

HONORABLE RONALD B. LEIGHTON

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES
WESTERN DISTRICT OF V

CHRISTIAN DOSCHER,

Plaintiff,

v.

in her individual capacity; and
JNTY,

Defendants.

SECOND DECLARATION OF BETTY
GOULD IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS'
MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Note for Docket: April 19, 2013

I, _____ am over the age of eighteen years, am competent to testify herein and have personal knowledge of the following:

1. I am the elected Clerk of Thurston County and ex officio Clerk of _____ County Superior Court and make this declaration in response to Plaintiff Christian Doscher's Affidavit in Support of Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment. Dkt. 22-1.

2. Christian Doscher's assertion of the "tendency of a _____ public access computer to print a different version of the document than what appears on the computer screen" is incorrect. Mr. Doscher is correct that, when he was sentenced in 1990 for possession of stolen property, the clerk did not catch the fact that Mr. Doscher was given a deferred sentence so the docket for his case read "sentencing deferred: no." His assertion that the computers printed different versions of the docket is false.

1 3. A copy of the docket was printed in 2003 and the printout was imaged and
2 placed in the court file for Mr. Doscher's criminal case, No. 88-1-00706-7. The 2003 docket showed
3 "sentencing deferred: no." Later, when Mr. Doscher brought to the Clerk's attention the fact that he
4 had received a deferred sentence, the ; docket was corrected to read, "sentencing deferred:
5 yes," but the imaged 2003 version of the docket remained in the case file. As a result, while the
6 docket provided correct information, it was possible to view and print the old image of the
7 docket from 2003 that still had the words "sentencing deferred: no." The difference in the 2003
8 printout of the docket and the live docket is not a printing inconsistency as Mr. Doscher
9 asserts, it just reflects the fact the old imaged document remained in the file when Mr. Doscher
10 reviewed the file in 2009.

11 4. Mr. Doscher asserts in paragraph 10 of his Affidavit that I personally handed him a
12 copy of the document he calls a "falsified order" in "late 2012" when he inquired of me about it. He
13 claims I told him that I added the words "microfilmed 1995," "corrected copy, felony non-deferred,"
14 and "date of conviction 1995" to the Order after the result of an audit "sparked by the 2009 N
15 County lawsuit." Mr. Doscher also asserts that I "mentioned that [he] was a 'convicted felon' during
16 this conversation." Dkt. 22-1 at 3:14-20. Mr. Doscher is fabricating the conversation. I did not
17 discuss the document with Mr. Doscher, never did an audit "sparked by the 2009 County law
18 suit," did not add the words he alleges to the document, and never stated Mr. Doscher is a convicted
19 felon. I did not hand him or provide him a copy of any document. In fact, the only interaction I have
20 had with Mr. Doscher was in 2011 when he accompanied the person who served Mr. Doscher's state
21 court law suit on me. On that occasion in 2011, I accepted the papers Mr. Doscher's companion
22 handed me, said "thank you" and walked away. At no other time have I had direct contact with Mr.
23 Doscher.

24 5. Mr. Doscher is incorrect in referring to the document he obtained from the
25) as the "original" court order. It is a document that appears to have

1 been created from a copying or faxing error. That document never appeared in County
2 Superior Court records until filed by Mr. Doscher after he obtained it from

3 6. My office contacted the State Archives and Records Management
4 Division of the Secretary of State's Office to respond to Mr. Doscher's discovery request asking
5 whether the paper version of his 1990 Order of Probation still exists and, if not, when it was
6 destroyed. In a letter dated April 9, 2013, the state archives advises that Mr. Doscher's criminal file,
7 No. 88-1-00706-7, was destroyed after May, 2004. A true and correct copy of the letter is attached
8 hereto as Exhibit No. 1 and incorporated herein by reference.

9 7. My office does not maintain documentation as to what documents are disseminated to
10 the State Patrol. When Mr. Doscher asked for copies of documents disseminated to WSP
11 regarding his criminal case in a discovery request, I responded that such documents do not exist.
12 While the court records of his criminal case exist, my office does not have any documents showing
13 which court records were disseminated to

14 **I DECLARE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY UNDER THE LAWS OF THE**
15 **STATE OF WASHINGTON AND OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA THAT THE**
16 **FOREGOING IS TRUE AND CORRECT.**

17 DATED this 18th day of April, 2013 at
18
19
20

21 I hereby certify that on date listed below, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send
22 notification of such filing to the following:

23 **Plaintiff Pro Se**
Christian Doscher
skepticrod@hotmai.com
24
25