

Gabe Galanda <gabe@galandabroadman.com>

Galanda v. Bernard: Request or Status Conference

1 message

Gabe Galanda <gabe@galandabroadman.com>

Mon, Apr 4, 2016 at 5:48 PM

To: salexander@nooksack-nsn.gov, Deanna Francis < DFrancis@nooksack-nsn.gov>

Cc: AB <anthony@galandabroadman.com>, Ryan Dreveskracht <ryan@galandabroadman.com>, Michelle Roberts <michelle.roberts3012@gmail.com>, Ray Dodge <rdodge@nooksack-nsn.gov>, "Rickie W. Armstrong" <rarmstrong@nooksack-nsn.gov>, "Thomas P. Schlosser" <t.schlosser@msaj.com>, "r.jackson@msaj.com" <r.jackson@msaj.com>

Bcc: Jacob Downs <jdowns@corrdowns.com>

Judge Alexander, Clerk Francis:

This email is not intended to be and should not be construed as the practice of law or transaction of business at Nooksack, by any of us. We offer it as Pro Se Plaintiffs, in Galanda v. Bernard.

We recognize the unorthodox nature of this email inquiry but like emails that the Court recognized circa February 24, 2016, when we emailed both the Judge and Clerks in desperate attempt to ascertain the status of our fitness to practice law at Nooksack, we submit this email to the Judge and Clerk as we are uncertain of the status of the Court and thus our recently filed pro se lawsuit and motion for injunctive and declaratory relief.

We write to inquire: (1) What is the status of our motion for injunctive and declaratory relief, which was noted for hearing last Friday? (2) What is the status of the business licensure protocols for lawyers, per the Court's March 21, 2016 Order, which were supposed to be submitted to the Court last Friday? Both of these inquiries of course relate to our desire to immediately return to the practice of law for over 270 Nooksack tribal members, in Nooksack Tribal Court. They also relate to our own civil rights and property rights, which the Court acknowledged in its March 21, 2016 Order.

We ask that a status conference with the Court be convened tomorrow or this Friday so that these inquiries can be expeditiously answered.

This unorthodox email inquiry is precipitated by the below sequence of rather unique acts or omissions concerning the Court---indeed begging overarching questions about the current state of the Court---over the last couple weeks:

- Since March 21, 2016--We understand that the Clerk has not yet produced Resolution Nos. 16-26, 16-27 or 16-28 to our fellow Pro Se Plaintiff Michelle Roberts, per the Court's March 2, 2016, Order. We of course have particular interest in receiving Resolution No. 16-28, now five weeks after we were apparently barred or disbarred.
- Week of March 28, 2016--Our office repeatedly called the Clerks regarding whether our motion for injunctive and declaratory relief would be heard by the Court with or without oral argument on April 1, 2016, as noted. Although over the last three years of litigation our office has routinely been able to speak with the Clerks, or leave messages and receive return calls from the Clerks, we have been unable to leave any form of message with the Court for the last week. See Attachment A.
- March 29-30, 2016--Our two emails to Clerk Francis, also regarding whether our motion for injunctive and declaratory relief would be heard by the Court with or without oral argument on April 1, 2016, as noted, received no reply, even though the Clerks have routinely replied to such procedural inquiries over the last three years.
- April 1, 2016--When Billie Rabang attempted to file our Notice regarding the Galanda v. Bernard defendants' failure to respond to our motion for injunctive and declaratory relief by March 30, 2016---which would be the first time Tribal defendants would not have responded to a motion in the last three years---Clerk Francis called Tribal defense counsel for advice about whether to accept out Notice for filing. As we communicated in Attachment B, that seemed rather inappropriate. We would have expected her to contact

the Judge, not opposing counsel, for such advice.

- April 1-4, 2016--As suggested above, we have yet to receive any notice that the Tribal Attorney submitted to the Court any business licensure protocols for lawyers, per the Court's March 21, 2016 Order.
- April 4, 2016--The set of pro se lawsuit and motion for injunctive and declaratory relief papers that we mailed to the Court, Attn: Clerk Leathers, on March 24, 2016, were returned to sender, and received by us today. In three years, we do not recall having this happen before.

Any of these acts or omissions, in isolation, would not cause us concern, or at least enough concern to submit this email inquiry and request to the Court in this way. But in all, they worry us, not only about the status of our recently filed pro se lawsuit and motion, but also about the state of the Court. If this inquiry and request need take the more formal form of a pro se motion, please advise us at once and we will oblige. Otherwise, we hope the requested status conference can be scheduled at once, so that our inquiry and any related issues can be addressed immediately.

Thank you,

Gabriel S. Galanda Pro Se Plaintiff, Galanda v. Bernard

Anthony Broadman Pro Se Plaintiff, Galanda v. Bernard

Ryan Dreveskracht Pro Se Plaintiff, Galanda v. Bernard

cc: Michelle Roberts, Pro Se Plaintiff, Belmont v. Kelly **Nooksack Tribal Attorneys**

2 attachments



Attachment A.pdf 135K





Gabe Galanda <gabe@galandabroadman.com>

Fwd: Galanda v. Bernard: Motion Hearing

1 message

Gabe Galanda <gabe@galandabroadman.com>

Thu, Mar 31, 2016 at 4:23 PM

To: Ray Dodge <rdodge@nooksack-nsn.gov>, "Rickie W. Armstrong" <rarmstrong@nooksack-nsn.gov> Cc: AB <anthony@galandabroadman.com>, Ryan Dreveskracht <ryan@galandabroadman.com>

Ray, Rickie:

Your clients' response to our motion was due yesterday at noon, irrespective of the Court's handling of our inquiries, as our motion was properly noted on 6 court days' notice. Having just checked the US Post to see if perhaps you snail mailed it rather than emailed it as was our standing practice prior to our disbarment, we do not see any response brief. Unless we receive a response brief from your office via email by first thing in the morning, we will notice the Court of your clients' failure to file any response, which of course generally causes courts to grant the motion as unopposed. This is simply fair warning. And this email is offered pro se, and not as the practice of law or transaction of business at Nooksack.

Gabriel S. Galanda

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

From: Gabe Galanda <gabe@galandabroadman.com>

Date: Wed, Mar 30, 2016 at 4:00 PM

Subject: Re: Galanda v. Bernard: Motion Hearing To: Deanna Francis < DFrancis@nooksack-nsn.gov>

Cc: AB <anthony@galandabroadman.com>, Ryan Dreveskracht <ryan@galandabroadman.com>, Molly Jones <molly@galandabroadman.com>, salexander@nooksack-nsn.gov, Ray Dodge <rdodge@nooksack-nsn.gov>,

"Rickie W. Armstrong" <rarmstrong@nooksack-nsn.gov>

Ms. Francis:

We, as pro se plaintiffs, have made several attempts to reach the Court today, in follow-up to this email below, but there has been no answer; and we have yet to receive any reply. Can you please let us know the status of our motion and any hearing thereon for this Friday? Thank you.

Gabriel S. Galanda

On Tue, Mar 29, 2016 at 9:11 AM, Gabe Galanda <gabe@galandabroadman.com> wrote:

Ms. Francis:

If you would, please let us and defense counsel know of the Court will hear our pending motion this Friday, April 1, as noted; and if so, if the Court will require oral argument.

As Messrs. Broadman, Dreveskracht and I all intend to attend any in-person hearing, we need to plan accordingly.

Thank you,

Gabriel S. Galanda

ATTACHMENT A



Gabe Galanda <gabe@galandabroadman.com>

Re: Galanda v. Bernard - Notice re Pro Se Plaintiffs' Unopposed Motion for **Injunctive and Declaratory Relief**

1 message

Gabe Galanda <gabe@galandabroadman.com>

Fri, Apr 1, 2016 at 10:05 AM

To: Molly Jones <molly@galandabroadman.com>

Cc: Deanna Francis <dfrancis@nooksack-nsn.gov>, salexander@nooksack-nsn.gov, Ray Dodge <rdodge@nooksack-nsn.gov>, "Rickie W. Armstrong" <rarmstrong@nooksack-nsn.gov>, Anthony Broadman <anthony@galandabroadman.com>, Ryan Dreveskracht <ryan@galandabroadman.com>

Judge Alexander:

We understand that right this moment, the Court Clerk is refusing to accept or stamp-received our Notice. She is calling the Tribe's defense attorney for advice, which seems inappropriate.

Gabriel S. Galanda

On Fri, Apr 1, 2016 at 10:00 AM, Molly Jones <molly@galandabroadman.com> wrote:

Please find attached a courtesy copy of: Notice re Pro Se Plaintiffs' Unopposed Motion for Injunctive and **Declaratory Relief**

Hard copy to follow via U.S. Mail.

Molly Jones PO Box 15146 Seattle, WA 98115 Main: 206.557.7509

Fax: 206.299.7690

This e-mail, and any attachments thereto, is intended only for use by the addressee(s) named herein and may contain legally privileged and/or confidential information. If the recipient of this e-mail is not a current client, receipt of this e-mail does not create an attorney-client relationship. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail, and any attachments thereto, is strictly prohibited (Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 2510-2521). If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately notify this firm at (206.557.7509) or the writer and permanently delete the original and any copy of any e-mail and any printout thereof.