



1 1.2 The State of Washington has chosen to establish the GAL program whereby GAL's are  
2 endowed by the State with vast, largely unchecked, investigatory powers gaining access  
3 to private family court matters under RCW 26.12.175, as well as minor representatives  
4 under RCW 13.34.100, RCW 13.34.105, and RCW 11.96A.160. In granting the GAL its  
5 vast investigatory powers into the family, personal finances, medical information and the  
6 like, the most intimate and private aspects of life, Washington State necessarily assumes  
7 the duty and responsibility to ensure the GAL adheres to the law, state statute, regulatory  
8 law, their pledged and assumed duties, professional responsibilities, and the Washington  
9 State Constitution, as beholden to the United States Constitution, and ultimately the  
10 fundamental promise of procedural due process (WA Constitution, Art. I, § 3).

11 1.3 The state of Washington, whether acting in its governmental or proprietary capacity, shall  
12 be liable for damages arising out of its tortious conduct to the same extent as if it were a  
13 private person or corporation (RCW 4.92.090). Every party should be treated equally as it  
14 is contrary to fundamental principles of law that one party be granted a special set of  
15 rules not afforded to others (RCW 4.96.010(1)). Without question, where the State  
16 assumes a duty to regulate, it can and should be held liable for its failure to act in proper  
17 accordance with that duty (*Cummins v. Lewis County*, 156 Wn.2d 844 (2006)).

18 1.4 There is extensive evidence of Defendants' knowledge of the pervasive problem  
19 represented by the mismanagement of the GAL program and individual GALs. Even  
20 without consideration of Plaintiff's ongoing but rebuffed efforts to seek redress, the State,  
21 and its AOC, were plainly on notice of the constitutionally, ethically and legally  
22 problematic outcomes of its GAL program for some time. Beginning at least in 2016, the  
23 nationally criticized 'Snohomish County GAL Scandal' revealed a devastating State  
24 Family Court case not dissimilar to Plaintiff's (Exhibit A., *In re Dependency of A.E.T.H.*,

1 196 Wn.2d 620 (2020)). Nevertheless, the State and its AOC have taken exactly *no*  
2 *remedial efforts* to correct the phenomenal scope of injustice at the hands of unmonitored  
3 state endowed private actors, the Guardian ad Litem.

4 1.5 This lawsuit seeks damages and declaratory relief to hold the Defendants, the State of  
5 Washington and its AOC, accountable for their complete and utter failure to develop,  
6 maintain, monitor, administer, regulate and/or enforce GAL program operations, which  
7 facilitated and perpetuated the GAL misconduct that directly led to the constitutional  
8 violations which caused Plaintiff's damages. Moreover, the Defendants have outright  
9 ignored, despite their affirmative duty to the law and our community, monstrous  
10 allegations and ongoing complaints against GALs, showing no intent to even  
11 acknowledge the catastrophic consequences of the issue, let alone pursue remedy.

12 1.6 Plaintiff Ms. Bloom filed Tort Claim Notice against the Defendant's March 24, 2025, in  
13 strict compliance with RCW 4.92.110.

## 14 II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

15 2.1 Jurisdiction is proper in Thurston County Superior Court as any Superior Court in  
16 Washington State maintains original jurisdiction as to any claim under the laws of the  
17 State of Washington (RCW 2.08.010).

18 2.2 Venue is appropriate for this civil action in Thurston County Superior Court of the state  
19 of Washington because Washington state maintains both its Capital and its AOC  
20 Administrative offices in Thurston County (RCW 4.92.010(5)).

21 2.3 Under Washington State Law Plaintiff seeks injunctive and declaratory relief for  
22 damages arising out of violations of the Washington State Constitution directly  
23 attributable to the acts and omissions of Washington state officials and agencies.  
24

1 III. PARTIES

2 3.1 Plaintiff Gina Bloom, by and through her attorney(s), Carnation Legal LLC, and Shannon  
3 M. Draughon, Pharos Law LLC, and Rasham Nassar, as and for her Complaint against  
4 the Defendants: State of Washington (“State”), State of Washington Administrative  
5 Office of the Courts (AOC) and JOHN DOES 1-10 *et. al.*, in each their individual and  
6 professional capacity as and in the roles that may be determined during the course of  
7 discovery and trial, states as follows:

8 3.2 Plaintiff Gina Bloom is an individual United State citizen, and mother of two (2), residing  
9 in King County, Washington, and who was residing in either King County or Snohomish  
10 County, Washington at the time of the acts, events and omissions complained of herein.<sup>2</sup>

11 IV. Defendant State of Washington (“State”) is a state organized under the laws of the United  
12 States, beholden to the United States Constitution and responsible for enacting,  
13 maintaining, and enforcing laws and policies regarding court-appointed Guardians ad  
14 Litem under RCW 26.12.175. By failing to oversee and regulate the GAL system and  
15 individual GALs, the State directly facilitated systemic due process violations.

16 4.1 Defendant Washington State Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) is the  
17 administrative body legislatively empowered by the State of Washington to maintain the  
18 training, oversight, and regulation of the GAL Program and individual GALs throughout  
19 the State. The AOC was on repeated and substantive notice of misconduct by GALs,  
20 including in Plaintiff’s case, but has failed to take any corrective action, violating its  
21 fundamental and statutory duties allowing for substantial ongoing damages to Plaintiff in  
22 this case.

23 \_\_\_\_\_  
24 <sup>2</sup> Previously known when married as Olimpia Georgiana Yorks

1 4.2 Doe Defendant(s) 1-10 *et. al.*: Plaintiff is presently unsure, or unaware, of the true and  
2 correct names and capacities or roles of those certain individual actors who participated  
3 in, authorized, or failed to prevent, the constitutional and statutory violations alleged  
4 herein. These unnamed Defendants may include employee(s), agent(s), and/or official(s)  
5 of the State and the Washington State Administrative Office of the Courts, or other  
6 governmental subdivisions or agencies responsible for oversight of the Guardian ad  
7 Litem system or complaint processes. Plaintiff will respectfully seek leave to amend this  
8 Complaint to include those Defendant(s) once their identities are entirely ascertained.

1 V. STATUTORY AND REGULATORY BACKGROUND

2 5.1 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, Civil Rights (1868): No State shall make or  
3 enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United  
4 States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due  
5 process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the  
6 laws.

7 5.2 WA State Constitution Art I § 3 Personal Rights: No person shall be deprived of life,  
8 liberty, or property, without due process of law.

9 5.3 WA State Constitution Art I § 7 Invasion of Private Affairs or Home Prohibited: No  
10 person shall be disturbed in his private affairs, or his home invaded, without authority of  
11 law.

12 5.4 WA State Constitution Art I § 10 Administration of Justice: Justice in all cases shall be  
13 administered openly, and without unnecessary delay.

14 5.5 WA State Constitution Art I § 12 Special Privileges and Immunities Prohibited: No law  
15 shall be passed granting to any citizen, class of citizens, or corporation other than  
16 municipal, privileges or immunities which upon the same terms shall not equally belong  
17 to all citizens, or corporations.

18 5.6 WA State Constitution Art I § 29 Constitution Mandatory: The provisions of this  
19 Constitution are mandatory, unless by express words they are declared to be otherwise.

20 5.7 WA State Constitution Art I § 32 Fundamental Principles: A frequent recurrence to  
21 fundamental principles is essential to the security of individual right and the perpetuity of  
22 free government.

1 5.8 RCW 26.12.175 governs the appointment, training, and oversight of Guardians ad Litem  
2 in Washington family law cases. It mandates that GALs must demonstrate neutrality,  
3 appropriate qualifications, and compliance with standards of practice.

4 5.9 RCW 2.56.030(15) tasks the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) with developing  
5 and managing policies and systems related to court operations, including the oversight of  
6 family law personnel and guardians ad litem.

7 5.10 *In re Dependency of A.E.T.H.*, 196 Wn.2d 620 (2020), the Washington Court of  
8 Appeals, Division I explicitly identified and acknowledged systemic failures within GAL  
9 oversight structures and directed courts and supervising bodies, including the AOC, to  
10 ensure compliance with GAL standards and fair procedures.

11 5.11 General Rule 31.1 (GR 31.1) governs access to administrative court records,  
12 including complaints, reports, and documents pertaining to court-appointed GALs. The  
13 AOC is obligated to ensure that county-level GAL programs operate transparently, in  
14 accordance with state rules and constitutional protections.

## 15 VI. RELEVANT FACTUAL BACKGROUND

16 6.1 The State of Washington and AOC have long been aware of systemic Guardian ad Litem  
17 (GAL) misconduct but have failed to act, despite clear duty, authority and responsibility  
18 under RCW 26.12.175 to regulate GALs.

19 6.2 In 2020, Court of Appeals, Division I mandated reforms to the GAL system following  
20 widespread misconduct and litigation in the 2016 Snohomish County case, *In re AETH*  
21 (*Id.*). However, the State failed to implement *any* remediation efforts fostering continued  
22 abuses of the most financially and/or socially vulnerable citizen participants in the  
23 Washington State Family Court system, including those experienced by Plaintiff.  
24

1 6.3 When Plaintiff Gina Bloom entered the Snohomish County Superior Family Court  
2 system in February 2020, she was a recently naturalized immigrant mother of two (2)  
3 young children fleeing her abusive husband, Brian Yorks, following an especially violent  
4 marital rape. Given Yorks significant history of domestic violence against Ms. Bloom,  
5 and his contemporaneous arrest for her rape, Ms. Bloom had sole custody and decision  
6 making as well as a protective order for her and the boys' safety (Snohomish County  
7 DVPO #20-2-01235-31). For that moment in time, the State protected Ms. Bloom and her  
8 children from their abuser.

9 6.4 Having been systematically isolated from her community, and forced to stop working,  
10 Ms. Bloom was dependent on Yorks for access to any money or resources. As the  
11 impending protection order hearing and Yorks retaliatory divorce filing proceeded Ms.  
12 Bloom found herself alone and destitute caring for her boys. Yorks on the other hand  
13 appeared equipped with a highly priced highly connected divorce lawyer and  
14 immediately requested a GAL, citing lawyer Canfield's "grave concerns" for Ms.  
15 Bloom's mental health and accounting her allegations of domestic violence as evidence  
16 of her mental infirmity or cruelty. Yorks' attorneys and their GAL buried Yorks' criminal  
17 history in endless pleadings and devastating criminal allegations against Plaintiff. With  
18 the power of the GAL, they would absolutely tear Ms. Bloom's life apart.

19 6.5 Very importantly, Yorks' lawyer, Damon Canfield worked directly with the Snohomish  
20 court to completely sidestep the neutral registry process mandated by Snohomish County  
21 Administrative Order 36-10 and ensure GAL Brian J. Parker of Port Gardner Law Group  
22 was assigned to serve as the GAL. GAL Parker was a known asset and colleague,  
23 solicited into the Snohomish County family law community by lawyer Jennifer Bitner, an  
24

1 associate at Canfield Madow Law Group, and the firm routinely facilitated to the point of  
2 assurance, GAL Parker's assignments in their cases (Ex. B, C).

3 6.6 As is common practice among the key family law community of attorneys in Snohomish  
4 County, this appointment was secured outside of the neutral registry process required by  
5 Snohomish County Administrative Order 36-10 but directly facilitated through informal  
6 communications between Canfield Madow and court staff, including Snohomish Superior  
7 Court judicial coordinator Nancy Norris (Ex. B).

8 6.7 GAL Parker was a favorite of Damon's firm, Canfield Madow PLLC. His appointment  
9 was commonly requested and always granted by the court. Brian Parker moved from  
10 Alabama to Clark County, and from Clark County to Snohomish County in 2019, where  
11 he was introduced and elevated by lawyer Jennifer Bitner. Since the inception of his  
12 work, of his twenty-four (24) total GAL case assignments in Snohomish County, twelve  
13 (12) or 50% originated from the direct request of Canfield Madow. Given the court  
14 endorsed, blatant and consistent deviation from the mandated neutral appointment  
15 process under Administrative Order 36-10, this prima facie favoritism – evidence  
16 contrary to neutrality, allowed Canfield Madow to place GAL Parker as the dominant  
17 GAL between 2020 and 2024 (Exhibit C).

18 6.8 As early as Aug. 10, 2020, the State was on notice of the specific GAL problem of  
19 Parker. In fact, in just his third assigned GAL case—and his first case not in answer to  
20 Canfield Madow—attorney J. Michael Gallagher filed a sworn declaration detailing to  
21 the court a warning that Parker had submitted *false statements in his GAL report*.

22 Gallagher cautioned the court of *Parker's misrepresentations and the risk of harm to*  
23  
24

1 *litigants and minor children* from his biased reports (Ex. D Atty. *Gallager Nielsen v.*  
2 *Nielsen #20-3-00087-31*).<sup>3</sup>

3 6.9 Despite these early and consistent red flags – including allegations and evidence of fraud  
4 and perjury, GAL Parker remained on the GAL registry and continued to be appointed in  
5 cases where domestic violence and child abuse were evident, and Parker fostered a  
6 volatile environment by framing these matters as high-conflict and placing  
7 disproportionate scrutiny on the one parent – the financially weaker parent, always the  
8 parent with the less connected attorney.

9 6.10 It was then, in 2021, that GAL Parker having been appointed over Plaintiff’s  
10 objections, to be paid privately by party opponent Yorks, submitted his first report – and  
11 changed everything in Plaintiff’s life, forever. The standard tactic was employed,  
12 whereby Canfield and his GAL methodically rewrote the story, representing Ms. Bloom  
13 as mentally ill and reverse custody.

14 6.11 August 16, 2021, Plaintiff Ms. Bloom filed a formal complaint regarding GAL  
15 Parker with the Washington State Consumer Resource Center (Ex. E AGO Complaint).  
16 She was ignored.

17 6.12 On August 20, 2021, Plaintiff filed a grievance with the Snohomish County GAL  
18 Administration, alleging fraud upon the court, bias, misrepresentation, and the  
19 unauthorized practice of law, asserting that the GAL’s conduct enabled Plaintiff’s ex-  
20 husband to violate the Domestic Violence Protection Order (DVPO) and remove the  
21 minor children from the state of Washington.

---

22  
23 <sup>3</sup> “*the GAL focused all of his attention on the Mother’s alleged deficits and even made a credibility determination*  
24 *based upon her "shaking" during an interview, concluding that this was evidence of an alcohol problem. It is*  
*unknown what training and/or expertise the GAL has in the area of drug and alcohol abuse.” Nielsen v. Nielsen,*  
page 4 ¶¶ 9–10.

1 6.13 On October 29, 2021, Canfield and GAL Parker colluded to fraudulently bring an  
2 ex parte “emergency” hearing. Plaintiff was not present and had not been provided proper  
3 notice of the hearing. Despite the fact that everyone, specifically the two officers of the  
4 court, attorney Canfield and his GAL Parker, knew Ms. Bloom was at Seattle Children’s  
5 with her younger son, they led the court to believe she was missing with the child,  
6 location unknown, and a danger to his safety. Commissioner Jacalyn Brudvik accordingly  
7 adopted Parker’s recommendations wholesale, which immediately flipped custody and  
8 decision making to Yorks, effectively abolishing the DVPO and any remnant of  
9 protection available to Ms. Bloom and her children.

10 6.14 That was only the beginning. Over the course of the family court litigation leading  
11 to trial, between June 2021 and November 2021, GAL Parker filed five (5) reports with  
12 the court, each responsive to Ms. Bloom’s allegations of abuse or neglect against her  
13 abuser Mr. Yorks, quickly mounting new and growing allegations against Plaintiff. Each  
14 report further vilified Ms. Bloom, categorically ignoring or misrepresented her conduct,  
15 the results of medical evaluations and her legal and financial circumstances to the court.

16 6.15 To secure a favorable outcome for his colleagues at Canfield Madow, GAL  
17 Parker went so far as to falsely testify, under oath with actual malice, that Dr. Monique  
18 Brown, the psychologist selected and paid for by Yorks, to conduct Ms. Bloom’s  
19 psychological evaluation, determined she (Plaintiff) suffers from a personality disorder  
20 that affects her ability to parent – which is not what the report concluded, rather, Dr.  
21 Brown affirmed that she is the primary parent and a victim of domestic violence – the  
22 report in fact favored Ms. Bloom and criticized the court, nothing that if there “were  
23 fairness and equity in the court,” Ms. Bloom would not have lost her children.  
24

1 6.16 Then, in the most devastating fashion possible, at trial, over Ms. Bloom's  
2 vehement objections, lawyer Bitner as buttressed by her GAL Parker, objected to and  
3 prevented Dr. Brown from testifying, arguing her testimony would be redundant and  
4 cumulative unnecessarily prolonging the trial, given the exhaustive 50+ page evaluation  
5 provided to the court.

6 6.17 Unfortunately, then, Ms. Bitner and GAL Parker wholly misrepresented the  
7 contents and conclusions of the report, which actually favored Ms. Bloom. The court  
8 relied on lawyer Bitner, and GAL Parker's testimony, and pronounced Ms. Bloom  
9 mentally ill, again, despite the fact that Dr. Brown's evaluation, and the prior two (2), for  
10 a total of three (3) mental health evaluations provided to the court, concluded no mental  
11 infirmity that would affect parenting, supporting Ms. Bloom as the primary parent and  
12 substantiating allegations of domestic violence against Plaintiff.

13 6.18 Over the course of the family law litigation, Plaintiff made numerous formal  
14 complaints evidencing GAL Parker's illegal activities. All efforts, *all efforts*, were utterly  
15 ignored or met with lukewarm placation (Ex. H).

16 6.19 Ms. Bloom filed formal complaints regarding GAL Parker with AOC in August  
17 of 2021 and again in January 2023. However, Ms. Bloom's efforts to challenge GAL  
18 Parker's conduct through the grievance process of the court were summarily denied  
19 without due process by Paul Thompson, Chair of the GAL Committee. Neither grievance  
20 received formal adjudication or review.<sup>4</sup> There was no hearing, no investigation, no  
21 appeal allowed under the local GAL Rules. Ms. Bloom was provided with no notice of  
22

---

23 <sup>4</sup> Snohomish County Superior Court Local Rules, Section 7.1(b)(2):  
24 The GAL Committee Chair or Presiding Judge shall review the grievance or complaint and make an initial  
determination regarding its potential merit. If the grievance or complaint is deemed to lack potential merit, it shall  
not be further reviewed, and the complainant shall be notified accordingly.

1 determination and only became aware of the first review and dismissal during the initial  
2 moments of her family law trial in May of 2021.

3 6.20 The Snohomish County Court Rules GAL Grievance Policy SCLGALR 7.1 states  
4 that if a grievance is deemed by the Chair to lack "potential merit," it is dismissed with no  
5 further review, appeal, or record entry. Apparently, this is exactly what happened here;  
6 following closed door individual review by GAL Committee Chair Thompson, he alone  
7 concluded the lack of merit, a process that on its face violates due process under the  
8 Washington State Constitution and the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States  
9 Constitution, as there is no procedural mechanism to challenge the conduct of a state-  
10 licensed and empowered GAL.

11 6.21 In addition to Plaintiff Bloom's formal complaints, public records and complaint  
12 documentation show that by 2022, Parker has accumulated multiple formal complaints  
13 (Ex. F Parker's 2022-GAL Registry Application). Despite this, GAL Parker continued to  
14 serve on all active cases through 2023 and 2024. Attorney GAL Parker was further  
15 engaged as a pro-tem commissioner for Snohomish County. Notably, GAL Parker no  
16 longer completed and maintained his yearly GAL application on file, for 2023 and 2024,  
17 in violation of registry renewal policies. Nevertheless, despite the complete procedural  
18 and substantive due process failures, rubber-stamped by Snohomish County Superior  
19 Court, GAL Parker continued to be preferred and assigned to high conflict custody cases.

20 6.22 In October 2023, by Everett Police Department investigation, it was determined  
21 that there was probable cause to charge GAL Parker with first-degree perjury based on  
22 his false testimony at Ms. Bloom's family law trial in May 2022.<sup>5</sup> Although the  
23

24  

---

<sup>5</sup> Everett Police Department #2022-00096343

1 Snohomish Superior Court temporarily suspended Parker from serving as a pro tem  
2 commissioner for a short time following reports of his criminal conduct, he was allowed  
3 to continue serving as a GAL, even as late as November 2024. Attorney Brian Parker  
4 currently serves as the family court commissioner in Clallam County, Washington.

5 6.23 The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), through its statutory duties and  
6 obligations, pronounced by RCW 26.12.175 and RCW 2.56.030, was aware of, or  
7 certainly should have been aware of, Parker’s ongoing misconduct. The AOC failed to  
8 intervene, reform, or implement any policy, or policy changes, despite knowledge of  
9 GAL regulatory failures in Snohomish County, even specifically as it relates to especially  
10 problematic GALs like Parker.

11 6.24 GAL’s are endowed by the State with a phenomenal scope of power, far  
12 exceeding that of any other attorney or judge. This vast investigatory power, unchecked  
13 by any constitutional and/or due process safeguards, is purchased to leverage by certain  
14 players in the family court system, here for example Canfield Madow and their GAL of  
15 choice Parker, to gain unfair advantage in litigation and/or maintain power and  
16 professional positioning and growth.

17 6.25 Despite mounting evidence—police findings, misconduct complaints, and a well-  
18 documented history of misrepresentation from multiple unconnected sources—the State  
19 has systematically failed to uphold core constitutional guarantees: procedural and  
20 substantive due process, parental rights, and access to an impartial tribunal, and court-  
21 appointed investigators. In doing so, the State has abandoned its duty to Gina Bloom and  
22 her two minor sons.

23 6.26 The court’s indifference to Ms. Bloom’s constitutional rights, judicial neutrality,  
24 and the safety of her children was laid bare when Parker, still serving as a GAL in active

1 cases involving Canfield Madow clients, was repeatedly re-appointed by the court as a  
2 pro tem commissioner. While presiding, he judged cases involving attorneys from the  
3 same firm—a glaring violation of neutrality principles.

4 6.27 Even as complaints mounted, knowing the risks Parker’s presence posed to  
5 litigants and their children—allegations of bias, ethical conflicts, and an unresolved  
6 perjury investigation—Judge Paul Thompson, a State actor, having denied Plaintiff’s two  
7 GAL grievances, and following his *sua sponte* recusal in response to the outcome of the  
8 criminal investigation of GAL Parker, Judge Thompson continued signing Parker’s  
9 judicial appointments into December 2024 (WA Const. Art. IV, § 1; *Keenan v. Allan*, 889  
10 F. Supp. 1320, 1363 (E.D. Wash. 1995) (judges are officers of Washington State); *Duvall*  
11 *v. County of Kitsap*, 260 F. Supp. 3d 1211, 1222 (W.D. Wash. 2017).<sup>6</sup>

12 6.28 The AOC’s deliberate indifference to the oversight, discipline, and removal of  
13 unfit GALs has rendered its regulatory framework meaningless. Behind the façade of  
14 formal oversight lies a vacuum of accountability, where entrenched failures persist  
15 unchecked, inflicting vast, devastating systemic harm on litigants like Plaintiff. Lives are  
16 being destroyed at the hand of State apathy and the court’s protectionism.

## 17 VII. CAUSES OF ACTION

18 Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference the paragraphs set out above as though fully set  
19 forth herein and below.

### 20 **Count I: For Damages Violation of Article, I, Section 3 of the WA Constitution**

21 (Against the State, the State Administrative Office of the Courts and State Officials in Their  
22 Official and Personal Capacities as May be Discovered and Proven at Trial)

23 Article I, Section 3 of the Washington Constitution provides that:

24 **“No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.”**

---

<sup>6</sup> Washington judges are state actors whose authority derives from the state, not the county.

1 7.1 Plaintiff Gina Bloom has a guaranteed fundamental liberty interest under both the  
2 Washington and United States Constitution, in her life, liberty, and the pursuit of  
3 happiness and in the care, custody, and control of her minor children, unencumbered by  
4 the unreasonable interference by the State.

5 7.2 Despite these recognized fundamental liberty interests, and how deeply the GAL affects  
6 them, the process by which GALs are certified, appointed, reviewed, and disciplined  
7 under the authority of the AOC, as prescribed by the State under RCW 26.12.175 and  
8 governed by GR 23, entirely lacks any mechanism for meaningful oversight, public  
9 accountability, or procedural remedy.

10 7.3 Specifically, while GALs are endowed by the State of Washington with broad rights of  
11 intrusion into the personal lives of citizens and their families, there are no corresponding  
12 checks and balances to ensure the protection of individual civil rights. There exists no  
13 independent adjudicative process for review of complaints submitted against GALs, even  
14 where those complaints allege perjury, ethical misconduct, and violations of court orders,  
15 often at the cost of children and domestic violence victims, the most vulnerable members  
16 of our community.

17 7.4 The State AOC's grievance procedures and those implemented at the county level  
18 facilitate closed doors, unilateral private review process, shielded entirely from outside  
19 scrutiny and unavailable legally to the public, even the complaining party, directly  
20 allowing for summary dismissal of complaints without hearing, notice, or right to appeal.  
21 The compliant process is devoid of any transparency whatsoever (Ex. I).

22 7.5 Plaintiff submitted detailed and credible grievances concerning GAL Brian J. Parker,  
23 including reports of dishonesty, bias, and procedural irregularities. Ms. Bloom reported  
24

1 credible evidence of the abuse of her children, and that GAL Parker was assisting in its  
2 cover-up.

3 7.6 However, despite ongoing original corollary evidence of GAL Parker’s illegal behavior,  
4 Ms. Bloom’s grievances were dismissed without explanation, hearing, or review.  
5 Purportedly all such complaints, for example Attorney Gallagher’s declaration of GAL  
6 Parker’s deceit, are met with utter ambivalence if not offense.

7 7.7 Even after Everett Police Department substantiated findings of first-degree perjury  
8 committed by Parker under oath, the AOC and Snohomish County Superior Court  
9 permitted him to continue serving as a GAL in pending family law matters, including  
10 those affecting Plaintiff and her children and their guaranteed constitutional rights as  
11 citizens of the United States of America and Washington State.

12 7.8 Ultimately, the administrative failures facilitated the removal of Plaintiff’s children from  
13 her care in a staged “emergency” ex parte proceeding, without proper notice, without  
14 Plaintiff’s participation, and in express contradiction of the protections afforded by  
15 Article I, Section 3 of the Washington Constitution and her then standing DVPO(s).

16 7.9 Parker’s GAL report in that proceeding, which was dispositive in flipping custody and  
17 financial relations between the parties, was later shown by neutral third-party Everett  
18 Police Department to contain knowingly false information, yet no accountability or  
19 remedial procedure was available to Plaintiff.

20 7.10 By establishing and maintaining a statutory and administrative framework for  
21 GAL certification and appointment, empowering them with unparalleled powers of  
22 intrusion and investigation, without incorporating the appropriate, or any affirmative due  
23 process protections, including notice, hearing, and opportunity to confront witnesses  
24 against you, an impartial tribunal, review, and appeal, Defendants allowed for and

1 effectively endorsed the extensive violation of Plaintiff's rights under Article I, Section 3  
2 of the Washington Constitution and the Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

3 7.11 The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), as the State agency tasked with  
4 oversight of Guardian ad Litem (GAL) programs under RCW 26.12.175, failed to ensure  
5 their GALs, here GAL Parker, follow the law, including the constitution, adhere to the  
6 Rules of Professional Conduct or development and maintain any form of meaningful  
7 grievance system for litigants who are harmed by GAL misconduct.

8 7.12 The State and its AOC have a clear duty to regulate GALs effectively, ensuring  
9 they act in the best interests of the vulnerable individuals to which they are assigned. It is  
10 clear, despite the protectionism by the court of its disciplinary records and the  
11 proclamation of confidentiality under GR 31.1, that there is systemic failure to properly  
12 establish and maintain a legally enforceable GAL program, and that systemic failure  
13 leads, and here led, to the massive devastation of individual constitutional rights without  
14 due process of law.

15 7.13 Although Guardians ad Litem are endowed by the State with investigatory  
16 authority that in some respects rivals or exceeded that of law enforcement, they operate  
17 with little to no external oversight, answerable only to the very judges who appoint them  
18 and rely on their reports as a primary source of evidence.<sup>7</sup> The State has utterly failed to  
19 address or remediate any of the fundamental problems with the GAL program and its  
20 GAL members:

21 a) NO Neutral adjudication of GAL grievances;

22  
23 <sup>7</sup> Snohomish County Superior Court Local Rule 7.1(g): All resolutions of grievances or complaints by the GAL  
24 Committee shall be final and not subject to further appeal. Except that a GAL/AGAL who has been removed from a  
registry may appeal to the Presiding Judge.

- b) NO Public or published findings;
- c) NO Removal of GALs following substantiated misconduct;
- d) NO Oversight of GAL appointment patterns indicating bias or conflicts of interest (Ex. G Email from AOC stating no mechanism of oversight).

7.14 This omission by the AOC allowed Parker, while at all times acting under color of State law, to continue harming Plaintiff, fraudulently removing Ms. Bloom’s custodial rights, jeopardizing the wellbeing of two minor children, and facilitating continued familial abuse by Yorks, again, always with the imprimatur of state legitimacy.

**Count II: For Declaratory and Injunctive Relief from Ongoing Violation of Article, I, Section 3 of the WA Constitution**

(Against the State and the State Administrative Office of the Courts and State Officials in Their Official and Personal Capacities as May be Discovered and Proven at Trial)

Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference the paragraphs set out above as though fully set forth herein and below.

7.15 Plaintiff Ms. Bloom seeks prospective equitable relief against officials of the Washington State Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) for and its officers and/or representative employees, as may be discovered, for ongoing and systemic violations of her guaranteed due process rights under the Washington and U.S. Constitutions.

7.16 The AOC has assumed statutory responsibility for the training, oversight, and regulatory supervision of Guardians ad Litem (GALs) pursuant to RCW 26.12.175 and General Rule (GR) 23. Despite this inherent responsibility and unique authority, AOC officials have permitted the GAL system to operate without any meaningful public accountability, procedural safeguards, or grievance adjudication process.

7.17 Consequent to this systemic failure:

- 1 a) Complaints of GAL misconduct—even as catastrophic as perjury, bias, illegal  
2 ex parte contact, and disregard of court orders—are dismissed without any  
3 known investigation, hearing, or right of review.
- 4 b) The administrative GR 31.1 rules implemented by the AOC do not permit an  
5 independent or impartial forum, in fact they actively prevent public access, to  
6 adjudicate these complaints or provide redress to aggrieved parties.
- 7 c) This regulatory void directly contributed to the loss of Plaintiff’s custody  
8 rights through reliance on falsified evidence, secreting exonerating evidence  
9 and the unverified reports submitted by court-appointed GALs, even those  
10 like Parker, with a lengthy documented history of material misconduct.

11 7.18 Even after the police substantiated findings of serious misconduct, the AOC still  
12 sanctioned GAL Parker to continue accepting appointments, perpetuating harm to  
13 Plaintiff and similarly situated parties. The vast majority of cases for which he was  
14 selected and assigned involved allegations of domestic violence and child abuse.

15 7.19 Plaintiff alleges that these ongoing practices and omissions amount to State  
16 obliviousness to its duty, whereby the State affirmatively ensures a structural and  
17 systemic denial of promised due process under Article I, Section 3 of the Washington  
18 Constitution.

19 7.20 Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks declaratory and injunctive relief requiring:

- 20 a) That this Court declare the current grievance procedures and oversight  
21 structure, or lack thereof, for GALs, as maintained by the AOC, to be  
22 constitutionally inadequate under Article I, Section 3.  
23  
24

- 1           b) That the Court enjoin the AOC from certifying or authorizing GALs until and  
2           unless they have established a meaningful, adjudicative process for GAL  
3           grievance review is implemented;
- 4           c) That the AOC adopt and enforce clear performance and disciplinary  
5           standards;
- 6           d) That the public has access to complaint outcomes;
- 7           e) That there are meaningful procedures in place to suspend or decertify GALs  
8           who have been found to commit misconduct.

9           **Count III: For Damages Relief from Violation of Article, I, Section 7 of the WA**  
10           **Constitution**

11           (Against the State and the State Administrative Office of the Courts and State Officials in Their  
12           Official and Personal Capacities as May be Discovered and Proven at Trial)

13           Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference the paragraphs set out above as though fully set  
14           forth herein and below.

15           Article I, Section 7 of the Washington Constitution provides that:

16           **“No person shall be disturbed in his private affairs, or his home invaded, without  
17           authority of law.”**

18           7.21       Plaintiff Gina Bloom has a guaranteed fundamental liberty interest under the  
19           Washington and United States Constitutions to be free from the unreasonable State search  
20           and seizure, the invasion into her personal affairs or her home without authority of law.

21           7.22       Despite these recognized fundamental liberty interests, GALs are endowed by the  
22           State to enter into the private affairs of citizens, seize personal information and materials,  
23           provide them to the opposing party, the court and other ancillary service providers, as  
24           individually determined by the GAL, prescribed by RCW 26.12.175 and governed by GR  
25           23. However, the program and process entirely lack any mechanism to ensure legal  
26           compliance, for meaningful oversight, public accountability, or procedural remedy.

1 7.23 In this case, GAL Parker was legislatively granted access and thereby possessed a  
2 vast record of Ms. Bloom’s personal information, and that of her sons, without limitation,  
3 medical, financial, mental health, including the detailed reports of Yorks pervasive sexual  
4 assault of Ms. Bloom as well as third party reports supporting allegations that Yorks is  
5 sexually molesting his oldest son. GAL Parker possessed the personal information and  
6 then contorted it, misrepresented it and maliciously falsified the record to ensure his  
7 employer colleagues and those at Canfield Madow success in trial, and remove Ms.  
8 Bloom’s children from her custody achieving additional long-term control over her life  
9 for her abuser Yorks.

10 **Count IV: For Damages Relief from Violation of Article, I, Section 10 of the WA**  
11 **Constitution**

12 (Against the State, the State Administrative Office of the Courts and State Officials in Their  
13 Official and Personal Capacities as May be Discovered and Proven at Trial)

14 Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference the paragraphs set out above as though fully set  
15 forth herein and below.

16 WA State Constitution Art I § 10 Administration of Justice.

17 **“Justice in all cases shall be administered openly, and without unnecessary delay.”**

18 7.24 Due process requires transparency and accountability. As introduced above, the  
19 Defendants have established and follow customs and policies that ensure justice is not the  
20 primary pursuit in GAL program administration and management and that the process is  
21 wholly hidden from the public, including the participant complaining party.

22 7.25 The State and the State AOC and its officers and officials are legally compelled to  
23 adhere to principles of justice, expediency and transparency, none of which are present,  
24 or even sought by the State in this case or elsewhere with GAL cases.

Defendants Breach of Duty

**Count V: For Damages State Negligence: Breach of Statutory Duty RCW 26.12.175.**

1 (Against the State, the State Administrative Office of the Courts and State Officials in Their  
2 Official and Personal Capacities as May be Discovered and Proven at Trial)

3 Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference the paragraphs set out above as though fully set  
4 forth herein and below.

5 7.26 Under RCW 26.12.175 the State imposes a duty upon the AOC and Superior  
6 Courts to ensure the integrity, neutrality, and qualification of GALs appointed in family  
7 law matters. The State statute authorizes the creation and regulation of GAL registries.

8 7.27 Under *Cummins v. Lewis County*, 156 Wn.2d 844 (2006), when a governmental  
9 entity undertakes a regulatory duty, it assumes an obligation to exercise reasonable care  
10 in its performance. The State, the AOC and Snohomish Superior Court categorically  
11 breached that duty causing significant emotional and physical damages and distress to  
12 herself and her family.

13 7.28 By continuing to authorize Brian J. Parker to serve as GAL while ignoring formal  
14 complaints, disregarding evidence of perjury, and failing to enforce registration renewal  
15 requirements, the AOC engaged in grossly negligent regulatory conduct.

16 6.17 This breach directly and proximately caused Plaintiff to lose custody of her  
17 children, access to family resource, the home and finances, suffer unmendable  
18 reputational harm, and endure continuing emotional and psychological injury.

## 19 VIII. DAMAGES

20 8.1 Plaintiff has suffered substantial damages, including but not limited to:

- 21 a) Extreme emotional distress from wrongful separation from her children;
- 22 b) Extreme emotional and physical health distress and malady due to the  
23 exasperated abusive litigation tactics employed by Canfield Madow and  
24 perpetuated by GAL Parker for the State.

- 1 c) Monumental financial losses from remedial legal fees required to challenge  
2 fraudulent GAL reports and continued litigation to right his wrongs;  
3 d) Total loss of access to the marital home and assets;  
4 e) Significant and lasting damage to her reputation due to false allegations of  
5 criminal, mentally ill, and neglectful behavior, leveled by GAL Parker and  
6 included in his reports to the court;  
7 f) The profound and irreversible devastation of a mother unjustly torn from her  
8 children—her parental rights stripped away through false allegations  
9 weaponized by her abuser with the aid of the State. The years stolen from her,  
10 the milestones missed, and the inability to protect or comfort them in their  
11 most vulnerable moments—losses so deep they can never be reclaimed.

12 8.2 Plaintiff seeks economic damages in an amount to be determined at trial and non-  
13 economic remedies in the form of declaratory relief and injunction.

#### 14 IX. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

15 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court enter judgment in her favor and  
16 grant the following relief:

##### 17 Declaratory Relief

18 10.1 Judicial declaration that the current Guardian ad Litem (GAL) grievance and  
19 oversight framework administered by the Washington Administrative Office of the  
20 Courts (AOC) and implemented under RCW 26.12.175, as applied, violates the  
21 procedural and substantive due process rights of family law litigants under Article I, §§ 3,  
22 7 and 10 of the Washington State Constitution and the Fourteenth Amendment to the  
23 United States Constitution.  
24

1 Injunctive Relief

2 10.2 A permanent injunction directing the AOC to:

- 3 a) Establish a transparent, impartial, and timely grievance adjudication process  
4 for GAL complaints;
- 5 b) Enforce statutory registration and application renewal requirements for GALs  
6 statewide;
- 7 c) Publish public-facing outcomes of substantiated grievances, disciplinary  
8 actions, or removals;
- 9 d) Prohibit GAL assignments for individuals not in current standing on approved  
10 registries.
- 11 e) Prospective Structural Relief
- 12 f) An order requiring the AOC to adopt oversight and audit procedures to  
13 monitor GAL appointment patterns, evaluate for potential conflicts of interest,  
14 and implement safeguards against judicial favoritism or attorney-directed  
15 assignments.

16 Monetary Relief

17 (State Negligence Claim Results in Violations of Constitution) RCW 4.92.090

18 10.3 An award of general and special damages in an amount to be proven at trial  
19 against the State of Washington for negligent regulatory conduct in the administration  
20 and enforcement of RCW 26.12.175.

21 10.4 An award of general and special damages in an amount to be proven at trial  
22 against the State of Washington, State AOC and its Officers or Agents as identified for  
23 failure to properly administer and enforce the GAL program in accordance with the  
24 Washington State Constitution and RCW 26.12.175.

