne, Ozzie and many others. Similarly, there are things I know but cannot share - some for ethical reasons and others for legal reasons.

I only want to add that I have no idea who Mary was talking about in her "powers that be" reference but Stacy Cowles is, in my opinion, operating under the spotlight of a reputation he didn't earn but that, because of his name, has become his legacy. I know several people who work for the SR and perhaps as many who no longer do. You would easily recognize their names and none of them - not one - has criticized the paper for it being beholden to the Cowles family. Quite the opposite, even those who've left the paper on less than favorable terms or for reasons they felt were unfair, tell me that Stacey runs the business, not the news and, in fact, he has taken many measures to distance himself from it so that he "doesn't" influence the stories that the paper carries (or decides not to carry). If he were interested in doing that, he could be the editor in chief and he's not. I think that "was" the case, many years ago, but hasn't been the case for many years, now. That is an objective opinion based on what his employees and former employees - especially those who left the paper somewhat unwillingly - have shared with me. In fact, though he seems to recognize me by sight, I doubt he even knows my name or, at least, connects it to the person he recognizes.

I appreciate you keeping this story and all its intricacies in the public eye, mind and heart because it "shouldn't" be put to bed and for many, many reasons, as you know. However, I object to the portrayal of someone who is doing nothing more than obeying the codes of judicial

conduct as making a response that's "evasive and cowardly." The only evasion I read in it is evasion of violations of the codes of judicial conduct. McMillian is exactly correct in what he says, both in terms of the codes of conduct by which judges are constrained and in terms of it being the responsibility of the people. On the Legislative Ethics Board, similar to the judiciary, we hear the cases that come to us and we are prohibited from investigating them ourselves - as is the judiciary. We are there to hear cases that the public brings before us; not to create complaints that we, ourselves, would then have to decide.

So, unless or until an attorney or judge is found in violation of the codes or of illegal conduct, the opponents campaign IS NOT ALLOWED to comment on the matter and for good reasons, reasons that the public has called for, demanded and which were put into place at the behest of the public and with overwhelming public support. And now someone's response is called evasive and cowardly for obeying those codes and laws? Someone who has cried out so loud and clear for us all that the laws have not and are not being upheld? You cannot reasonably call for adherence to law and, in the next breath, criticize those who obey it. I am very disappointed by the contradiction.

Donna L. McKereghan

----- Original Message -----

From: [Larry Shook](#)
To: [Ron Wright](#)
Cc: michaeldmcmillin@hotmail.com ; ds@spowa.us ; [Stacey Cowles](#) ; [Gary Graham](#) ; [Verner, Mary](#) ; CityCouncil@spokanecity.org ; [e](#) ; [Richard, Mark J.](#) ; BMager@spokanecounty.org ; stucker@spokanecounty.org ; [Emacio, James](#) ; [Anne Kirkpatrick](#) ; [Knezovich, Ozzie](#) ; [Frank Harrill](#) ; [ken. wade](#) ; [Curley, Tom](#) ; [Ted McGregor](#) ; scottm4@atg.wa.gov
Sent: Friday, July 30, 2010 7:14 AM
Subject: Re: Corruption, Judge Siddoway, and the Spokesman-Review

Det. Wright: Mr. McMillin's response, below, to evidence of Laurel Siddoway's unethical and possibly illegal conduct strikes me as evasive and cowardly. If Judicial Canons prohibit discussion of evidence of unethical and perhaps illegal conduct by candidates for judicial office, that, in itself, makes the canons a farce, it seems to me. And that, in turn, condemns the judiciary to sophistry and the mockery of justice. These are the very qualities, the evidence proves, that are the hallmarks of the RPS project and Laurel Siddoway's role in it. "It is vital that we get a moral and ethical man into office and replace the Gregoire appointee/ACLU Board of Directors member," Mr. McMillin concludes, after admonishing you that Judge Dunham's campaign is barred by canon from engaging in mudslinging. Sigh. How is one to respect the integrity of a candidacy like that? As you know, my view is that the American experiment in democracy now faces a historical threat from its own rampant corruption and moral failure. This moral failure, in my view, is more dangerous to this nation than terrorists can ever be. I don't think America's biggest problem is the impurity of any political ideology, as Mr. McMillin and his candidate appear to believe. I think its biggest problem is plain old fashioned immorality. I'll take an honest conservative over a corrupt liberal, and vice versa, any day. This is openly and privately copied to various parties, because I consider this a public discussion. All recipients are free to distribute it as they choose. All best, Larry Shook

On Fri, Jul 30, 2010 at 4:20 AM, Ron Wright <nar9350@gmail.com> wrote:
FYI

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Michael McMillin** <michaeldmcmillin@hotmail.com>
Date: Thu, Jul 29, 2010 at 11:23 PM
Subject: RE: Corruption, Judge Siddoway, and the Spokesman-Review
To: nar9350@gmail.com

Det. Wright,

I appreciate this information, unfortunately there is nothing much we can do with it. If this information were to be released by someone outside of the campaign, there is nothing we can do to stop that. Although, under the Judicial Canons, both Harvey and myself cannot partake in any mudslinging. Judicial candidates and their campaigns must hold the highest ethical standards when running for office. It is the job of the people and supporters to get the word out. Thanks again, we appreciate both the information and the support. It is vital that we get a moral and ethical man into office and replace the Gregoire appointee/ACLU Board of Directors member.

Respectfully,

Michael D. McMillin
Campaign Manager for
Harvey Dunham, Candidate
WA Court of Appeals
Division III, District I

<http://www.VoteDunham.com>

This e-mail, and any attachments, is intended only for use by the addressee(s) named herein and may contain legally privileged and/or confidential information. Do not

disseminate without the approval of the Sender. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, you are hereby notified any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this e-mail, and any attachments, is strictly prohibited. If you receive this

e-mail in error, please immediately notify me at 307.254.1364, and permanently delete the original copy and any other copy of the e-mail, and any printout. d

NOTE FROM LARRY SHOOK: The information Mr. McMillin is referring to is the email, below, that I sent to Det. Wright responding to The Spokesman-Review's endorsement of Laurel Siddoway to be a court of appeals judge. This is an important subject, because the Cowles-owned Spokesman-Review has a long history of supporting with favorable news coverage and editorial endorsement political candidates who cover for the family's illegal activities and attacking those who attempt to expose them. The Siddoway endorsement, in my view, is an example of this. Mayor John Talbott was twice blasted as a "civic terrorist" for attempting to expose the fraud in the \$23 million HUD loan to the Cowleses as part of the RPS project. (See "All in the Family" and "Inside Job" at www.camasmagazine.com.) Jim McDevitt, on the other hand, won an S-R headline quoting a federal judge calling him the "perfect" U.S. attorney for Eastern Washington. Mr. McDevitt is directly implicated in the RPS securities fraud scandal. (See "McDevitt's Fingerprints" at www.camasmagazine.com.)

Det. Wright: Laurel Siddoway was the public's lawyer when she served Mayor John Powers as RPS special counsel. In that capacity, she and Mayor Powers dropped the civil conspiracy charges brought against the RPS developer and various public officials by Mayor John Talbott and his RPS special counsel, O. Yale Lewis. Neither Ms. Siddoway nor Mayor Powers ever explained why they dropped those charges. As the RPS municipal securities fraud litigation progressed, discovery produced overwhelming evidence that there was indeed a conspiracy between the developer and public officials to commit securities fraud; to, as Mr. Lewis alleged, "improperly divert public money for private purpose." The RPS plaintiffs documented this evidence in their 91-point Omnibus Statement of Facts." (<http://www.camasmagazine.com/articles/viewArticle.asp?aid=179>.) Based on Ms. Siddoway's recommendation, the City of Spokane settled with the plaintiffs by purchasing their case. That case proved the existence of the fraudulent conspiracy that Ms. Siddoway said didn't exist. The purchase of that case cost Spokane's citizens \$44.8 million. Ms. Siddoway, in other words, contradicted herself as precisely as possible. The result of her contradiction suggests that Ms. Siddoway willingly and knowingly became a central agent in perfecting the RPS fraud against the public. See "A New RPS Fraud?" <http://www.camasmagazine.com/articles/viewArticle.asp?aid=199>. The facts, then, show that Ms. Siddoway did not represent the public when she was paid by the public to be the public's lawyer. She represented the perpetrators of the RPS fraud. The key perpetrator of that fraud, of course, was the RPS developer, Betsy Cowles. It isn't surprising that Ms. Cowles's newspaper would endorse Ms. Siddoway as an appellate court judge. This preserves the Cowles family's influence over a judiciary the corruption/and/or incompetence of which enabled the RPS fraud. Remember that Spokane Superior Court Judges Kathleen O'Connor and Sam Cozza refused to let Spokane's citizens vote on the RPS "public/private partnership." Remember that the evidence suggested from the beginning that this project was fraudulent, which is why Spokane's citizens wanted to vote on it. Remember that Ms. Siddoway ultimately agreed that the project was fraudulent by recommending the city purchase the evidence proving that it was. Remember the city agreed with Ms. Siddoway by taking her advice. Of course Ms. Siddoway will be the perfect appellate court judge to protect the Cowles family's provably criminal conduct. But there is no reason to believe that Judge Siddoway will interpret the law in a way to protect the public from this continuing criminal enterprise. When Spokane Mayor Mary Verner refers to Spokane's "powers that be," this is the organized criminal enterprise she appears to be referring to. Please see "America's Most Dangerous Cop" at www.larryshook.com. Anyone running against Ms. Siddoway for this office who is not willing or able to review and explain this evidence to the electorate is probably no more willing or able to represent the electorate, or uphold the law, than could be expected of Judge Siddoway. Obviously, this statement also applies to every other elected official and candidate for public office in Spokane. You can't serve two masters. In Spokane you can serve the organized criminal enterprise of the Cowles family or you can serve the public upon which that enterprise preys. At this moment I do not know of a single public official or candidate for public office in Spokane who possesses the morality and courage to represent the public. Not one. As always, you may distribute these comments as you choose. Larry Shook
