

**From:** <donotreply@wsba.org>  
**Subject:** Online Grievance Form Confirmation  
**Date:** Fri, 25 Jul 2014 12:42:10 -0700  
**To:** <billscheidler@wavecable.com>



## GRIEVANCE AGAINST A LAWYER



Office of Disciplinary Counsel  
 Washington State Bar Association  
 1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 600  
 Seattle, WA 98101-2539

### GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

- Read our information sheet Lawyer Discipline in Washington before you complete this form, particularly the section about consenting to disclosure of your grievance to the lawyer.
- If you have a disability or need assistance with filing a grievance, call us at (206) 727-8207. We will take reasonable steps to accommodate you.
- Please note that this form is only for new grievances. *If you have already filed a grievance, do not use this form to send us additional information.* Mail any additional information with your grievance file number to the address above.
- If you provide an email address, you will receive a confirmation email after you submit your grievance. *We will communicate with you by letter after we review your grievance.*

Date Received: **7/25/2014 12:42:00 PM**

Confirmation Number: **201407250003**

### INFORMATION ABOUT YOU

**Scheidler, Bill**

Last Name, First Name, Middle Initial

1515 lidstrom pl

Address

Address Line 2

port orchard, WA 98366

City, State, and Zip Code

United States

### INFORMATION ABOUT THE LAWYER

**Kay, Peter**

Last Name, First Name

Office of the Attorney General - Tacoma Division

Address

1250 Pacific Ave Ste 105 PO Box 2317

Address Line 2

Tacoma, WA 98401-2317

City, State, and Zip Code

Country	United States
3607698531	Country
Phone Number	(253) 593-5243
	Phone Number
Alternate Phone Number	24331
billscheidler@wavecable.com	Bar Number (if known)
Email Address	

### **INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR GRIEVANCE**

Describe **your** relationship to the lawyer who is the subject of your grievance:

I am an opposing party

Is there a court case related to your grievance?

Yes

If yes, what is the case name and file number?

In Re the Welfare of: Miles Tejano, Luis West, Pheonix West

Explain your grievance in **your own words**. Give all important dates, times, places, and court file numbers. You may attach additional materials by using the file upload feature below.

Peter Kay is the Assistant Attorney General, which is a position of "public trust." Peter Kay is bound by law, court rules and the rules that define his profession and his "official duties."

Peter Kay represents the "State" in this case

Peter Kay's involvement in every respect is a issue of substantial public importance.

Peter Kay has violated his Oath to speak the truth, never seek to mislead a judge by any artifice or false statement of fact or law, and advance no fact prejudicial to the honor or reputation of a party. Mr. Kay has violated, numerous times, each of these provisions of his statutory oath – he lies, files false reports... and are violations of LAW and the Rules of Professional Conduct

The laws violated (full citations omitted) include but not limited to: RCW 2.48.180(6), RCW 2.48.210, RCW 18.130.180(1, 7, 12 and 13), RCW 42.20.040, RCW 42.20.080, RCW 42.20.100, RCW 9A.72.040, RCW 9A.80.010...

The Rules of Professional Conduct violated (full citations omitted) include, but not limited to: RPC 1.1, RPC 3.1, RPC 3.3, RPC 8.4...

The lies that Peter Kay tells all occur in "official proceedings" and are a matter of "official record."

The attached files support the factual allegations noted below and include:

- 1) Scheidler's motion to intervene
- 2) Scheidler claims in support of motion to intervene
- 3) Peter Kay's memorandum in opposition to motion to intervene

#### 4) The report of proceedings

The facts that prove Peter Kay violated the laws and RPC's noted above are:

1) Peter Kay engaged in "court room" behavior that is repugnant to law and justice. As noted in both the motion and claims in support of motion to intervene, Peter Kay, before all parties, lawyers, the judge and members of the public (me), accused the father, who is the opposing party in this lawsuit, of "tape recording the proceedings" and demanded the father manipulate the recording device to reveal a special software program that converts speech into text. This created an argument between Peter Kay and the Father that lasted a few minutes. Eventually the father handed Peter Kay the suspected recording device, which Peter Kay claimed had this trick program. Peter Kay examined the device for himself and it was found that neither the device recorded anything nor did the device have this trick program. Judge Kevin Hull did nothing about Peter Kay's false allegations and intrusion into the father's benign device.

My motion to intervene was based in my witnessing and my direct interest in the "judicial process" and the duties of "public servants" to abide by the law – the TRUTH!

2) Peter Kay responded to my motion to intervene, which in its entirety, misstates the facts and the law. Peter Kay claims my motion to intervene is my attempt to get involved in who is awarded custody of the children – the parents, or the State (Kay's client). This is false, my interest as my motion and claims clearly state, are related the "justice system" in which such 'custody' hearing occur.

3) Because Peter Kay misstates the facts, his "legal" arguments are also false.

4) Peter Kay claims in his reply that I don't have standing as I'm a member of the general public. This is a half truth.... Peter Kay, a lawyer and assistant attorney general, could easily determine if I am a "taxpayer" in addition to being a member of the general public. I am a "taxpayer" and Peter Kay's salary is paid with the tax money I provide. Standing therefore is properly decided on "taxpayer standing" and NOT in the half-truth Peter Kay advances.

5) When the motion to intervene was called for hearing, Judge Kevin Hull sat as judge. Judge Kevin Hull is the very judge before whom Peter Kay performed his 'legal charade'. Judge Kevin Hull is a witness and because Judge Kevin Hull failed to hold Peter Kay to the legal as well as professional conduct required of him, is a potential "party."

6) I, as the transcript of the hearing will substantiate, asked Judge Hull to "disqualify" himself, as the law requires –RCW 2.28.030(1). Judge Hull asked each lawyer that was present for argument on this "disqualification" issue. All the lawyers, except Peter Kay, declined to opine.

7) Peter Kay, in answer to the Judge's request, advanced yet another irrelevant argument seeking to have the Judge rule on the merits of the motion rather than on the issue of "disqualification."

8) Judge Hull refused to disqualify himself. I objected and withdrew my motion out of protest in not being provided a "qualified" judge to hear the merits.

Peter Kay, given his tremendous power that comes with being an assistant attorney general must be removed from government service.

Attached Files:

(Your files have been successfully uploaded but not included in confirmation email)

**AFFIRMATION**

I affirm that the information I am providing is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge. I have read Lawyer Discipline in Washington and I understand that the content of my grievance can be disclosed to the lawyer.