

Honorable Judge Richard D. Eadie
Hearing Date: December 12, 2012
Hearing Time: 9:00 AM

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
26

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
FOR THE COUNTY OF KING

LANE POWELL, PC, an Oregon
professional corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

MARK DECOURSEY and CAROL
DECOURSEY

Defendants


No. 11-2-34596-3 SEA

**DECLARATION OF
CHARLES A. DAHM
REGARDING HEARING BEFORE
JUDGE EADIE ON NOVEMBER
16, 2012**

Herewith is the declaration of CHARLES A. DAHM who attended the November 16, 2012
hearing before Judge Richard D. Eadie in the above-captioned case.


DATED this 16 day of December 2012.

Carol DeCoursey



Pro se

Mark H. DeCoursey



Pro se

DECLARATION OF CHARLES A. DAHM

Mark and Carol DeCoursey, pro se
8209 172nd Ave NE
Redmond, WA 98052
Telephone 425.885.3130

I, Charles Dahm being of legal age and competent to testify, swear under penalty of perjury pursuant to the laws of the State of Washington, the following is true and correct.

On November 16, 2012, I attended a courtroom hearing (for partial summary judgment) in the matter of Lane Powell v. Mark DeCoursey and Carol DeCoursey, Case No. 11-2-34596-3-SEA. Judge Richard D. Eadie presided at the hearing. This is what I observed.

I was struck by the behavior of the Judge and the primary lawyer for Lane Powell. There was a symbiotic relationship that bordered on merging. I had a difficult time determining who was running the court, the Judge or the Lane Powell lawyer. I have to officially say that it was, in my observed opinion, the Lane Powell lawyer that was running the show and determining what the judge allowed in evidence and how the judge was going to rule.

The Lane Powell lawyer was the recipient of many constant knowing head bops, and other attentions that were disturbing to me.

The Lane Powell lawyer supplied almost word for word what the judge was going to use in the ruling, even to the point of making small what I observed was the reasonable and pertinent objections that the DeCourseys were striving to make about the lying in the proceedings.

Of course, this was deleterious to the DeCourseys case. In summation, I simply did not see the impartiality that I expected in the courtroom from a representative of the state, the judge. I was surprised by what seemed to be a rush to judgment, an ignoring of evidence, and an obvious, again to me, bowing to the lawyer for Lane Powell.

I was particularly disturbed by something called Exhibit K. The Lane Powell lawyer said it was something the DeCourseys had written and signed and sent to Lane Powell. Mark DeCoursey asked to see the document and it turned out that Exhibit K had been written and sent by Lane Powell to the DeCourseys.

When this was revealed the judge ignored the discrepancy and then prevented the DeCoursey's from presenting evidence.

This is my observation.

Signed this day, December 11, 2012

Charles A. Dahm



8219 172nd Ave. NE

Redmond, WA 988052

206-200-3260