

Appendix C
Misrepresentations to the Court

CPA and attorney, Henry Judson, took full advantage of the perceived limitations of the court. Their pleadings included a multitude of distortions, far too many to include here. It is instructive to read their account of the home visit. It was obvious that they went back to the office and brainstormed for every possible way a fact could be distorted enough as to become a negative sufficient for their purposes. If they couldn't distort it, they just made it up.

The final report documents their absolute disregard for the truth and for the court's ability to see the truth. They cannot plead guilty to some lesser offense such as sloppy bookkeeping, there are too many made up phone calls from outsiders who never called them. The four and a half hours and two sessions Ms Miller spent on the one sentence correction of her own mistake puts these papers in the category of deliberate fraud.

On June 10, 2002, Mr. Judson asked for seventy seven hundred dollars for his services. He swore that the "the issues were not immaterial or trifling" and that attorney representation required a "high or moderate level of skill or training." I would say that hallway gossip and whiling away his time at meetings is nothing but trifling. I would say also that hours and hours of "reviewing and revising" of an elementary report is also trifling and immaterial. Neither requires much beyond his physical presence.

On August 5, 2002 he asked for and received \$516 for responding to the Motion for Revision. On 9/11/02 he asked for an additional \$400 for having to ask to be paid. He also asked for and received interest. There is some discrepancy with this, as he stated incorrectly the amount he had been awarded. On August 22, 2002, he asked for \$500 to pay for the seven hours that CPA spent among other things "reviewing its billing statement." On October 4, 2002, he asked for an additional \$612 for replying to something I wrote. He was given \$175. Though I was unable to find it, he also asked for additional money for the guardian. I mention all these requests for additional money supposedly for considering my objections and reviewing the billing because, despite all those additional hours, they never found a single error. I found dozens of bogus calls, bogus meetings and bogus hours spent on ridiculous matters. Mr. Judson, with all his reviewing never noted that they had calls and conferences with him that he didn't have with them. He didn't notice that he had not adjusted the "est." time reported on his final court session. It is obvious to me that they were just making it up.

To add hypocrisy to the mix, each time Mr. Judson asked for more money for work he didn't do, he specifically requested it come from my assets and not my mother's. This is to pretend he had a benevolent concern for her pocket book. He had no idea who was paying for what, but he could pretend that he wanted to make sure that she wasn't being charged because I was dragging them into court. This despite the fact that both he and his client were stealing her blind and if they had had their way would have stolen every cent she had and stuck her in a nursing home to make it more convenient. To put it in the vernacular, Mr. Judson was playing the court.

One of his strategies for deceiving the court involves making nonsensical "explanations." I wondered often why something as easy as the medication mix up was so difficult for them to understand. Each time they addressed it in pleadings, it was clear to me that they just "didn't get it." They got it alright! I realized that when I complained about LI charging three hours for a two and a half hour meeting of which she attended about an hour. She arrived late and left early, and, yet charged for three hours. A legitimate business would simply acknowledge the error and refund the difference. Not Mr. Judson and CPA. He couldn't lie, as I suspect he would have preferred, because John Hertog was at the meeting. Instead he submitted (Exhibit 12, 13) which, if you read carefully is pure nonsense. Mr. Judson was counting on the fact that the court doesn't have time to read carefully. He knew it would, at a glance, seem to be an explanation. He was right. The court didn't read carefully, and that nonsense seems to have been accepted as an explanation. He used the same strategy when discussing the medication mix-up. Mr. Judson takes full advantage of the court's limitations just as he and the guardianship took advantage of my mother's limitations.

Also, Mr. Judson withheld my mother's records from the AFH. He lied to the court repeatedly, stating that I asked him to get the records. He told the WSBA that John Hertog made something like a request. Neither

Appendix C

Misrepresentations to the Court

is true. He jumped in unmasked and volunteered to get them when John mentioned that the AFH director was not co-operating. I received a partial set of records eight months after his offer and only after DSHS intervened. I have never received all of my mother's records, and I'm sure I never will. The bar found that there wasn't enough evidence to believe that Mr. Judson knew that CPA had my mother's records, so they wouldn't hold him responsible. This despite the fact that he supposedly spent hours and hours "reviewing and revising," the final report that notes on 3/1/02 the chart information that came in from the AFH. If he didn't note that, he had no business charging and collecting for the many hours of "reviewing and revising" the report that had that in it. I have included a copy of the grievance submitted to the bar should you want details. (Appendix D) I did not include the exhibits.

Mr. Judson and client made a mockery of notions of truth, impartiality, and justice as products of court proceedings