

JUDGE LAUREN KING - PATTERN OF OBSTRUCTION

ORDER #1: AUGUST 7, 2025 - DISMISSAL WITHOUT PREJUDICE

Case: Boyd v. International Union of Operating Engineers Local 701, et al.

Case No.: 2:25-cv-01225-LK

Document: Docket #16

Filed: August 7, 2025

COURT' S ACTIONS

DISMISSED Plaintiff' s complaint (Dkt. 13)

DENIED all pending motions as moot

STRUCK supplemental exhibit packet (Dkt. 14)

Gave plaintiff 21 days to file amended complaint

COURT' S CRITICISMS

1. "Confused" and "Violates Federal Rules"

"The 'complaint' continues in this confused manner for hundreds more pages... Ms. Boyd' s submissions violate the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and other applicable law in a number of ways."

2. "Multiple Embedded Complaints"

"The complaint' s 1,061 pages consist of multiple embedded complaints, motions, charts, declarations, exhibits and random other documents."

3. "Not Short and Plain"

“Ms. Boyd’s complaint, which contains multiple embedded complaints, arguments, charts, exhibits, declarations, and other documents, falls far short of Rule 8’s requirement.”

4. “Burden on Court”

“Neither defendants nor the Court are obligated to search through hundreds of pages in order to determine what allegations she is attempting to make.”

5. “Serial and Duplicative Motions”

“Litigants are not entitled to file serial and duplicative motions dedicated to the same subject matter.”

6. “Exhibit Packet Not Proper”

“Nor is an ‘exhibit packet’ a procedurally proper way to amend a pleading, seek relief, or communicate with the Court.”

7. “No Emergency”

“Any assertion of irreparable harm necessitating ‘emergency’ relief is undercut by the amount of time Ms. Boyd waited to initiate proceedings. She states that she discovered the defendants’ ‘violations’ in 2024.”

8. “Did Not Respond to Show Cause Order”

“Although she filed her motion to proceed in forma pauperis on June 29, 2025, she did not respond to a July 1, 2025 order to show cause why the application should not be denied until July 21, 2025.”

9. “Has Not Served Defendants”

“There is no indication that Ms. Boyd has served any Defendant as she is required to do under Rule 4.”

10. Warning of Sanctions

“Ms. Boyd must ensure that her filings are procedurally appropriate, or else they will continue to be dismissed, stricken, or denied, and the Court may also impose sanctions.”

ANALYSIS OF OBSTRUCTION

PROCEDURAL TRAPS:

1. **Dismissed for “confusion”** - But plaintiff provided extensive evidence with exhibits
2. **Criticized for length** - But case involves \$56 trillion fraud requiring documentation
3. **“Not short and plain”** - Impossible standard for RICO/ERISA case of this magnitude
4. **Struck exhibit packet** - Prevented evidence from entering record
5. **21-day deadline** - Unrealistic timeframe to reorganize 1,061 pages of evidence
6. **Threatened sanctions** - Intimidation tactic against pro se litigant

DENIAL OF JUSTICE:

1. **No consideration of merits** - Dismissed on procedural grounds without examining evidence
2. **No acknowledgment of fraud magnitude** - \$56 trillion disgorgement ignored
3. **No protection for pro se litigant** - Court has duty to liberally construe pro se pleadings
4. **Catch-22 created** - Too much evidence = dismissed; too little evidence = insufficient
5. **Sanctions threat** - Chilling effect on plaintiff's ability to pursue case

COMPARISON TO STANDARD PRACTICE:

Federal courts routinely accept:

- Complex RICO complaints with extensive exhibits
- ERISA cases with actuarial evidence and financial documentation
- Whistleblower cases with voluminous supporting evidence
- Pro se filings with liberal construction

Judge King's approach:

- Hyper-technical procedural dismissal

- No attempt to identify operative complaint
- No guidance on how to cure defects
- Threat of sanctions for attempting to provide evidence

PATTERN EVIDENCE

This dismissal is part of a coordinated obstruction pattern:

1. **Timing** - Dismissed August 7, 2025, just as evidence was being compiled
 2. **Coordination** - Weissmuller threats (August 2024) preceded filing by one year
 3. **WSBA inaction** - State bar deferred/ignored complaints against Weissmuller
 4. **Docket manipulation** - Subsequent orders show CM/ECF corruption (Docket #44 issue)
 5. **Impossible standards** - Pro se plaintiff cannot meet contradictory requirements
-

ORDER #2: NOVEMBER 5, 2025 - MINUTE ORDER (FOURTH AMENDED COMPLAINT)

Document: Docket #44

Filed: November 5, 2025

COURT' S ACTIONS

ACCEPTED Fourth Amended Complaint

GRANTED extension of time to serve defendants until December 9, 2025

PERMITTED appropriate motions and filings

DOCKET CORRUPTION ISSUE

November 12, 2025 - Plaintiff' s Notice of Clarification:

PROBLEM #1: CM/ECF Links to Wrong Documents

- When users click on Docket #44 (Fourth Amended Complaint)
- System downloads documents from DISMISSED Docket #14 (July 23, 2025 filing)

- Docket #14 was dismissed August 7, 2025
- **Plaintiff cannot serve defendants with correct complaint**

PROBLEM #2: Law Firm Added as Defendant Without Consent

- Court's docket lists "Barlow Coughran Morales & Josephson, PS" as defendant
- Plaintiff only named Linda Josephson individually
- **Court added law firm without plaintiff's authorization**

OBSTRUCTION IMPACT:

- December 9, 2025 deadline approaching (28 days to serve)
 - Plaintiff cannot serve because docket is corrupted
 - If plaintiff misses deadline, case will be dismissed
 - **Classic procedural trap**
-

ADDITIONAL ORDERS TO REVIEW

Need to locate and analyze:

1. July 1, 2025 - Show cause order (mentioned in August 7 order)
 2. Any orders between August 7 and November 5, 2025
 3. Any minute orders or text-only orders
 4. Any orders on motions to compel, preliminary injunction, etc.
 5. Response to November 12, 2025 Notice of Clarification
-

LEGAL VIOLATIONS BY JUDGE KING

28 U.S.C. § 455 - Disqualification of Justice, Judge, or Magistrate Judge

(a) Any justice, judge, or magistrate judge of the United States shall disqualify himself in any proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned.

Grounds for disqualification:

1. **Appearance of bias** - Hyper-technical dismissal of massive fraud case
2. **Pattern of obstruction** - Multiple procedural traps
3. **Docket manipulation** - CM/ECF corruption benefits defendants
4. **Coordination with defendants** - Timing suggests advance knowledge
5. **Denial of due process** - Pro se plaintiff not afforded liberal construction

Judicial Misconduct

Code of Conduct for United States Judges - Canon 2:

“A judge should avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety in all activities.”

Violations:

1. Creating procedural traps for pro se litigant
 2. Threatening sanctions to chill legitimate claims
 3. Manipulating docket to prevent service of process
 4. Dismissing case without considering merits of \$56 trillion fraud
 5. Coordinating with IUOE enterprise to obstruct justice
-

REMEDIES REQUESTED

Immediate Actions

1. **Recusal** - Judge King must recuse herself from this case
2. **Reassignment** - Case must be assigned to different judge
3. **Docket correction** - CM/ECF corruption must be fixed
4. **Extension of deadlines** - Plaintiff needs time to serve with correct documents
5. **Preservation order** - All evidence must be preserved

Judicial Conduct Investigation

1. **Complaint to Ninth Circuit** - Judicial misconduct complaint
2. **U.S. Marshals investigation** - Coordination with RICO enterprise
3. **FBI investigation** - Obstruction of justice (18 U.S.C. § 1503)
4. **DOJ Civil Rights Division** - Denial of access to courts (42 U.S.C. § 1983)

Criminal Referral

18 U.S.C. § 1503 - Obstruction of Justice

“Whoever corruptly... obstructs, or impedes, or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede, the due administration of justice, shall be punished...”

Evidence:

- Procedural traps designed to dismiss case
- Docket manipulation preventing service
- Coordination with defendants (timing, WSBA inaction)
- Pattern of obstruction spanning multiple orders
- Denial of access to federal courts

18 U.S.C. § 241 - Conspiracy Against Rights

“If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any person... in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him

| *by the Constitution or laws of the United States...*”

Evidence:

- Coordination between Judge King, IUOE, Weissmuller, WSBA
 - Systematic denial of access to courts
 - Witness tampering + judicial obstruction = conspiracy
 - Pattern of rights violations
-

CONCLUSION

Judge Lauren King’ s orders demonstrate a clear pattern of obstruction designed to prevent this case from proceeding on the merits. Her hyper-technical procedural dismissals, creation of impossible standards for a pro se litigant, manipulation of the court docket, and threats of sanctions all suggest coordination with the defendants to deny the plaintiff access to justice.

This is not normal judicial conduct. This is obstruction of justice in furtherance of a \$56 trillion RICO enterprise.

Judge King must be named as a defendant and investigated by federal law enforcement.