2

4

5

6

7

8

GINA BLOOM, an individual,

City of Lake Stevens ("City") a municipal entity in Washington State,

**Lake Stevens Police Department** 

Kristen Parnell ("Parnell"), Jonh

City of Lake Stevens, **Detective** 

Does 1-10, et.al.

Defendant.

(LSPD), a division of the Defendant

Plaintiff,

9

10

11

1213

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

\_ .

23

24

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

NO. C25-1111

JURY DEMAND

**COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES** 

For CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATIONS UNDER THE FIRST, FOURTH, FIFTH and FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS, of the UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION, and RELATED STATE CLAIMS and STATE CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATIONS.

# I. Introduction

- 1.1 The promises of the United States of America, freedom and opportunity, stood juxtaposed to the life Gina Bloom knew growing up, at the turn of the century, impoverished, from a small town in eastern Romania. Gina knew an abusive father, a browbeaten mother, a broken educational system and a corrupt government. Her hometown was unapologetically managed by the forces of corruption and bribery.
- 1.2 Young Gina remembers watching, as her father, knuckles cracked and still bleeding, would greet the police at their front door with joviality and a firm handshake, payment in

- 1.3 But Gina was smart, and industrious, she could see the way out. Hyper focused on her studies she maintained exceptional marks, earning her the opportunity to travel to Western Europe, and eventually the United States, on scholarships for her schooling. Her dreams of a new life, freedom and opportunity, a land where she could have voice, were coming true.
- 1.4 Soon after beginning her college studies in 2007, in Bellevue Washington, Gina met the man who would become the father of her children, Brian Yorks. Brian swept her off her feet, with his words, his emails, messages and phone calls, wrote with his praise for Gina's beauty and loveliness. He just couldn't live without her. Finally, Gina agreed to meet Brian in person, on June 13, 2008.
- 1.5 Wooed in romance for the first time, Gina fell in love, he married her, and they were a family. Gina had two (2) baby boys. Gina continued to study and achieved her United States citizenship; her dreams were coming true, she was working, a wife and mother, and an American citizen.
- 1.6 But then, she wasn't. When Gina went to the police for help, pleading for protection, for herself and her children, from Brian's escalating violence in their home, ongoing sexual assault and leveraging threats to the boys for Gina's submission, she thought they would help. Gina fully believed in the United States, and in her hometown of Lake Stevens Washington, the police would be there to help her. She was wrong.

## **II.** Complaint for Damages

- 2.1 Plaintiff Gina Bloom, by and through her undersigned counsels, brings this action against Defendant City of Lake Stevens, The Lake Stevens Police Department, Lake Stevens Police Department, Detective Kristen Parnell, and JOHN DOES 1-10, and alleges as follows:
- 2.2 That the Defendants, did *and do*, developed and adhered to a policy custom or practice; official policy or widespread, unwritten custom(s) that violate well established and understood federal rights granted to citizens under the United States Constitution, that those policies, customs or practices did directly cause the violations and damages alleged herein, and those as may be proved at trial, that it is the Defendant(s) municipality that it responsible for the violation of Ms. Bloom's constitutional rights, that the Defendant(s) knowingly, or with wanton disregard, violated those rights, and that it is the Defendant municipality that is responsible for these unconstitutional customs, policies, and practices, that directly led to the violations of her rights and the resulting, and ongoing, damages she is currently suffering.

### **III. Jurisdiction and Venue**

- 3.1 This is a civil action for violations of Plaintiff's constitutional rights under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, and related state-law claims. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question jurisdiction) over the federal claims, and supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1367 over the state-law claims, as those state claims arise from and form part of the same case or controversy.
- 3.2 Venue is proper in this Federal Western District because the events giving rise to the claims occurred in the Western District of Washington, the Plaintiff and all Defendants are located in this district.

## IV. Parities

- 4.1 <u>Plaintiff</u> **Gina Bloom** ("**Bloom**"), previously known as Olimpia Georgiana Yorks, is a United States citizen, mother of two, domestic violence survivor and advocate, and long-term resident of Washington State, currently living in King County, Washington State. At all relevant times, Ms. Bloom was engaged in good faith efforts to protect herself and her children from the abuse she continues to suffer by her ex-husband, Brian Yorks, and to seek help from law enforcement and the courts.
- 4.2 <u>Defendant</u> City of Lake Stevens ("City") is a municipal entity in Washington State that operates the Defendant Lake Stevens Police Department (LSPD). The City of Lake Stevens is or was the employer of the law enforcement officers involved in the acts and omissions described herein and is responsible for their conduct and adherence to state-law, and the associated claims, under the doctrine of respondeat superior. The City, through its LSPD, had a duty to properly train, supervise, and discipline its officers in compliance with the law, including due process and equal protection, discrimination laws and domestic violence victim rights and training. And generally, to refrain from using their power to impermissibly squelch individuals' constitutional rights.
- 4.3 <u>Defendant</u> Lake Stevens Police Department (LSPD) is a division of the Defendant City of Lake Stevens and is charged with providing law enforcement and public safety services within the City's territorial limits. The Defendant City of Lake Stevens is responsible for the policies, customs, practices, and supervision of the Lake Stevens Police Department and its officers, including but not limited to Detectives, Sergeants, Chief personnel, and the offices administrative personnel.
- 4.4 <u>Defendant</u> **Detective Kristen Parnell** ("**Parnell**") is, upon information and belief, a detective employed by LSPD. At all relevant times, Detective Parnell acted under color of state law in the course and scope of her duties as a law enforcement officer. Detective

Parnell is named herein in individual capacity, and to the extent available and applicable by law, in her official capacity, and was a central actor in the events and omission herein described, including engaging in a pattern of purposely retaliatory and defamatory conduct toward Ms. Bloom.

4.5 <u>Defendants</u> **J. Does 1-10** Plaintiff is ignorant or not fully aware of the true names and capacities of those certain persons who were involved in the wrongdoing alleged. These Doe Defendants may include other officers or officials of LSPD or the City, or other agencies who coordinated with Defendant Parnell or participated in the deprivation of Plaintiff's rights. Plaintiff will respectfully seek leave to amend this Complaint to allege their true names and capacities when finally ascertained.

## V. Factual Background

- 5.1 Gina was only twenty-one (21) years old when she met Brian. The man that would be the father of her two (2) children. Brian groomed Gina, and manipulated Gina into eloping in Las Vegas, on August 29, 2008, after only dating for two (2) months.
- 5.2 More than a decade later, after what emerged quickly to be a relationship riddled with physical and psychological abuse, Gina mustered the courage, and called her local police, Lake Stevens Police Department (LSPD). This time, her husband, Yorks had found her in bed, post serious back injury, already medicated, and asleep, so he proceeded to violently rape her. It was not the first time, and truly Gina knew it would not be the last. She had to do something.
- 5.3 At this point in the marriage, after years of grooming and manipulation, Gina had been completely demoralized by Yorks, systematically isolated from her community and limiting her social life to the women at Yorks' Baptist church, who's mantra was "wives 'submit' to your husband. Yorks forced Gina to stop working outside the home while she

<sup>1</sup>LSPD #2016-00005257 No charge for non-fatal strangulation was pursued, in part due to Officer Kilroy's failure to properly document Ms. Bloom's visible neck and chest injuries as consistent with non-fatal strangulation.

- 5.4 It was not uncommon for Yorks to follow Gina when she left the house, appearing places unexpected, seen hiding in shopping aisles across the store, and then scooting across the background and disappearing, even in places Gina would have never believed he would be able to know about, such as a trip to the grocery store, in the middle of the afternoon, while Yorks was meant to be at work.
- 5.5 Despite Gina failing the courage to leave Yorks until 2020, LSPD were aware of the domestic violence leveled against her as early as 2016, when in March of that year, LSPD arrested Mr. Yorks for malicious mischief (domestic violence) and interfering with reporting domestic violence, following a physical encounter in which he strangled Ms. Bloom, leaving visible red marks on her neck and chest area.
- 5.6 Inexplicitly, following the onsite investigation and the officer's interview with suspect Yorks, LSPD Officer Kilroy attributed the large, lasting red skin burns, likely to be consequent to Gina holding her then three (3)-week-old infant.<sup>1</sup>
- 5.7 On February 12, 2020, LSPD arrested Yorks again, this time charging him with Rape in Second Degree (domestic violence), after Ms. Bloom reported the violent sexual assault, she endured following her auto accident induced back injury.
- 5.8 Consequently, on that same day, February 12, 2020, Ms. Bloom obtained a Domestic Violence Protection Order (DVPO) from the Snohomish County Superior Court, against him for her and her children's protection. Gina had sole temporary custody of the parties' children.

- 5.9 Yorks then filed for divorce from Gina on February 26, 2020, initiating the Family Court proceedings in Snohomish County Family Court. Despite the protective measures put in place by that same Court, Mr. Yorks ramped up his abusive and threatening behavior.
- 5.10 On multiple occasions between 2020 and 2022, Ms. Bloom reported violations of the Snohomish DVPO's she had in place for her and her sons' protection, including credible allegations of stalking, harassment, and instances of abuse of/or child endangerment by Yorks.
- 5.11 On multiple occasions, Gina reported stalking or illegal conduct to LSPD. Despite repeated attempts to seek redress from the local authorities, Gina was met with only mounting hostility.
- 5.12 Gina, extremely concerned with the police treatment she was receiving, and following those multiple instances in which LSPD failed to act on her reports of Yorks, and his individual associates, in July 2021, Gina petitioned LSPD for a formal internal investigation into the conduct of Officers Bassett, Kilroy and Valvick, those officers known to Gina that were refusing to assist her, and baselessly alleging her miscreance.
- 5.13 Just the month before, in May 2021, Gina had reported to LSPD an individual who had been previously trespassed from Gina's home, entered without consent and took photographs of the home and Gina's boys illegally, before Gina could have the person removed. LSPD did nothing.
- 5.14 Despite reporting the criminal conduct, the suspect ultimately provided the pictures to Mr. Yorks, and his Guardian ad Litem (GAL), who reformatted them for use in the family court proceedings against Ms. Bloom.
- 5.15 Further, despite the fact that there was a DVPO in place, the history of complaints against Yorks, and Gina's multiple contemporaneous 911 calls directly reporting and

alleging Brian Yorks' involvement in coordinating this exact third-party contact, LSPD declined to intervene, refusing to characterize the behavior as criminal, or a violation of the active DVPO in place.

- 5.16 Ms. Bloom's July 2021 internal investigation request was made in good faith, through proper administrative channels, and was in her response to LSPD no longer appropriately responding to her safely needs, the safety of the children, or her the risk posed to each of them by her known abuser, Yorks.
- 5.17 The entire summer of 2021, Ms. Bloom and her boys were supposed to be protected under a valid Domestic Violence Protection Order (DVPO) <sup>2</sup>, which explicitly restrained Brian Yorks from contact, surveilling or recording the protected parties.

  Despite this, the Lake Stevens Police Department (LSPD) repeatedly undermined the legal protections afforded to the Plaintiff and her children through a pattern of dismissive, biased, and unprofessional conduct.
- 5.18 For specific example, based on public records requests, LSPD Sergeant James Barnes has been found to have engaged in repeated email communications with Mr. Yorks, the restrained party, whereby the sergeant provides Yorks with strategic legal advice, addressing procedural matters related to DVPO enforcement and Yorks's parenting plans (Ex. A. Emails).
- 5.19 On July 18, 2021, the children returned home to Gina from the first unsupervised weekend with their father Yorks since he was arrested for Rape DV 2 back in February 2020. The older child, M.Y. displayed new evidence of physical abuse including bruises and marks on his back, legs, and buttocks.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> #21-2-02025-31

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3

- 5.20 M.Y. disclosed to Ms. Bloom that "daddy played tickle games, and he tickled my private parts, and it made me uncomfortable." This is the first time Ms. Bloom was aware of the sexual abuse being directed at one of the children.
- 5.21 Upon the advice of the children's pediatrician, Dr. St. Claire, Ms. Bloom took
  M.Y. to Seattle Children's Hospital on July 20, 2021. M.Y. Then also, on July 21<sup>st</sup>, 2021,
  Ms. Bloom followed up and took M.Y. to his pediatrician to whom he disclosed the
  sexual molestation by Yorks. The disclosure was reported to Child Protective Services
  (CPS).
- The children's next scheduled visit with their father Yorks was July 28, 2021.

  Upon arrival at the exchange location, Frontier Village in Lake Stevens, Washington, Ms.

  Bloom was unable to get the children to exit the car in order to deliver them to Yorks.
- 5.23 M.Y., then just 7, made spontaneously expressed and disclosure fear and resistance to returning to their father. The boys absolutely refused to leave the car. Ms. Bloom, at a total loss, her son disclosing assault, her being stalked and no help to be found, she immediately contacted LSPD.<sup>3</sup>
- 5.24 The LSPD officers that responded to the scene failed to properly investigate or conduct a trauma-informed inquiry or any type, ultimately misrepresenting M.Y.'s disclosure of assault as "not wanting the food," and minimized the concern by categorizing the call as a mere "suspicious incident." (Ex. L Police Report).

I arrived onscene and contacted Olimpia in the parking lot near her black Jeep Grand Cherokee. Olimpia was at the rear drivers side door talking with her son, Child Could hear Child Crying in the back. Olimpia kept repeating questions similar to, "Why don't you want to go to your dads," and "How does he hurt you?" The only thing I could clearly hear from him as a response was "I don't like the food."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> LSPD #2021-1544

- 5.25 Audio evidence from police contact clearly shows that the officer's report falsely attributed "leading questions" to the Plaintiff to imply she was coaching the boys and expressly omitted or mischaracterized the substance of the child's distress. The responding officer failed to initiate a report to Child Protective Services (CPS) as mandated by law (RCW 26.44.030).
- 5.26 Compounding this failure, at the scene, on of the LSPD officers traveled real time back and forth between the Plaintiff's and Yorks' vehicles, relaying sensitive information disclosed by the children, the minor victims in an ongoing sexual assault investigation, directly to Yorks. When the parties collectively tried to ply the boys from Gina's car to leave with Yorks, the older child, the one that had made the recent disclosures, vomited all over himself, and refused to budge, begging not to make him go with his father. None of these details made it into the Officer's written report.
- 5.27 However, unknown at the time to Gina or the officers, Yorks was videotaping the entire interaction and provided the same to the GAL in his Snohomish County Family Court case, thereby making it later available to Ms. Bloom ((Ex. K: transcript of video recording). In the recorded exchange, the officer expresses personal sympathy toward Mr. Yorks and affirms his discrediting of the children's statements, remarking, "I don't think that's what's going on," and "I wish I could do more," while providing legal guidance and validation to Mr. Yorks (Id.).
- 5.28 The transcript also reveals the Officer's misrepresentation of the boys, wherein his report he claims the only complaint from the boys was about the food at their father's house, that *there was not abuse*, according to the boys (Id.). The Officers were clearly aware of the children's fear of Yorks.

```
8
                    OFFICER 1: Nothing we can do to make
     him -- make them go.
 9
10
                    MR. YORKS: Okav.
11
                    OFFICER 1: -- at this point.
12
                    MR. YORKS: Were --
13
                    OFFICER 1: So the best recourse, like I
14
     told you before, is that's it.
1.5
                    MR. YORKS: Okay. Can you tell me what the
16
     kids are saying anything? Like --
17
                    OFFICER 1: That they just don't feel safe.
18
                    MR. YORKS: Okay.
19
                    OFFICER 1: They feel like you're going to
     hurt them.
21
                    MR. YORKS: Yeah. Okav. All right.
22
                    OFFICER 1: And do I think that's what's
23
    going on, no.
```

- 5.29 This pattern of conduct, overtly sympathizing with a restrained party, minimizing child disclosures, and deliberately relaying victim statements to the alleged perpetrator, in real time, demonstrates deliberate indifference to child safety and contravenes law enforcement's statutory obligations.
- 5.30 In important part, in that same set of grossly inappropriate interactions, the parties' children can be heard reporting to the LSPD officers that they "don't feel safe" with their dad and they are afraid their dad, "is going to hurt them" someday.
- 5.31 However, regardless of the boy's expression of fear of Yorks, directly to the police, and the known history of violence by Yorks against vulnerable individuals, the LSPD failed to investigate the children's disclosures as required by RCW 26.44.030 or make a mandatory CPS referral as required by law.
- 5.32 Sergeant Barnes never reached out to Gina, as the protected party, nor did any other officer with LSPD, to offer or extend similar, or really, any, support whatsoever.
- 5.33 LSPD's actions, taken while Ms. Bloom and her children were legally designated, and protected victims of domestic violence protective order and entitled to court order enforced safety under Washington law, demonstrates their willful disregard for not only

Gina's safety,	and that of	the parties'	children,	but also	the basic	constitutional	promises
made to all A	merican citiz	zens by law	enforcen	nent.			

- Solidifying LSPD position as Yorks' official advocate in the family law case, on August 30, 2021, LSPD Sergeant James Barnes emailed Yorks directly, in response to Yorks's need for legal support and advice, in part stating: "...you must adhere 100% to what the order says and requires of you. If you don't, it leaves the window open for a vindictive person to go to court and say that you violated the order. I emphasize with you on this issue, but I cannot give you legal advice. Best of luck with this," (Ex. A. at pg. 5).
- 5.35 LSPD's responses to Ms. Bloom' reports during this period were inadequate or dismissive. For instance, on January 25, 2022, Ms. Bloom had traveled to the bank in town, where she regularly conducted her personal business. Gina entered the bank to deposit a check. Upon exiting and returning to her vehicle, Gina discovered her children (then ages five (5) and eight (8)) sitting unattended in Mr. Yorks' running vehicle. Leaving the boys in a running car in the parking lot is incredibly unsafe, and a violation of the parties parenting plan child safety provisions.
- 5.36 By this time, in the family court case, the script had been flipped, and there was a temporary order of Protection in place for Yorks and the boys protection, against Gina. So, rather than contacting the boys or Yorks, and risk more vilification by law enforcement, left with no other recourse, Ms. Bloom called 911 out of concern for her children's immediate safety.
- 5.37 LSPD Officer Marshall responded but inexplicably gave Mr. Yorks a pass on this incident and instead, shortly thereafter, the focus materially and permanently shifted to investigating Ms. Bloom. On February 10, 2022, at the behest of LSPD, the prosecutor charged Gina with violating a temporary restraining order by being at the bank. The

violation was based on going to the bank, a clearly baseless charge because the restraining order did not stipulate nor bar her presence at that location.

- 5.38 For clarity, Ms. Bloom went to her bank, to complete a personal banking transaction when she encountered her children alone, in Yorks' running car. Because Gina was restricted by a temporary restraining order for Yorks and the boys' protection against her, she could not contact them, but she rather called 911. As a consequence of her calling 911, Yorks was allowed to leave with the boys and she was criminally charged with violating the temporary restraining order.
- 5.39 Officer Marshall engaged in extensive communications with Mr. Yorks between January 25, 2022, and February 10, 2022, culminating in the filing of false criminal charges against Ms. Bloom for allegedly violating a temporary restraining order.
- In important part, during the period of criminal investigation against Ms. Bloom for violating the temporary restraining order when she went to her bank, Ms. Bloom provided Officer Marshall with clear exculpatory evidence of where she was immediately prior to and what she was doing at the bank. Specifically, she submitted verified documentation confirming that she was at Swedish Hospital in downtown Seattle receiving a scheduled neck steroid injection immediately prior to the alleged incident at the bank.
- 5.41 Despite having received this key exculpatory evidence, Officer Marshall nevertheless failed to acknowledge or respond to Ms. Bloom, omitted the exculpatory information from the police report, and instead maintained active communications with Mr. Yorks, soliciting statements from him, offering legal guidance, and providing relief in his favor. The Officer extended Yorks the courtesy of three (3) days in order to perfect his statement.

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	
2	3
2	4

- 5.42 The exculpatory evidence was never disclosed to the prosecuting authority, an obvious *Brady*<sup>4</sup> violation and as a result, Ms. Bloom, who had no prior criminal history, had never violated any court order, a law-abiding citizen, was wrongly and maliciously charged. This criminal allegation was *ensured* by Officer Marshall and forever changed Ms. Bloom's legal standing in the Snohomish Superior Court.
- 5.43 Officer Marshall and the Lake Stevens Police Department violated both the U.S. Constitution and the Department's own City Policy 604 "*Brady Material Disclosure*," which mandates that officers provide all exculpatory or impeachment evidence to the prosecuting attorney.
- 5.44 Specifically, between January 25, 2022, and February 10, 2022, Officer Marshall insistingly pursued an investigation into Bloom, designed to ensure Plaintiff was falsely charged with violating the temporary restraining order.
- 5.45 Again, Plaintiff provided Officer Marshall with dispositive exculpatory evidence of her verified location, she was at Swedish Hospital receiving a neck injection during the time of the alleged incident. Officer Marshall refused to acknowledge or document this evidence, as he admitted openly in incident report 2022-00001416:

On 02/01/2022, at approx. 1237 hours, I was sent an email to my work email from Olympia G. Yorks (Gina). In the email, it appears Olimpia expanded on her statements she made to me on 01/25/2022 about why she was at the Chase bank. She also attached two photos of deposits. I have not responded to the email. (emphasis added).

5.46 Officer Marshall did not submit a supplemental report as required under Policy 604.3 as required when officers learn of potentially exculpatory information. The

BLOOM COMPLAINT

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83 (1963)

10

11

13

12

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

exculpatory evidence was never conveyed to the prosecuting attorney, thereby violating Plaintiff's due process rights under *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83 (1963).

- 5.47 Officer Marshall's failure to adhere to the rigors of Due Process, resulted in Plaintiff being falsely charged with a criminal offense despite the presence of irrefutable alibi evidence.
- Furthermore, Policy 604.3 mandates that "Officers must include in their 5.48 investigative reports adequate investigative information and reference to all material evidence and facts that are reasonably believed to be either incriminating or exculpatory." Officer Marshall's intentional omission of Plaintiff's exonerating evidence constitutes willful disregard to her fundamental constitutional rights, gross misconduct and a material Brady violation.
- 5.49 As a direct result of this exculpatory evidence being withheld, Plaintiff was deprived of a fair legal process. This violation continued to demonstrate the Defendant's policy, custom, pattern or practice of constitutional violations, and underscores Defendant' federal liability.<sup>5</sup>
- Moreover, during the January 25, 2022 bank incident, where Ms. Bloom was the 5.50 reporting party, the party that informed Officer Marshall that minor children had been left unattended in a parked vehicle while their father was nowhere to be found, Officer Marshall failed to make any mandated report or referral to Child Protective Services, despite clear statutory obligations to do so under RCW 26.44.030.
- 5.51 Additionally, the circumstances plainly implicated Lake Stevens Municipal Code §9.12.020, which provides that it is unlawful for any person having the care, custody, or

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Monell v. Department of Social Services, 436 U.S. 658 (1978)

control of a child under eight (8) years of age, to leave that child unattended in a vehicle unless supervised by someone over the age of twelve (12). Ms. Bloom's children were just 5 and 8.

- 5.52 Violations of this section constitute a misdemeanor, but Officer Marshall failed to take any protective action, disregarding both the municipal code and mandatory reporting laws, and continuing to demonstrate their custom of selective enforcement in favor of Mr. Yorks while ignoring credible child safety concerns raised by Ms. Bloom.
- 5.53 Ms. Bloom fought the charge and presented evidence that the LSPD officer (Officer Marshall) had misapplied the court order to pursue prosecution. On June 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2022, LSPD's Deputy Chief Jeff Young acknowledged the mistake: he personally apologized to Ms. Bloom, informed her that the department would provide additional training to officers, and even contacted the prosecutor to advocate dismissal of the charge.
- 5.54 The wrongful charge against Ms. Bloom was dismissed ten (10) days later, when Ms. Bloom filed a Motion to Dismiss and included all the exculpatory evidence that LSPD failed to provide to the prosecutor. The charge was dismissed, but only after she endured a protracted "malicious prosecution" and incurred significant stress and expense for months.
- 5.55 This episode exemplified LSPD's pattern of handling Ms. Bloom not as a victim but as a troublemaker, a posture and attitude that would continue to manifest itself against Gina in subsequent events.
- 5.56 Later that summer, on September 18, 2022, during another custody exchange, the children once again refused to exit Ms. Bloom's car to go with Yorks. The children were visibly upset and expressed fear of returning to their father; one child unexpectedly

recounting to Officer Olivia Scholz, a particularly horrifying incident that "Dad almost killed me a year ago when he held me upside down by my feet over a railing." Ms.

Bloom, again with no other recourse, sought help from LSPD in exchanging the children.

- 5.57 However, again, it was LSPD Officer Scholz who responded, and interacted with the children while they made explicit disclosures of abuse, and then did *not* refer the matter to Child Protective Services (CPS) or promptly investigate the father, Yorks.

  Instead, Ms. Bloom was told to take the children home with her. Gina was handed a pink pamphlet for domestic violence and shelter services.
- 5.58 At no point following the children's disclosures on September 18, 2022, did LSPD officers, including Officer Scholz, make a report to Child Protective Services as required by RCW 26.44.030(1)(a). Under Washington law, law enforcement officers are mandatory reporters and are required to report suspected child abuse or neglect to CPS immediately upon receiving such disclosures.
- 5.59 Ms. Bloom's children stated clearly that they were afraid to go with their father and described physically dangerous conduct that should have triggered LSPD's obligation to report. Instead, LSPD officers failed to act and sent Ms. Bloom away without support.
- 5.60 That omission was not only a breach of statutory duty, but it also materially harmed Ms. Bloom's legal position: because there was no police investigation or CPS referral at the time of the incumbent court hearing, when Yorks sought a contempt finding, the judge found in his favor, based on his false declaration signed under penalty of perjury stating that Ms. Bloom kidnapped the children.
- 5.61 Only two (2) days later, on September 20, 2022, Ms. Bloom personally went to the LSPD station with her children, desperately seeking police assistance before an

emergency ex-parte court hearing that afternoon. Rather than treating the allegations with the urgency they deserved, LSPD personnel told Ms. Bloom that the situation was a "civil matter."

- 5.62 B.Y., then only six years old, quietly listened to the officers in the lobby, while sketching his family on a Lake Stevens Police Department pamphlet (Ex. B). As Ms. Bloom and the children were ordered to leave without receiving help, both B.Y. and M.Y. broke down in tears, visibly distraught and heartbroken.
- 5.63 The emotional toll was immediate and profound. Having been taught to view police officers as protectors and heroes, they were left confused and deeply disappointed by the officers' refusal to act. For two vulnerable children seeking safety, the rejection by the very institution they trusted inflicted a tragic and lasting emotional wound, permanently shaking their belief in justice and undermining their faith in adult authority.
- That same day, lacking police confirmation of the abuse disclosures made by the children to Officer Scholz on September 18, 2022, the family court proceeded to hold Ms. Bloom in contempt (for having kept the children away from their father during the dispute) and temporarily stripped Ms. Bloom of custody. She was also assessed thousands of dollars in attorney fees to Mr. Yorks. Essentially, LSPD's inaction and dismissal of her pleas for help, directly facilitated Ms. Bloom losing custody of her children in the fall of 2022.
- 5.65 LSPD's failure to adhere to basic constitutional rights, follow state law, and protect victims, here directly resulted in Ms. Bloom being <a href="held in contempt of court">held in contempt of court</a>, each directly, materially and substantially, contributed to Ms. Bloom's loss of custody demonstrating the department's pattern of disregarding its obligations to protect victims of domestic violence and child abuse.

	1	
	2	
	3	
	4	
	5	
	6	
	7	
	8	
	9	
1	0	
1	1	
1	2	
1	3	
1	4	
1	5	
	6	
1	7	
1	8	
1	9	
2	0	
2	1	
2	2	
2	3	

- 5.66 Befuddled by the utter lack of resources in the police, Ms. Bloom continued to gather evidence of her children's abuse herself and following the July 18, 2021, had installed a video device on her vehicle. Accordingly, Ms. Bloom provided the September 18, 2022, go pro video footage of her children describing the abuse by their father to the LSPD.
- 5.67 When Ms. Bloom presented this video evidence to LSPD officers the day after the September 20 hearing, they finally responded: LSPD Officer Kilroy simply refused to fully acknowledge what the children were saying and at one point a supervisor claimed he "couldn't hear very well" and seemingly wrote off the recording entirely.
- 5.68 It was only after the video presentation and persistent pressure from Ms. Bloom that LSPD belatedly made a CPS referral, more than seventy-two (72) hours after the abuse disclosures, and subsequently placed Officer Scholz on administrative leave for mishandling the situation.
- 5.69 Finally, by February 2023, LSPD's own reports **confirmed** that the September 18, 2022, incident legally constituted third-degree child assault by Mr. Yorks. Unfortunately, this lukewarm confirmation of Ms. Bloom's mounting concerns came too late to prevent the monumental irrecoverable harm: Ms. Bloom had already been reoriented in the court's eyes, punished financially and restricted from her children, including a 93-day no contact with her children.<sup>6</sup>
- 5.70 In the wake of LSPD's repeated failures to protect her and her children, Ms.

  Bloom sought help from other channels. On September 28, 2022, Ms. Bloom, submitted a formal complaint to the Snohomish County Sheriff's Office, Office of Professional

<sup>6 #2022-00017616</sup> 

Accountability, concerning the Lake Stevens Police Department's failure to fulfill their statutory duty to report mandated disclosures of child abuse. Despite the seriousness of these child abuse disclosures, and the statutory mandate under RCW 26.44.030 requiring law enforcement to report such incidents to Child Protective Services (CPS), no such report was made.

- 5.71 Sergeant Jason Tift of the Snohomish County Sheriff's Office acknowledged receipt of Ms. Bloom's complaint but informed her that, because the incidents involved Lake Stevens Police Department personnel, the matter would need to be addressed directly with LSPD. This deferral reflects a systemic failure of accountability within the County and City and further contributed to the lack of appropriate response and oversight concerning the safety and well-being of the minor children involved.
- 5.72 Given the lackluster response from the County, if Gina wanted to help her children, she had no choice but to turn back to the City. This time, on October 11, 2022, after pleading incessantly for help, blindly calling for help through any government email channels available to her, Ms. Bloom was finally granted a meeting with Mayor Brett Gailey, the Mayor of the City of Lake Stevens.
- 5.73 Ms. Bloom requested the City launch a formal investigation into LSPD's conduct regarding her children's abuse disclosures (Ex. C.). Nothing more came of this her request.
- 5.74 October 12, 2022, Ms. Bloom filed official complaints with the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), reporting what she believed was misconduct or negligence by LSPD in handling her domestic violence and child abuse reports.

- 5.75 These actions by Ms. Bloom, including formally contacting the City Mayor and federal authorities, were an exercise of her First Amendment right to petition the government for redress of grievances. They also signaled to LSPD that Ms. Bloom was not going to remain silent about the department's failures. At this point, tensions between Ms. Bloom and LSPD, particularly the detective assigned to deal with Ms. Bloom, Lake Steven's Police Department, Detective Kristen Parnell, began to escalate.
- 5.76 Public records obtained by Ms. Bloom reveal active and ongoing communications during this period between Detective Parnell, representatives of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Mayor of Lake Stevens, the Chief of Police, and Sergeant Jason Tift of the Snohomish County Sheriff's Office. These records confirm that the Lake Stevens Police Department was fully aware that Ms. Bloom was actively exercising her constitutional right to petition the government for redress of grievances, including through complaints to multiple oversight bodies.
- 5.77 Despite this awareness, no appropriate remedial action was taken, and the underlying issues involving failure to report child abuse and retaliatory conduct remained unaddressed.
- 5.78 LSPD was not pleased, specifically Detective Parnell it seemed, and things went even sharper downhill for Gina and the boys.

# VI. Factual Allegations

- 6.1 Ms. Bloom had to prove what was happening and try to understand why the police were doing this to her and her children.
- 6.2 Every time she claimed discrimination, or illegality, or anything improper, her complaint was turned into evidence of her menace and mental infirmity, *like anyone in the police*, or her ex-husband or his lawyers, could be corrupt, would actually lie...she must be

6.3 As evidenced by Detective Parnell professional communication and reactions, LSPD was not just aware of Ms. Bloom's complaints, allegations and concerns, the nature and

importance of them, they knew enough to proactively defend against them and to

crazy! Gina had no other next step, nowhere to turn. Committed to saving her sons, she

interfere with her reporting the same to other agencies (Ex. D).

continued to pursue public records, she would not give up.

- 6.4 Even with the LSPD's failure to report child abuse and criminal retaliatory conduct by Yorks, as required by the law, having been openly acknowledged by the police department in February 2023, the failure to initially report remained unaddressed, they did not care. LSPD was not interested in helping Ms. Bloom.
- 6.5 November 1, 2022, Interrogation by Detective Parnell. Shortly after Ms. Bloom began reaching out to alterative agencies of recourse, on or about October 31, 2022, Defendant Detective Kristen Parnell summoned Ms. Bloom to her police station, with a text saying, "When are you available to come in for an interview regarding M.Y. and B.Y."
- 6.6 Ms. Bloom agreed to avail herself to the Detective at the Lake Stevens Police Department on November 1, 2022, under the pretense of providing a voluntary witness statement related to her children's disclosures of abuse by their father, and their much-needed protection.
- 6.7 The meeting was framed as friendly, supportive, non-custodial and cooperative; maybe even reconciliatory. Ms. Bloom understood that she was being called to assist her sons.

  Gina did not know or believe herself to be a suspect, even after everything that had happened, it still didn't occur to her. She went to help her boys, hopefully herself too.
- 6.8 Ms. Bloom asked her Domestic Violence Advocate, Natalie Burton of LifeWire, to accompany her to the meeting. Upon arrival at the station, Detective Parnell told DV

- Advocate Burton that, yes, she could stay in the room, but absolutely must not interject, speak, or participate in the meeting, in any way whatsoever.
- 6.9 Detective Parnell never mentioned to Gina that she was a suspect in an investigation and at no point was Ms. Bloom advised of her *Miranda* rights. The interview was audio-recorded. The first forty (40) minutes proceeded in a conversational manner focused on Ms. Bloom's statement related to the children's disclosures.
- 6.10 However, after that point, the interview took a sharp turn. Without warning,

  Detective Parnell shifted into the role of interrogator, escalating the encounter into a

  custodial one. Ms. Bloom had been tricked and trapped, and was suddenly confronted

  with hostile and coercive questioning, including pointed and inflammatory accusations

  that she had fabricated abuse allegations against Yorks, coached her children, and made

  claims that LSPD officers assaulted her.
- 6.11 At this point, the interrogation was custodial, Ms. Bloom, already seated in a private, windowless, interview room, at the Lake Stevens Police Station, with the door closed, did not feel she could leave at any time, certainly, she was not advised that she was free to leave at any time.
- Although Ms. Bloom was not offered counsel, and her statements were later used against her in a court of law, she was brazenly subjected to a classic custodial interrogation, flaunting obvious techniques aimed at oppression and eliciting her confession(s).
- 6.13 The Detective lured Gina to the police station under false premises and committed to deceiving her for forty (40) minutes, attempting to move her to a level of comfort that creates vulnerability, and then administered coercive tactics to pressure Ms. Bloom into

24 Bloo

disavowing her credible abuse allegations or admitting to her own wrongdoing, all without any of the fundamental protections guaranteed by law.

- 6.14 The manner and tone of the second portion of Detective Parnell's interrogation were highly intimidating to Ms. Bloom. Gina had already suffered and been traumatized by a lifetime of horrific domestic violence, compounded substantially by LSPD's failure to help her, their endorsement of her criminalization; now she was officially in the hot seat, and her boys still weren't safe.
- opportunity to browbeat Ms. Bloom, lashing out, launching verbal insults at Gina, calling her "so far gone" and "delusional" during the recorded interview, and in the presence of Advocate Burton. Exhausted by the unlawful surprise interrogation, Bloom plead with Defendant Parnell stop yelling at her, that she does not like being yelled at: the verbal assault inflicted intentional emotional distress upon Ms. Bloom exacerbating her PTSD.
- 6.16 Ms. Bloom was not charged with any crime as a consequence of this interrogation, but it's devastating impact would soon reverberate in her ongoing family law case. Unbeknownst to Ms. Bloom at the time, the November 1, 2022, interview was transcribed, documented and passed along to Mr. Yorks for his use in the Family Court proceedings.
- 6.17 Ms. Bloom later became aware, through public records and email disclosures, that on the same day as her interrogation, Detective Parnell was actively corresponding with Mr. Yorks, the named suspect, by email.
- 6.18 Among those communications, Mr. Yorks forwarded to Detective Parnell a message he had sent to the children's pediatrician, in which he falsely accused Ms. Bloom of kidnapping the children and made additional inflammatory allegations.

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2

- 6.19 These emails reveal that prior to the interrogation of Gina, Detective Parnell had already been run through the one-sided and defamatory narrative presented by Mr. Yorks, and that his communications served as the basis for many of the accusations Detective Parnell later directed at Ms. Bloom during the custodial portion of her "interview." (Ex. E).
- 6.20 The fact that Detective Parnell engaged with Mr. Yorks in this manner and then relied on his testimonial misrepresentations to frame her interrogation of Ms. Bloom demonstrates the officer's illegitimacy and lack of neutrality in the investigation and interview process.
- 6.21 Detective Parnell confiding in Yorks prior to the interrogation, baiting and purposely misleading Gina, and later providing Yorks a copy of the interrogation for his personal litigation is prima facia evidence of bad faith on the part of Detective Parnell and the LSPD.
- 6.22 <u>Use of the Parnell Interview in Family Court</u>: Having assisted Detective Parnell in the execution of Ms. Bloom's interrogation, Mr. Yorks and his counsel in the family law matter decided that with unilateral control of the transcript they could confuse the record and use it to further degrade Ms. Bloom in the Family Court proceedings.
- 6.23 The transcript of the November 1, 2022, interview, titled "Partial Interview of Olimpia 'Gina' Yorks, conducted by Detective Parnell," was filed in the Snohomish County Superior Court case by Yorks three (3) different times.<sup>7</sup>

BLOOM COMPLAINT

<sup>23</sup> 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Mr. Yorks filed the interrogation transcript in the dissolution case #20-2-00465-31 May 2, 2023. Yorks then sought and was granted DVPO citing the transcript (No. 23-2-03799-31) filling the transcript again on May 23, 2023, followed by a third filling on May 6, 2025.

- 6.24 In the sampled portion of the transcript used against Ms. Bloom, Detective Parnell is interrogating Ms. Bloom' as to her mental health and veracity for truth telling. In the manner the transcript was presented to the Court, Mr. Yorks very effectively took statements out of context, manipulated their presentation, and painted Ms. Bloom as a dishonest or unstable person, who even the local police did not believe.
- 6.25 To this day, the Family Court continues to be influenced by this narrative. Ms. Bloom' credibility was again severely undermined in the eyes of the Court, which contributed to an exasperated loss of her custodial rights and reputation with the Court.
- 6.26 Following the traumatic interrogation by Defendant Parnell, Mr. Yorks escalated his pattern of psychological abuse toward Ms. Bloom and use of their Court-ordered communication platform to create damning exhibits for his use against Gina in Court.
- 6.27 He began echoing Detective Parnell's accusations, referring to Ms. Bloom as "delusional" and "too far gone," parroting the same derogatory language used by Detective Parnell during the November 1, 2022, coercive and emotionally degrading police interaction.
- 6.28 Mr. Yorks' language and tone was intentionally crafted to underscore, reinforce and exploit official government misconduct, for the purposes of intimidation, thereby further isolating and discrediting Ms. Bloom. This not only inflicted emotional distress but also amplified the harm caused by the state actors' failure to intervene, protect, or investigate her complaints.
- 6.29 In other words, Detective Parnell's actions on November 1, 2022, directly assisted Ms. Bloom' abuser in the civil case, causing Ms. Bloom concrete harm in the form of reputational damage and loss of her parental rights.

- 6.30 Despite having full knowledge that Ms. Bloom was a documented victim of domestic violence living under Washington's Address Confidentiality Program (ACP), Detective Parnell, during the coercive and traumatizing interrogation on November 1, 2022, demanded that Ms. Bloom disclose her residential address.
- 6.31 When Ms. Bloom provided her ACP-authorized P.O. Box address, Parnell explicitly stated that it was not sufficient and insisted on a physical residential location. This demand occurred in direct contradiction to the legal protections afforded to ACP participants under RCW 40.24, which strictly prohibits the disclosure of such addresses. Compounding this violation, Ms. Bloom's confidential residential address was later included by LSPD, without redaction, in the public release of the third-degree child assault report naming Mr. Yorks as the suspect and Ms. Bloom as the children's guardian.
- 6.32 The public dissemination of her address not only constituted a breach of state confidentiality law but also placed Ms. Bloom at grave risk. In the aftermath of this interrogation, Ms. Bloom experienced recurring nightmares and panic-inducing flashbacks, ultimately prompting her to relocate out of Snohomish County entirely by the end of that same month in an effort to re-establish safety and emotional stability. This sequence of events underscores the retaliatory and reckless disregard for Ms. Bloom's legal protections and personal security demonstrated by the Lake Stevens Police Department.
- 6.33 <u>May 2023 Mukilteo Police Department Incident and LSPD Interference.</u> In the spring of 2023, Ms. Bloom continued to experience threatening behavior reasonably understood to be orchestrated by Mr. Yorks.

- 6.34 On May 14, 2023, Ms. Bloom received a package that contained a small jewelry box. Outside the box, she found a note reading "KILL YOURSELF" that looked to be made by Mr. Yorks label maker, with its familiar font and sticker style.
- 6.35 At the time of the death threat by Yorks, Ms. Bloom was present in the city of Mukilteo, Washington. Once again, fearing for her life, on May 19, 2023, Ms. Bloom reported the death threat incident to the Mukilteo Police Department (MPD).
- 6.36 Gina provided MPD with the details of the incident and the physical evidence (box, note, etc.), and she identified her ex-husband, Yorks, as the likely perpetrator given his history of harassment, the physical evidence, the witness of him personally delivering the box, and the box used to deliver it being one originally addressed to Yorks new wife, Julita, presumably he reused one of her package delivery boxes.





6.37 MPD took the death threat Harassment report and initiated a case investigation.

As part of their investigation, a Mukilteo detective contacted Brian Yorks (the suspected individual who delivered the threat). Mr. Yorks responded by deflecting the investigation, specifically providing *before he would answer any questions*, the Mukilteo detective should "call Lake Stevens Police Department" for background (on who and what Ms. Bloom really is).

16

23

22

24

6.38 No doubt in Mr. Yorks mind, LSPD, and certainly Detective Parnell, would advocate for him by denigrating Ms. Bloom' credibility. Indeed, when the Mukilteo detective reached out to LSPD for information, Detective Parnell, as later corroborated by the LSPD records team and disclosure, told the Mukilteo Police that "Gina Bloom is a known liar who fabricates abuse claims and files false police reports."

#### Case #23-

#### Narrative by: Officer Y. Shi/MK2434

I am Officer Y. Shi, MK2434, of the Mukilteo Police Department. On the date and time of the following incident, I was assigned to Patrol Duty in a marked Patrol Vehicle and full uniform, complete with a body-worn camera. The below incident occurred in the City of Mukilteo, Snohomish County, WA.

In the previous case report, I mistakenly wrote, "Lake Stevens PD advised me that Olimpia had a long history of false reporting, and she reported serious allegations against Brian, but after investigation, it was apparent that Olimpia was telling the truth." This statement was not accurate. After the investigations conducted by Lake Stevens PD, it was apparent that Olimpia was NOT telling the truth.

#### **EOR**

Report Generated by Officer Y. Shi/MK2434

I am submitting this document to a court, a prosecutor or a magistrate from an electronic device owned, issued, or maintained by a criminal justice agency. I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the preceding is true and correct.

Sworn: May 22, 2023, in Mukilteo, WA, by Officer Y. Shi/MK2434 Mukilteo Police Department

- 6.39 Detective Parnell's statements to Mukilteo PD about Ms. Bloom were egregiously false and were made with no legitimate reason or purpose. At the time Detective Parnell labeled Ms. Bloom a liar, LSPD had no visibility or knowledge of the May 15th death threat incident or the evidence of it (such as the jewelry box and the "kill yourself" note). Detective Parnell simply maligned Ms. Bloom without regard to the truth or the consequences.
- 6.40 Not surprisingly, as a consequent of Detective Parnell, the Mukilteo Police

  Department *terminated or declined to actively pursue* Ms. Bloom' report. Upon being told by LSPD that the complainant was a "known fabricator," Mukilteo PD effectively

shelved the case. No arrests were made, and no further investigative steps to protect Ms. Bloom were taken by Mukilteo authorities.

- 6.41 The death threat incident was left unresolved, the physical evidence was never collected from Ms. Bloom, leaving Ms. Bloom without the protection or justice she sought, deserved and needed.
- 6.42 Gina now knew that Detective Parnell would actually keep her from getting help from anyone, blocking her even from outside resources. Ms. Bloom's legitimate plea for help in the face of a death threat was proactively obstructed and undermined by Detective Parnell's defamatory and unfounded allegations.
- 6.43 Ms. Bloom was left more vulnerable than ever, realizing that not only would LSPD not protect her, but they would also actively prevent other police departments from protecting her too.
- 6.44 Ms. Bloom, who was, and is still living in a confidential domestic violence shelter location, legally protected by the Address Confidentiality Program (ACP), was left feeling more frightened than ever and vowed to never seek law enforcement relief again.
- 6.45 The Mukilteo PD episode exemplified how Detective Parnell, at all times acting under color of law, extended her retaliatory campaign beyond Lake Stevens. By May 2023, Ms. Bloom understood that LSPD's actions were not just isolated to her own town; LSPD had effectively "blacklisted" her across law enforcement agencies in the region, branding her as someone not to be believed.
- 6.46 This caused profound emotional distress to Ms. Bloom and emboldened her abuser, who learned that he could invoke LSPD's influence and power to escape consequences elsewhere, including allegations of child sexual assault. They did not care.

6.47 <u>December 2023 Kirkland Police Department Incident and LSPD Interference.</u>

Then in December 2023, Ms. Bloom was the target of yet another terrifying act of harassment.

6.48 On or about December 22, 2023, Ms. Bloom received an anonymous threatening letter at her residence in Kirkland, Washington: "YOU DON'T DESERVE TO LIVE.

YOU ARE BETTER OFF DEAD." The phrasing and the use of similar label-maker style printing caused Ms. Bloom to believe this was once again from Yorks.



- 6.49 By this time, however, Ms. Bloom was extremely hesitant to report incidents to the police. Of course, who could Gina possibly turn to, given how LSPD had treated her, interrogating her, calling her a liar, and sabotaging her prior report(s).
- 6.50 In fact, rather than seeking out police support, Ms. Bloom confided to friends that she feared LSPD might somehow twist this newest threat to her safety, back against her somehow, or even that someone within LSPD could be assisting Yorks with the harassment. Gina's trust, in anyone, especially law enforcement, was gone.
- 6.51 Ultimately, it was a legal advocate working with Ms. Bloom that decided the December 22, 2023, threat was too serious, given the totality of the circumstances especially, to ignore and independently reported it to the Kirkland Police Department (KPD).

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3

6.52 KPD opened an investigation into a possible case of stalking, harassment, or threats (often categorized under "malicious harassment" under Washington law, given the nature of the content). KPD Detective Sandoval was assigned to investigate. Initially, it appeared KPD was treating Ms. Bloom as a bona fide victim of a crime and was taking steps to identify the source of the threatening letter.

- 6.53 However, as part of standard procedure, Detective Sandoval reached out to other law enforcement agencies to gather background information on both the suspect, Yorks, and the victim, Ms. Bloom. When Detective Sandoval contacted LSPD in early 2024 to inquire about Brian Yorks, Gina's abusive ex-husband, and any history related to Ms. Bloom' complaints, LSPD once again diverted the focus onto Ms. Bloom.
- 6.54 In that communication, an LSPD representative, who, upon information and belief, was Defendant Parnell, told the Kirkland detective that he should *not be deceived by Ms. Bloom* and that she was not to be believed.
- 6.55 According to the Kirkland Police Report #2023-00043606, Detective Sandoval states:

23-43606 Harassment Detective J. Sandoval-#682

## SUPPLEMENTAL NARRATIVE

I, Detective Sandoval, am assigned in the Family Violence Unit with the City of Kirkland Police Department. I have reviewed the investigation below, which has assigned to me on 02/01/2024 and documented in Kirkland Police Department Case Number: 23-43606

Below is a summary of the events of the incident and my follow up investigation. Be advised that this is a summary of events and statements and is not a word for word transcription. Therefore, for further details review associated body worn camera footage and/or supplemental narrative(s).

Associated with the documentation, I had viewed a several police reports, by multiple police agencies, in which Brian, Olimpia, and their shared children were the involved parties. The agencies include Lake Stevens Police Department, Renton Police Department, Edmonds Police Department, Tacoma Police Department, and Mukilteo Police Department.

In the reports, Olimpia reported several incidents of sexual assault and physical abuse, to include sexual and physical assaults towards their shared children (with Brian being the suspect). Lake Stevens PD completed a child assault investigation, during which a child forensic interview was completed as well as a statutory referral. It appeared, based on the report, that Olimpia's claims of assault were not supported by the children's interviews.

After speaking with a Lake Stevens PD Detective, I was told that Olimpia has a history of false reporting. Lake Stevens PD also has a significant history of police contacts with the above involved parties.

When reviewing the police report from Mukilteo Police Department, I had learned Olimpia reported to officers, in 2023, that she had received a Mother's Day gift that Brian dropped off with a handwritten note that said, "kill yourself" (on the bottom of the box).

The Officer contacted Lake Stevens PD and learned that Olimpia has a history of false reporting; however, the reporting officer noted she felt it was apparent Olimpia was telling the truth. *An information report was taken, Mukilteo PD Case No. 23-12989.* 

The Mukilteo PD report, although like the incident reported, appeared to have a slight difference being that the message was a typed sticker rather than a handwritten note (with the message "Kill yourself") inside the box.

- 6.56 Essentially, Detective Parnell reiterated the same defamatory warning 'to fellow law enforcement' that Ms. Bloom "is a liar" who fabricates allegations. LSPD, acting outside their jurisdiction, again, conveyed to KPD that any claims coming from Ms. Bloom were suspect, probably just false, because she is a hateful liar and a vindictive mother.
- 6.57 Detective Parnell's characterization of Ms. Bloom to KPD was knowingly false and measurably misleading. At the very moment LSPD was maligning Ms. Bloom'

- credibility, evidence was mounting that corroborated Ms. Bloom' concerns about her exhusband's dangerousness.
- 6.58 In fact, in just the weeks to follow, on January 7, 2024, Lake Stevens Police officers responded to a 911 call from Mr. Yorks' new wife, Julita.
- 6.59 Julita, like Ms. Bloom, is also an immigrant, and was also pressured into marriage, quickly induced to have a child by Yorks, their son is only three (3).

  Unfortunately, based on information and 911 call audio transcription, Yorks has leveled up this time however, and blocked Julita from becoming a US citizen.
- 6.60 Thus, even as another woman, matching a victim profile, was coming forward with specific and articulable fear of the same suspect, Yorks, LSPD continued to insist that Ms. Bloom was dishonest and malicious.
- 6.61 The LSPD showed no concern. Their conduct revealed not just recklessness but outright malice towards Ms. Bloom. They went so far as to issue venomous statements that dismissed clear, substantive evidence. Ms. Bloom's reports were not only credible but here LSPD encounters Yorks second known victim and still the department did nothing.
- 6.62 27. Upon hearing LSPD's negative assessment of Ms. Bloom, the Kirkland Police

  Department's attitude toward the case shifted. Much like Mukilteo PD earlier, KPD

  became wary of investing resources into Ms. Bloom' report.
- Although a Kirkland police report in April 2024 nominally classified the incident as "malicious harassment" against Ms. Bloom, there was little to no follow-through in terms of protective action or pursuing charges. Effectively, the Kirkland investigation was stalled or terminated, once again leaving Ms. Bloom without recourse.

- 6.64 Ms. Bloom knew that LSPD's defamatory communications had poisoned yet another well: Kirkland officers were now likely to view her, rather than her abuser, as the source of trouble.
- of harm, separate and distinct from the harm Ms. Bloom suffered in her family law case.

  In the Family Court matter, Detective Parnell's actions directly led to Ms. Bloom' loss of credibility and custodial rights.
- 6.66 In the Mukilteo and Kirkland episodes, Detective Parnell's false statements led to the termination of police investigations that Ms. Bloom had initiated as a victim seeking protection. In these instances, Ms. Bloom suffered a different kind of injury entirely: the denial of law enforcement protection and the chilling of her ability to seek help from the legal system. She was effectively barred from accessing police assistance in those jurisdictions because LSPD had intentionally sabotaged her credibility.
- at a secret location more than five (5) hours away from her confidential King County residence, and Ms. Bloom remained there for the six (6) months during which time she legally changed her identity and obtained a new name.
- 6.68 Prior to this ugly culmination of cross department persecution by Detective Parnell, on January 16, 2023, Ms. Bloom had sent another desperate text message to Detective Parnell pleading with her to stop impeding another sexual assault investigation and to express and memorialize the trauma caused by the November 1st, 2022, interrogation.
- 6.69 Ms. Bloom plainly told the Detective that she felt blindsided and unreasonably intimidated. Bloom reiterated that her prior attempts to disclose abuse, including through

Officer Miner and the couple's therapist, had also been ignored. Ms. Bloom further indicated that her traumatic brain injury diagnosis, which she had previously emailed Parnell, was also disregarded.

- 6.70 In her text message, Ms. Bloom clearly identified the beginning of the massive scope of her injuries, and how they resulted from LSPD negligent and willful misconduct, disregard for the law and individual citizen rights. (Ex. F).
- 6.71 The LSPD's actions had shattered what was left of her trust in law enforcement and endangered her children. She had raised them to respect the police. Her statements establish clear notice to the Department of both prior abuse and the psychological and legal harm caused by the Department's mishandling of her case.
- 6.72 Having unbelievably demonstrated her retaliatory motive and institutional disregard, Ms. Bloom explicitly requested that Detective Parnell never contact her again, citing the trauma and distress caused by Parnell's prior misconduct.
- 6.73 Ms. Bloom hoped, prayed and believed this would put an end to Defendant's Parnell persecution, but instead, as elaborated on above and below, it only emboldened Parnell, as seen from her inappropriate and dishonest intervention into the Mukilteo and Kirkland PD investigations.
- 6.74 Importantly, at no point has Ms. Bloom ever been charged with making a false police report, nor has any court or investigative agency ever made a finding that she is not credible.
- 6.75 Despite the assertions by Detective Parnell, there is no record, official or otherwise, besides the one propagated by her ex-husband Yorks, to support the claim that Ms. Bloom fabricates abuse.

- 6.76 On the contrary, many of Ms. Bloom' allegations of abuse have been later supported by evidence. For specific but not limited example, LSPD's own acknowledgment of child assault in February 2023; the fact that Mr. Yorks's subsequent wife, Julita, also reports abuse.
- 6.77 Ms. Bloom has no criminal history, aside from the one wrongful charge LSPD pressed and was then dropped. There has never been a judicial determination that Ms. Bloom lied about any abuse or about anything, ever.
- 6.78 Therefore, when Detective Parnell told other police departments that Ms. Bloom is a known liar, the Detective's statements were made knowingly false or with reckless disregard for the truth. Detective Parnell had no factual basis to doubt Ms. Bloom' reports; instead, it appears her motive was to punish Ms. Bloom for her persistence and prior complaints against LSPD, to include the FBI and DOJ, or perhaps in the defense of someone else entirely.
- 6.79 Detective Parnell's affirmative actions taken in 2023–2024 to nefariously interfere with outside police investigations, including Mukilteo and Kirkland, as well as proactively preventing Ms. Bloom from accessing police protection, amount to a continuing course of retaliatory and defamatory conduct under color of law.
- 6.80 In essence, after the November 1, 2022, interrogation, Detective Parnell continued to target Ms. Bloom, ensuring that wherever Ms. Bloom turned for help, she would be disbelieved and ignored, discredited.
- 6.81 Detective Parnell's actions are retaliation for Ms. Bloom' ongoing efforts to seek help from LSPD, the only police available to her, and to hold LSPD accountable by way of her "petitioning" activities, and to silence or undermine her.

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2

- Such conduct, the acts and omissions of the City of Lake Stevens, its Lake Steven's Police Department, its Detective Parnell, and J. Does 1-10., violated: Ms. Bloom' rights under the First Amendment; Ms. Bloom has a guaranteed right to petition the government, without fear of retaliation; Ms. Bloom's Fourteenth Amendment rights, including due process and equal protection, and those acts and omissions giving rise to state-law tort claims as further described below.
- 6.83 <u>LSPD Failure to Investigate or Protect Following 911 Call by Minor</u>. On March 30, 2025, Plaintiff's minor son, M.Y., then 11 years old, placed a 911 call from his father, Yorks's residence, stating unequivocally that he was afraid and that his father had been threatening him, and that he wanted to return to his mother's custody.
- During the call, M.Y. told the dispatcher, "My dad has been threatening me," and, "I want to go back to my mom." He also expressed fear for his stepmother (Jolita), describing coercive and aggressive conduct by his father. The 911 transcript confirms M.Y. was alone in the backyard, reporting a domestic disturbance and seeking police assistance.
- officers arrived at the scene and failed to speak with M.Y. at any point. According to the body-worn camera footage and corresponding transcript, Officer Savchuck spoke with the adults present, made small talk, but never even stepped inside the home to understand what moment of desperation had led to the police being called in the first place, let alone attempt to assess the well-being of M.Y., the reporting child victim that called 911, or the other two minor children present in the home.

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

- 6.86 The entirety of LSPD's police response presence was approximately seven (7) minutes. There is no indication in the police report that any effort was made to document M.Y.'s concerns or evaluate whether he was safe.
- 6.87 Compounding this neglect, the officers failed to comply with their statutory duty to report suspected child abuse or neglect under RCW 26.44.030, despite M.Y.'s disclosures and evident distress. No Child Protective Services (CPS) referral was made, and no follow-up investigation occurred. (Ex. G).
- 6.88 The officer's failure to speak with M.Y., to assess his safety, or to initiate a mandatory report constitutes a breach of duty and deliberate indifference to the welfare of a vulnerable child who had directly sought governmental protection. It further reflects systemic negligence and a disregard for LSPD's obligations under the U.S. Constitution, Washington law, and recognized law enforcement standards of care for responding to juvenile 911 callers.
- 6.89 The Department's inaction not only endangered M.Y.'s well-being but also contributed to his ongoing psychological harm. In the weeks that followed, M.Y. was diagnosed with trauma-related symptoms and was referred for urgent psychiatric care by the Seattle Children's Hospital.
- 6.90 This incident is emblematic of a broader pattern of misconduct and indifference by the Lake Stevens Police Department in cases involving Plaintiff and her children and supports claims for breach of duty, negligence, willful misconduct, and knowing constitutional violations.
- 6.91 As a direct result of Defendants' actions, Ms. Bloom has suffered and continues to suffer significant damages. She has endured loss of familial relations (custody of her children), severe emotional distress (including intensified PTSD, multiple suicide

attempts, anxiety, and fear for her life), reputational harm (being branded a liar among law enforcement, legal communities, and her own proceedings), and the loss of the normal benefits of legal protection that any citizen should be able to expect.

- 6.92 She now lives in hiding, in constant fear that her abuser will harm or kill her. A fear compounded by the knowledge that local police, influenced by LSPD's false representations, might not come to her aid or might even suspect her if she calls for help.
- 6.93 The following Causes of Action incorporate and build upon the foregoing factual background and factual allegations. Each cause of action constitutes an independent ground for relief based on the violations and injuries described.

# VII. First Cause of Action: 42 U.S.C. § 1983 – First Amendment Retaliation (Free Speech/Petition)

- 7.1 Protected Activity: Plaintiff Gina Bloom engaged in constitutionally protected speech and petitioning activity on multiple occasions. This includes but is not limited to: (a) speaking out about her domestic abuse and reporting crimes committed by her ex-husband; (b) filing internal complaints and contacting the Mayor, FBI, and DOJ in October 2022 to report misconduct by LSPD; and (c) petitioning the government for help by filing police reports with the Mukilteo PD and Kirkland PD in 2023. These activities are protected by the First Amendment's guarantee of free speech and the right "to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."
- 7.2 <u>Adverse Actions: Defendants</u> (particularly Detective Parnell, acting under color of law) took adverse action against Ms. Bloom that would chill a person of ordinary firmness from continuing to engage in that protected activity. Such adverse actions included:

- 14
- 15
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24

- 7.3 Interrogating and Intimidating the Plaintiff: Detective Parnell's hostile interrogation of Ms. Bloom on November 1, 2022 was done not to legitimately investigate a crime, but to intimidate Ms. Bloom for having repeatedly sought outside help and to cast doubt on her abuse allegations.
- 7.4 Defaming the Plaintiff to Other Agencies: When Ms. Bloom subsequently filed police reports with Mukilteo PD and Kirkland PD, Detective Parnell intervened by falsely branding Ms. Bloom as a liar and troublemaker to those agencies. This resulted in the termination of investigations that Ms. Bloom initiated and effectively denied her access to police protection.
- 7.5 Blacklisting/Undermining Plaintiff's Credibility: Defendants, through Parnell's actions, created an environment in which Ms. Bloom could not turn to any local law enforcement without being doubted or dismissed. This blacklisting is a continuing adverse action that deters Ms. Bloom from exercising her rights (indeed, as noted, she became afraid to report even serious threats to the police).
- 7.6 Motivating Factor: Plaintiff's protected activities were a substantial or motivating factor for the Defendants' adverse actions. Detective Parnell's own statements, as alleged on information and belief, indicate retaliatory animus: for example, LSPD (through Parnell) stated that Ms. Bloom was a liar "because [she] requested two internal investigations, contacted the mayor, and filed complaints with FBI and DOJ."
- 7.7 In other words, Parnell explicitly tied her negative portrayal of Ms. Bloom to the fact that Ms. Bloom had engaged in complaint-making and whistleblowing against LSPD. Additionally, the timing and pattern of conduct support a retaliatory motive: Parnell's interrogation followed almost immediately after Ms. Bloom' external complaints in late

- 2022, and the interference with other police reports occurred as Ms. Bloom continued to seek redress in 2023.
- 7.8 There was no legitimate law enforcement reason to call Ms. Bloom a liar or to sabotage investigations of threats against her; the inference is that Parnell acted out of personal animus and a desire to retaliate against Ms. Bloom for her persistence in speaking out and seeking help.
- 7.9 Chilling Effect and Injury: Defendants' actions would chill a person of ordinary resolve from engaging in further protected speech or petitions. In Ms. Bloom' case, the retaliation actually succeeded in chilling her: she became (and remains) fearful of reaching out to police or authorities, even when she faces grave danger, because she anticipates that she will be disbelieved or even targeted.
- 7.10 This chilling effect on her First Amendment rights is itself a constitutional injury. Moreover, as detailed above, Ms. Bloom suffered concrete injuries as a result of the retaliation loss of custody of her children, loss of police protection, and severe emotional distress which compound the constitutional violation.
- No Legitimate Justification: Defendants cannot show any legitimate, non-retaliatory reason for the actions they took. There was no factual basis to believe Ms. Bloom was filing false reports; indeed, Defendants never charged her with such, and evidence often later vindicated her complaints. The false statements and investigative inaction by Detective Parnell served no valid law enforcement purpose and only served to shield an abuser from accountability while punishing the victim. Thus, any claimed justification is pretextual.
- 7.12 <u>Liability of Defendants:</u> Detective Parnell is liable under §1983 for engaging in retaliatory acts under color of law that violated Ms. Bloom' First

Amendment rights. The City of Lake Stevens is also liable to the extent that Parnell's actions were taken pursuant to municipal policy or custom, or with the knowledge and tacit approval of LSPD's leadership. Upon information and belief, LSPD's policymakers were aware of Parnell's treatment of Ms. Bloom (especially given Ms. Bloom' prior internal complaints and the overt communications with other agencies) and either directed, authorized, or ratified this conduct, or showed deliberate indifference to such retaliation.

7.13 The City's failure to prevent or correct Parnell's retaliatory conduct — and its continuation over an extended period — reflects a municipal policy or custom of deliberate indifference to citizens' First Amendment rights, making the City liable under Monell for the resulting constitutional violation.

7.14 <u>Damages:</u> As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' retaliatory conduct, Ms. Bloom has suffered damages, including but not limited to: pain and suffering, emotional distress, loss of familial relationships, reputational harm, legal expenses, and other economic and non-economic damages in an amount to be proven at trial. Ms. Bloom also seeks punitive damages against Detective Parnell in her individual capacity for her willful, malicious, and reckless disregard of Plaintiff's rights, as well as attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988.

# VIII. Second Cause of Action: 42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Fourteenth Amendment (Equal Protection and Due Process)

Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

8.1 Equal Protection - Class-of-One: The Fourteenth Amendment guarantees every person equal protection of the laws. Defendants, acting under color of state law, intentionally treated Ms. Bloom differently from other individuals similarly situated, without any

- 8.2 Here, however, Ms. Bloom was uniquely singled out by LSPD and Detective Parnell for mistreatment: instead of receiving protection, she was branded a liar, and her reports were actively undermined. There was no legitimate law enforcement rationale for this disparate treatment. Indeed, other police departments (Tacoma, Renton, Seattle, Edmonds, and others to whom Ms. Bloom reported past incidents) believed her and did not label her a liar; only LSPD (and those it influenced) treated her this way. Defendants' actions were motivated by ill-will and retaliation, not by any reasonable differentiation. This arbitrary and malicious denial of police services to Ms. Bloom constitutes a violation of her right to equal protection. As a "class of one," Ms. Bloom was intentionally treated adversely where others in her situation would have been helped, and the difference in treatment was wholly unjustifiable.
- 8.3 Equal Protection Gender, Race, Victim Status, Bias (Alternative Theory): To the extent evidence shows that Defendants' conduct was driven by gender-based stereotypes or animus (for example, a pattern of not believing female victims of domestic violence or favoring male suspects' accounts), or other patently impermissible class of discrimination, such conduct would also violate equal protection on the basis of sex.

  (Plaintiff notes that LSPD effectively sided with her male abuser and discredited her, a female victim, repeatedly. Any such pattern or practice would be discriminatory.) This alternative allegation will be explored in discovery if applicable.
- 8.4 <u>Due Process Interference with Access to Courts and Safety</u>: The Fourteenth

  Amendment's Due Process Clause protects against certain arbitrary government actions

that infringe on fundamental rights or liberty interests. Ms. Bloom has a liberty interest in her personal security and in the custody of her children, as well as a right of access to institutions of justice. Defendants, acting under color of law, deprived Ms. Bloom of these interests through their extreme misconduct. By knowingly providing false information and preventing other police agencies from investigating legitimate threats, Defendants effectively sabotaged Ms. Bloom' access to legal protection.

- 8.5 This conduct can be viewed as a violation of procedural due process (interfering with her ability to seek law enforcement aid and to have her complaints fairly processed) and substantive due process (shocking the conscience by willfully subjecting her to danger).

  Detective Parnell's actions made Ms. Bloom more vulnerable to private violence a state-created danger by ensuring that her abuser would not be held accountable and that she could not obtain restraining or criminal enforcement against him elsewhere.

  Moreover, by assisting her ex-husband in the custody case (via the Parnell interview transcript and false narrative of her credibility), Defendants infringed on Ms. Bloom' fundamental right to familial relations without due process of law, effectively helping to deprive her of custody without a fair consideration of the facts.
- 8.6 No Immunity or Privilege: Defendants' conduct was not a good-faith mistake or a discretionary enforcement decision that might be protected by immunity. Rather, it was a willful misuse of official power to target an individual. Falsifying information to sabotage someone's access to the courts and police protection is not a constitutionally permissible act and serves no legitimate governmental objective.
- 8.7 Municipal Liability: The City of Lake Stevens is liable under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for the violations of the Fourteenth Amendment described above to the extent that these violations were caused by an official policy or a longstanding custom or practice. Upon

information and belief, LSPD as an organization either fostered or allowed a practice of retaliating against Ms. Bloom (and perhaps other complaining victims) by branding them as not credible. LSPD's leadership knew or should have known of Detective Parnell's actions (for example, through inter-agency communications or internal complaints by Ms. Bloom) and yet failed to intervene or correct this misconduct. This deliberate indifference and failure to supervise amount to a policy or custom attributable to the City, which led directly to the deprivation of Ms. Bloom' rights.

8.8 <u>Damages</u>: As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' violation of Ms. Bloom'
Fourteenth Amendment rights, Ms. Bloom has suffered significant damages, including loss of custody time with her children, loss of the benefit and protection of law enforcement services, emotional trauma, and other economic and non-economic harms.

Plaintiff seeks compensatory damages for these injuries, and punitive damages against the individual Defendant for her outrageous and conscious-shocking conduct. Plaintiff also seeks attorneys' fees and costs under 42 U.S.C. § 1988 for the vindication of her civil rights.

#### IX. Third Cause of Action: 42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Civil Conspiracy to Violate Civil Rights

Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

9.1 Defendants, and other co-conspirators yet unknown, reached an agreement or meeting of the minds to engage in a concerted effort to deprive Ms. Bloom of her civil rights, including her First Amendment right to seek redress and her Fourteenth Amendment right to equal protection and due process. The pattern of coordinated conduct — such as LSPD (through Detective Parnell) repeatedly communicating with other police departments (Mukilteo and Kirkland) to deliberately undermine Ms. Bloom' credibility and halt her

to achieve an unlawful objective.

9.2 Specifically, upon information and belief, Detective Parnell conspired with one or more

reports — indicates a shared understanding between Parnell and at least one other person

- 2.2 Specifically, upon information and belief, Detective Parnell conspired with one or more individuals, which may include other officers or officials within LSPD and/or individuals in other local police departments, to <a href="blacklist">blacklist</a> Ms. Bloom and to ensure that her attempts at obtaining police protection would fail. In the Mukilteo incident, Mr. Yorks (a private party) was able to predictably enlist LSPD's aid in sabotaging Ms. Bloom' complaint, suggesting a tacit agreement or prior course of dealing between Mr. Yorks and Detective Parnell (and/or LSPD generally) to discredit Ms. Bloom. In the Kirkland incident, Detective Parnell's false statements were passed to KPD, whose detective then followed the implicit suggestion to treat Ms. Bloom as not credible evidencing at least a tacit coordination between LSPD and KPD personnel in quashing Ms. Bloom' case. These acts were not isolated; they were part of a continuing scheme.
- 9.3 The conspiratorial agreement was to accomplish an unlawful purpose (retaliating against and silencing Ms. Bloom for her speech and denying her equal protection of the laws) by unlawful means (defamation and abuse of police authority under color of law). Each Defendant and co-conspirator committed overt acts in furtherance of the conspiracy, such as making or disseminating false statements about Ms. Bloom, refusing to investigate her reports, and sharing misinformation with others. Detective Parnell's communications and Mr. Yorks' direction to contact LSPD are examples of such overt acts.
- 9.4 As a direct and proximate result of the conspiracy, Ms. Bloom suffered the deprivations of rights, and the damages described above. All conspirators are jointly and severally liable for these damages under §1983. Any non-state actor who participated in the conspiracy (for example, if Mr. Yorks or others outside LSPD are found to have

conspired with Detective Parnell) thereby acted under color of state law in joint participation with state officials and is liable for the resulting civil rights violations.

- 9.5 Defendants' conspiracy was conducted with malice, oppression, and reckless disregard for Ms. Bloom' rights, making an award of punitive damages against the individual Defendant appropriate. Plaintiff also seeks attorneys' fees and costs under 42 U.S.C. § 1988 for this claim.
- X. Fourth Cause of Action: Custodial Interrogation Without Miranda Warning and Right to Counsel (42 U.S.C. § 1983 Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments)

- 10.1 The Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution, made applicable to the states through the Fourteenth Amendment, provides that no person "shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself." The Supreme Court in *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436 (1966), established that before any custodial interrogation, a suspect must be clearly informed of their right to remain silent, that any statement made may be used against them, and that they have the right to the presence of an attorney. These protections exist to safeguard an individual's privilege against self-incrimination and are triggered whenever a person is in custody and subjected to interrogation by law enforcement.
- 10.2 On November 1, 2022, Defendant Detective Kristen Parnell, acting under color of state law, conducted a custodial interrogation of Plaintiff without first administering the required Miranda warnings and without ensuring Plaintiff understood her rights, in violation of her constitutional protections under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments.

  Although the interview began as a voluntary statement concerning Plaintiff's children's disclosures of abuse, it evolved—without warning—into an accusatory interrogation

targeting Plaintiff herself. The change in tone, the aggressive questioning, and the use of coercive tactics (including confronting Plaintiff with false allegations of lying and coaching) transformed the interaction into a custodial setting in which Plaintiff was effectively *not free to leave* and became the subject of suspicion.

- 10.3 At no point during the interview did Detective Parnell inform Plaintiff of her Miranda rights. Nor did she offer or permit access to counsel, despite the increasingly accusatory nature of the questioning. These omissions violated Plaintiff's clearly established constitutional right to receive *Miranda* warnings before being subjected to custodial interrogation, and to have the opportunity to exercise the right to remain silent and to consult an attorney.
- 10.4 As a direct and proximate result of this custodial interrogation without Miranda advisement or access to counsel, Plaintiff suffered constitutional injury, including the chilling of her right to seek protection from the police, damage to her credibility in family court proceedings, and emotional and psychological trauma resulting from being coerced, demeaned, and treated as a suspect while attempting to report child abuse. Additionally, the statements obtained through this interrogation, whether or not they were incriminating, were later used against Plaintiff in her custody litigation, despite being procured through unconstitutional means.
- 10.5 No reasonable officer could have believed that a custodial interrogation without Miranda warnings was lawful in 2022, particularly when shifting a subject from a voluntary witness to a suspect without notice or legal safeguards. Detective Parnell's conduct violated clearly established constitutional law, and she is not entitled to qualified immunity.

- 10.6 Plaintiff seeks compensatory damages for the constitutional injury sustained as a result of this unlawful custodial interrogation. Plaintiff also seeks punitive damages against Defendant Parnell for her willful and knowing violation of Plaintiff's rights, as well as **attorneys' fees and costs** pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988.
  - XI. Fifth Cause of Action: Malicious Prosecution (42 U.S.C. § 1983 Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments)

- 11.1 Defendants, acting under color of law, initiated and continued criminal proceedings against Ms. Bloom without probable cause, and did so with retaliatory intent following Ms. Bloom's protected speech and petitioning activity, including her July 2021 request for an internal investigation into LSPD's inaction in response to Brian Yorks' stalking.
- 11.2 On or about January 25, 2022, after Ms. Bloom reported that her children had been left unattended in a running car, in violation of Chapter 9.12 CRIMES RELATING TO CHILDREN AND MINORS, a Lake Stevens Municipal Code, LSPD forwarded criminal charges against her for allegedly violating a protection order. The order did not prohibit Ms. Bloom's presence at the location in question. LSPD's own leadership, including Deputy Chief Jeff Young, later acknowledged that the order had been misread and that the charge was meritless. The prosecutor dismissed the charge on June 13, 2022.
- 11.3 The initiation and pursuit of that charge amounted to a seizure within the meaning of the Fourth Amendment, as Ms. Bloom was subjected to legal process without probable cause. The filing of a criminal complaint triggered an obligation to appear in court and created an official record of prosecution, which caused reputational and tangible harm.

  Ms. Bloom had no prior criminal record beforehand.

- 11.4 The prosecution also violated Ms. Bloom's rights under the Fourteenth Amendment's Due Process Clause, as it was undertaken with malicious or retaliatory intent and lacked any legitimate law enforcement justification. Rather than being the product of neutral enforcement of law, the charge was an act of targeted retaliation against a woman who had criticized LSPD and sought accountability.
- 11.5 No reasonable officer could have believed that prosecuting Ms. Bloom under these circumstances with no factual or legal basis was lawful. Defendants' conduct violated clearly established constitutional rights under the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments, and they are not entitled to qualified immunity.
- The City of Lake Stevens is liable under *Monell* because its failure to train and supervise its officers permitted the initiation of retaliatory or baseless charges without proper oversight. LSPD's failure to correct the officer's conduct until after the harm was done reflects deliberate indifference to the rights of citizens, and the City is liable for the consequences of the prosecution initiated by its officer acting in the scope of employment.
- 11.7 As a direct and proximate result of this malicious prosecution, Ms. Bloom suffered constitutional injury and actual damages, including emotional distress, reputational harm, legal fees, and the use of this charge to undermine her custody in the family law case. Plaintiff seeks compensatory damages, punitive damages against the individual Defendant, and attorneys' fees and costs under 42 U.S.C. § 1988.
- XII. Sixth Cause of Action: Municipal Liability Monell Claim (42 U.S.C. § 1983)

Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein

- 12.1 Defendant City of Lake Stevens is liable under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for the constitutional violations described above, including violations of the First, Fourth, and Fourteenth Amendments, because those violations were the result of official policies, customs, or practices of the City and its police department (LSPD), or were caused by the City's failure to adequately train, supervise, or discipline its officers.
- 12.2 At all relevant times, the City of Lake Stevens maintained or permitted a de facto policy or widespread custom of disbelieving domestic violence victims, discrediting abuse reports by mothers involved in custody litigation, and treating such individuals with suspicion or hostility rather than providing protection. The City, through its police department, tolerated a culture in which officers were empowered to intimidate and retaliate against abuse reporters—particularly women who criticized the department's failure to act.
- 12.3 The actions of Detective Parnell, including but not limited to (a) conducting an unlawful custodial interrogation of Plaintiff without Miranda warnings; (b) falsely branding Plaintiff as a fabricator to other police departments; (c) interfering with Plaintiff's ability to seek protection from Mukilteo and Kirkland police; and (d) providing weaponized "evidence" to Plaintiff's abuser for use in family court, were carried out under the color of official authority and within the scope of her employment. These actions were not isolated but reflected a broader failure by the City to protect reporting parties and to ensure that its officers did not misuse their authority to harm vulnerable individuals.
- 12.4 The City of Lake Stevens failed to adequately train and supervise its officers, including Detective Parnell and Officer Marshall, on proper handling of:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Domestic violence reports involving co-parenting or custody disputes;
- Mandated CPS referrals under RCW 26.44.030;
- Constitutional protections during custodial interviews (including the requirement to provide Miranda warnings);
- Retaliation avoidance and safeguarding of First Amendment rights;
- Proper inter-agency communication protocols and use of law enforcement databases.
- The City's failure to train/enforce/manage/monitor its officers in these areas 12.5 constituted deliberate indifference to the constitutional rights of citizens such as Plaintiff. The need for such training was obvious given the frequency of DV-related complaints and the City's actual notice of prior officer misconduct. Yet the City failed to implement or enforce adequate procedures, leading directly to the violations of Plaintiff's rights.
- 12.6 In addition, the City of Lake Stevens, through its final policymakers, ratified the misconduct described herein. Senior officials, including Deputy Chief Jeff Young, were made aware of LSPD's wrongful conduct in Plaintiff's case—such as the misreading of the protection order that led to a false charge, the mishandling of the September 2022 abuse disclosure, and the dissemination of defamatory statements about Plaintiff to other agencies. Despite this notice, no corrective action was taken, and officers involved in the violations remained in their positions. This ratification further establishes municipal liability.
- 12.7 The constitutional violations described herein—induced through the Defendant's retaliation, malicious prosecution, interference with familial relations, denial of equal protection, and unlawful custodial interrogation—were clearly consequent the

foreseeable and proximate result of the City's policies, customs, and failures of training and supervision. But for the City's actions and omissions, the harm to Plaintiff would not have occurred.

- 12.8 Plaintiff therefore seeks to hold Defendant City of Lake Stevens liable under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for the constitutional injuries inflicted upon her by its employees acting pursuant to municipal policy, custom, or deliberate indifference.
- 12.9 As a direct and proximate result of the City's actions and omissions, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer economic and non-economic damages as set forth above. Plaintiff seeks full compensation for those damages, as well as attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988.
- 12.10 In summary, *Monell* liability is clear in this case, as LSPD has demonstrated a consistent pattern of deliberate indifference to constitutional violations, especially in its handling of domestic violence and child abuse cases, as well as in the treatment of protected persons under domestic violence protection orders (DVPOs).
- 12.11 LSPD, through its officers and leadership, including but not limited to Det.

  Kristen Parnell, Sgt. James Barnes, and Officer Marshall, engaged in and ratified actions that systematically violated Plaintiff's civil rights and contributed to the failure to protect a known child victim (M.Y.), the obstruction of justice, the suppression of exculpatory evidence, and the misuse of legal process to favor the alleged perpetrator Brian Yorks.
- 12.12 LSPD operated under customs or de facto policies that include: (1) Discrediting or ignoring domestic violence complaints brought by women against male perpetrators, especially those involving complex custody matters. (2) Failing to document, investigate, or report credible allegations of child abuse or endangerment, including refusing to speak to minor M.Y. despite a clear and direct 911 plea for help and a legal duty to refer to CPS

under RCW 26.44.030. (3) Providing legal guidance and active coordination with alleged abusers under DVPOs (*e.g.*, Yorks), while simultaneously ignoring or suppressing or discrediting evidence and denying the same procedural protections to the protected party. (4) Deliberately mischaracterizing and altering police reports to portray Plaintiff in a negative light, including but not limited to minimizing child abuse disclosures and omitting key facts that favored Plaintiff's account. (5) Retaliating against Plaintiff by using criminal charges, false narratives, and fabricated evidence to discredit her in ongoing custody litigation.

- 12.13 In line with these customs, LSPD withheld critical *Brady* material, including exculpatory video and witness statements in Plaintiff's own criminal case, and misrepresented internal communications, records, and investigatory actions taken regarding Plaintiff's 2020 rape report and the associated witness, Rosana Aho.
- 12.14 The misconduct by LSPD was not isolated. For example: (1) Det. Parnell fabricated statements during a custodial interrogation on November 1, 2022, falsely claiming Plaintiff accused LSPD officers of physical assault—a claim wholly unsupported by any evidence and later admitted by the agency to be fabricated. (2) LSPD deliberately delayed, denied, or destroyed responsive records to Plaintiff's Public Records Act (PRA) requests, including police reports, BWC footage, internal communications, and records regarding defamatory inter-agency communications by Det. Parnell to other police departments. (3) LSPD failed to follow its own policy on *Brady* disclosures (Policy 604), which mandates the timely release of exculpatory evidence to prosecutors and defense.
- 12.15 These acts and omissions were carried out with deliberate indifference to Plaintiff's constitutional rights and demonstrate the City of Lake Stevens' failure to

implement proper policies, training, oversight, and discipline concerning: (1) Domestic violence investigation protocols. (2) Mandatory child abuse reporting. (3) Evidence preservation and disclosure. (4) Conflict-of-interest protocols regarding officers acting in favor of abusers. (5) Proper handling of civil rights and protected status under court orders.

- 12.16 The violations were so widespread and obvious that the need for additional training or supervision was plainly evident, yet LSPD and the City failed to act. Their inaction amounts to an official policy of ignoring or undermining civil rights protections, which was the moving force behind the injuries suffered by Plaintiff.
- 12.17 As a direct and proximate result of these unconstitutional policies and practices,
  Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer psychological trauma, reputational harm,
  loss of parental rights, financial injury, and a deprivation of liberty without due process.

# XIII. Seventh Cause of Action: Tortious Interference with Access to Law Enforcement Protection (State Law)

- 13.1 Existence of Expectancy/Relationship: By law and public policy, when Ms.

  Bloom reported crimes and threats (to Mukilteo PD and Kirkland PD), she had a reasonable expectation that those law enforcement agencies would investigate and take appropriate action for her protection. In essence, there was an expected beneficial relationship between Ms. Bloom (as a crime victim) and the police departments receiving her complaints a relationship predicated on the duty of police to protect the public and assist victims.
- 13.2 <u>Knowledge:</u> Defendants were aware of Ms. Bloom' attempts to obtain protection and justice through those other police agencies. Detective Parnell knew that Ms. Bloom

had filed reports with Mukilteo PD and Kirkland PD because officers from those agencies reached out to LSPD as part of their coordination/inquiries. Thus, Defendants had actual knowledge of Ms. Bloom' prospective dealings with the Mukilteo and Kirkland police regarding her complaints.

- Intentional Interference: Defendants intentionally and unjustifiably interfered with Ms. Bloom' expectancy of police protection. Detective Parnell, acting within the scope of her employment with LSPD, provided false and disparaging information about Ms.

  Bloom to the Mukilteo and Kirkland departments, with the intent and result that those agencies would cease to actively investigate or respond to Ms. Bloom' reports. This interference was accomplished through wrongful means namely, lies about Ms.

  Bloom' credibility and the misuse of LSPD's authority to influence the decisions of fellow officers in another jurisdiction. There was no privilege or lawful justification for LSPD to intervene in this manner; indeed, standard professional conduct would call for cooperation to help a victim, not sabotage her case.
- 13.4 Termination of Expectancy and Damage: As a proximate result of Defendants' interference, the police investigations by Mukilteo PD and Kirkland PD were effectively terminated or diminished, and Ms. Bloom was denied the services and protection she otherwise would have received. The death threat and harassment against her were not fully investigated or prosecuted, leaving her without justice or security. This caused Ms. Bloom to suffer actual damages, including increased risk of harm from the unaddressed threats, extreme emotional distress (knowing that even outside police would not help her), and the expense and inconvenience of having to find alternate ways to ensure her safety. The value of the benefit she expected police intervention and possibly criminal enforcement against her abuser was lost due to Defendants' interference.

11

16

20

21

22

23

24

13.5 Vicarious Liability of City: Detective Parnell's actions in interfering with another agency's investigation were committed within the scope of her employment as a detective (she was purporting to act as a representative of LSPD providing information). Therefore, the City of Lake Stevens is vicariously liable under respondeat superior for this tortious conduct of its employee. The City is also directly liable to the extent it authorized or ratified Parnell's actions.

13.6 Damages: Plaintiff seeks to recover all damages proximately caused by Defendants' tortious interference, in an amount to be determined at trial. These damages include the fear and emotional turmoil inflicted on Ms. Bloom, the deprivation of her opportunity to see her offender held accountable, and costs incurred for alternative safety measures. Plaintiff also seeks any appropriate punitive or exemplary damages against the individual Defendant for willful and wanton misconduct, to the extent permitted by law.

#### **Eighth Cause of Action: Defamation – Slander (State Law)** XIV.

Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

14.1 False and Defamatory Statements: Defendant Detective Parnell made oral and/or written statements about Ms. Bloom to third parties (specifically, to officers of the Mukilteo Police Department and the Kirkland Police Department) that were false and defamatory. In particular, Detective Parnell stated in substance that "Gina Bloom is a known liar who fabricates abuse allegations and files false police reports," and that she "should not be believed" or words to that effect. These assertions of fact are false: Ms. Bloom does not fabricate her abuse allegations, and she had truthful and credible grounds for all reports she filed. Accusing Ms. Bloom of making false police reports also imputes

criminal conduct to her (as filing a false report is a crime), which is a defamatory assertion per se.

- 14.2 <u>Unprivileged Publication</u>: Detective Parnell's false statements were published to at least one third party outside of LSPD—specifically to officers/detectives in Mukilteo PD and Kirkland PD, in the course of those agencies' inquiries. These communications were not privileged. They were not made as part of any judicial proceeding, nor were they necessary communications for law enforcement purposes. To the contrary, the statements were gratuitous and false smears that fell outside any legitimate duty. Even if a qualified "common interest" privilege between law enforcement agencies could arguably apply, that privilege is vitiated here because Detective Parnell acted with malice (as described below) and without honest belief in the truth of her statements.
- 14.3 Fault/Malice: Detective Parnell made the defamatory statements knowingly, intentionally, and with actual malice. Parnell either knew the statements were false or, at minimum, acted in reckless disregard of the truth. As detailed, Ms. Bloom has never been found to have made a false report, and LSPD had evidence reinforcing the credibility of her abuse claims. Detective Parnell had no evidence to support calling Ms. Bloom a fabricator—on the contrary, available information indicated that Ms. Bloom was telling the truth about her abuse. Parnell's statements were motivated by ill-will and an intent to retaliate against or disparage Ms. Bloom, rather than any good-faith effort to relay factual information. Such spiteful, unfounded accusations demonstrate actual malice.
- 14.4 <u>Injury to Plaintiff</u>: Detective Parnell's defamation of Ms. Bloom has caused injury to Ms. Bloom' reputation, personal dignity, and ability to obtain help. The audience of the statements—police officers in other jurisdictions—now view or have viewed Ms. Bloom as untrustworthy and unstable. This not only humiliated Ms. Bloom but also

- 14.5 <u>Vicarious Liability of City:</u> Detective Parnell made the defamatory statements in the course of her employment as a detective responding to law enforcement inquiries.

  Therefore, the City of Lake Stevens is vicariously liable for defamation under respondeat superior. It was foreseeable and within Parnell's role as an LSPD officer that she might communicate with other agencies; however, the City is responsible when those communications are done maliciously and injure a private citizen.
- damages: Plaintiff seeks full compensation for the defamation, including general damages for harm to reputation and mental anguish, as well as any special damages to be proven (such as costs incurred due to the loss of police protection or other opportunities). Because Detective Parnell's conduct was willful, wanton, and malicious, Plaintiff also seeks punitive damages against her personally (if available under applicable law) to punish and deter such egregious abuse of authority. Plaintiff additionally seeks an order requiring Defendants to retract or correct the false statements in any law enforcement databases or records where such slanders may persist (injunctive relief), as well as costs and interest as allowed by law.
- XV. Ninth Cause of Action: Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress (NIED) (State Law)

- 15.1 <u>Duty of Care</u>: Defendants owed Ms. Bloom a duty to exercise reasonable care in the handling of her reports and in their interactions with her. This duty arises from the special relationship between law enforcement and individuals seeking protection (once an officer undertakes to respond or communicate about a case, they must not do so in a manner that foreseeably causes unnecessary harm), as well as from general principles that one must refrain from outrageous or reckless conduct that is likely to cause serious emotional harm to others. At the very least, Detective Parnell had a duty not to subject Ms. Bloom to foreseeable emotional distress by egregiously misusing her authority.
- 15.2 <u>Breach of Duty</u>: Defendants breached this duty of care through the conduct described above. Detective Parnell's actions interrogating Ms. Bloom in a traumatic manner, calling her a liar, undermining her pleas for help, and effectively leaving her to fend for herself against a violent abuser were unreasonable and wrongful. Even if some of these acts were intentional (and therefore addressed in other claims), they also reflect a profound breach of any reasonable standard of care owed to a victim of crime. In the alternative to any intentional tort, Defendants acted negligently and without due care for Ms. Bloom' mental well-being. It was highly foreseeable that treating a domestic violence victim in this manner would cause severe emotional distress, given the vulnerability of such victims and the stakes involved (custody of children, fear of lifethreatening harm, etc.).
- 15.3 <u>Causation of Emotional Distress</u>: As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' breach, Ms. Bloom suffered serious emotional distress. The distress includes, but is not limited to, exacerbation of her post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), anxiety, depression,

- 15.4 Severity of Distress: The emotional distress inflicted upon Ms. Bloom is severe. A reasonable person in Ms. Bloom' position would be unable to calmly endure the situation she was put in: not only being terrorized by an abusive ex-husband but also being effectively shunned and discredited by the police force she relied on. The betrayal by LSPD and the collapse of her sense of security caused psychological harm that is significant and long-lasting. Ms. Bloom' distress is far beyond the trivial or transient; it has impacted her daily functioning and requires therapeutic intervention.
- 15.5 <u>Vicarious Liability of City</u>: Detective Parnell's negligent (and/or reckless)

  conduct occurred in the scope of her employment, as all her interactions with Ms. Bloom and other agencies were under the guise of official police duty. Therefore, the City of Lake Stevens is vicariously liable for the negligent infliction of emotional distress upon Ms. Bloom. In addition, if the City's own failures in training or supervision contributed to the harm, that provides a direct basis for negligence as well.
- 15.6 <u>Damages:</u> Plaintiff seeks damages for the emotional distress and psychological injuries caused by Defendants' conduct. This includes costs of medical and psychological treatment, past and future pain and suffering, and other compensatory damages allowed by law. Plaintiff also seeks to recover for any economic losses resulting from the distress

(for example, if her ability to work or relocate was impacted). Although labeled as

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

"negligent" infliction, the egregious nature of Defendants' actions should permit the trier of fact to consider enhanced or punitive damages to the extent available, given the reckless indifference to Plaintiff's welfare demonstrated here.

#### XVI. Tenth Cause of Action: Malicious Prosecution (State Law)

- 16.1 On January 25, 2022, Ms. Bloom reported that her children were left alone in a running vehicle in front of Chase Bank, in Lake Stevens, WA. Rather than investigating the clear safety and statutory violations committed by Mr. Yorks, LSPD redirected its focus to Ms. Bloom. Officer Marshall, acting under the authority of LSPD, forwarded a criminal charge against Ms. Bloom for allegedly violating a restraining order by being present at the bank where Ms. Bloom lived, where she's been a regular Chase Bank customer since moving to Lake Stevens in 2011, and where the Yorks' home mortgage was paid through—despite the fact that the order did not stipulate nor bar her from being at Chase Bank.
- 16.2 On June 3, 2022, LSPD Deputy Chief Jeff Young called Ms. Bloom, although represented by a public defender, and acknowledged that the officer misread the order, and that Ms. Bloom had committed no violation. He personally apologized to Ms. Bloom, and LSPD advised the prosecutor that the charge should be dismissed. The charge was eventually dismissed, constituting a termination of the proceedings in Ms. Bloom's favor.
- 16.3 At the time the charge was brought, Defendants knew or should have known that there was no probable cause to support it. The restraining order was unambiguous and had been misread. The criminal charge was forwarded by LSPD despite the plain

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

language of the order, suggesting either gross negligence or a retaliatory motive by the
agency, particularly in light of Ms. Bloom's July 2021 internal complaint to LSPD
regarding its failure to act on her earlier stalking report.

- 16.4 The decision to forward criminal charges against Ms. Bloom was made with malice. At the time the charge was initiated, LSPD officers—including those previously criticized by Ms. Bloom—were aware that she had requested an internal investigation into their conduct. The charge was brought within six months of her internal complaint and formed part of a broader pattern of retaliation, including LSPD's subsequent conduct in 2022 and 2023.
- 16.5 As a direct and proximate result of this malicious prosecution, Ms. Bloom suffered damages including reputational harm, emotional distress, legal expenses, and injury to her credibility in family court. The prosecution was used by Mr. Yorks to portray Ms. Bloom as unstable and criminally liable, and the charge appeared in court filings, custody arguments, and public records.
- 16.6 The City of Lake Stevens is liable under respondeat superior for the malicious prosecution initiated by Officer Marshall and approved by the department. The conduct was within the scope of his employment, and the City was responsible for training, supervising, and correcting such misuse of police authority.
- 16.7 Plaintiff seeks compensatory damages for the harm caused by this wrongful prosecution, including emotional distress, reputational injury, and economic loss. Plaintiff also seeks punitive damages to the extent allowed by law, and such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.
- XVII. Eleventh Cause of Action: Violation of Washington Public Records Act (RCW 42.56) (State Law)

- 17.1 On or about July 31, 2024, Plaintiff submitted a lawful public records request #24-1210 to the City of Lake Stevens for materials relating to a key witness, Rosanna Aho, in connection with Plaintiff's own report of sexual assault stemming from a February 2020 arrest incident. The request specifically sought witness statements, police narratives, and related communications. In response, the LSPD produced only a single-page document that appeared conclusory and incomplete, omitting crucial materials necessary to understand the Department's handling of the incident. (Ex. H).
- 17.2 Plaintiff later learned that her professional supervisor, Lori Kirkland, on July 16, 2024, submitted a public records request #24-1106 for all records pertaining to Ms.

  Bloom and Mr. Yorks. In stark contrast to what was disclosed to Plaintiff, Ms. Kirkland received a comprehensive and complete production of responsive records. These included but were not limited to:
- 17.3 Two complete documents, including the 02.23.2022 recorded interview as well as the 12/21/2021 report regarding more communication between LSPD sergeant Warbis and Rosanna Aho, both of which were withheld from Plaintiff's production; Audio and video materials; Additional narrative reports and officer supplements concerning Ms. Aho's role and statements as a witness. (Ex. I).
- 17.4 The disparate treatment is further evidenced by the emails and attachments contained in the files released to Ms. Kirkland, which collectively demonstrate that LSPD provided significantly more information to Ms. Kirkland than to the Plaintiff, despite the requests being nearly identical in scope and reference.

- 17.5 This inconsistent and selective disclosure of public records constitutes a violation of RCW 42.56.070 and 42.56.080, which require public agencies to make identifiable public records promptly available to any person without inquiry into the purpose of the request and without discrimination as to the identity of the requester. The law is unequivocal: public records must be produced fully, without prejudice, and equitably.
- 17.6 Moreover, *public records* reveals that the Snohomish County Prosecutor's Office requested additional evidence from the Lake Stevens Police Department (LSPD) regarding the rape investigation into Brian Christopher Yorks, specifically under case #20-002980, for Second Degree Rape Domestic Violence. Prosecutors explicitly indicated they would keep the file open until July 6, 2020, awaiting the requested items. Despite this:
- 17.7 Requested Items Withheld: The listed request included photos booked into evidence, which were never returned according to the complaint history and subsequent record request issues.
- 17.8 Failure to Provide Discovery: The complainant (Ms. Bloom) asserts that key evidence from her two-hour video-recorded disclosure interview was never submitted to the prosecution. This omission directly contradicts LSPD's duty to disclose Brady material evidence that could be favorable to the victim and essential to prosecution decisions.
- 17.9 Witness Delay and Investigative Failure: As highlighted earlier, Rosana Aho, a critical witness, was not interviewed until nearly two years later. Her statements including observations of physical bruising and suicidal ideation from the victim could have substantially corroborated the disclosure. By delaying this interview until after the case was declined, LSPD rendered the testimony effectively moot.

- 17.10 The Lake Stevens Police Department failed to comply with a direct prosecutorial request for evidence in a violent felony sex offense case. This contributed to a decision to decline charges and severely undermined the Ms. Bloom, the victim's credibility, further traumatizing her. Such neglect was not incidental but part of a broader pattern by LSPD to obstruct the Plaintiff's access to justice, violate RCW 10.99.030(6) (requiring law enforcement to notify victims of their rights and to forward necessary evidence), and contravene their internal Brady Policy (Policy 604). The department's prolonged inaction, selective record-sharing, and failure to safeguard the investigative integrity constitute actionable misconduct. (Ex. J).
- 17.11 In furtherance of a broader pattern of inaction, retaliation and obstruction, the Lake Stevens Police Department (LSPD) and Detective Kristen Parnell undertook deliberate and coordinated efforts to conceal material facts relating to defamatory communications made to third-party law enforcement agencies and to withhold public records critical to Plaintiff's ability to seek redress and defend her reputation.
- 17.12 Between early 2023 and 2025, Plaintiff submitted numerous records requests directed at uncovering the scope and substance of communications between Det. Parnell and the Mukilteo Police Department and the Kirkland Police Department. These efforts were met with persistent resistance, incomplete disclosures, and multiple delays. Plaintiff was forced to appeal responses, request internal reviews, and seek city attorney intervention to compel even partial production.
- 17.13 Ultimately, after extended delay, the City of Lake Stevens admitted that Det.

  Parnell had, in fact, engage in communications with officers at both Mukilteo and

  Kirkland Police Departments in order to falsely represent that Plaintiff, Ms. Bloom, had a

  "history of false reporting." These statements were defamatory per se, as they impugned

Plaintiff's honesty, mental health, and credibility in matters relating to public safety, domestic violence, and child welfare.

- 17.14 Further, Plaintiff's investigation revealed that Det. Parnell had fabricated a material statement during the recorded interrogation of Plaintiff on November 1, 2022. In that interview, Det. Parnell falsely accused Ms. Bloom of previously claiming that LSPD officers physically assaulted her—an accusation for which there is no supporting record, report, complaint, or video. Det. Parnell's assertion that she had a video in her possession substantiating this nonexistent complaint was also knowingly false. The City of Lake Stevens has since confirmed that no such complaint or video exists.
- 17.15 The County Family Court party opponent and Ms. Bloom's abuser, Yorks, has filed this unlawful interrogation transcript three (3) different times into Superior Court matters. The transcript has been modified and presented to falsely present Ms. Bloom, and as it stands, the Family Court firmly believes that Ms. Bloom made false allegations of assault against LSPD officer(s), which is not true.
- 17.16 This conduct demonstrates not merely a single act of negligence but a persistent institutional effort to:
  - Retaliate against Plaintiff for reporting abuse and asserting her rights under domestic violence and civil rights laws;
  - Obstruct her access to public records to which she is lawfully entitled;
  - Delay disclosure until the value of the records for litigation or administrative
     relief had been materially diminished; and
  - Defame and discredit Plaintiff with other police departments including the Snohomish County prosecutors.

- 17.17 This obstructive behavior is part of a broader pattern of misconduct by the LSPD, wherein Plaintiff was also previously denied complete access to records regarding a key witness in her own sexual assault investigation. The City has thus demonstrated a repeated failure to comply with its obligations under RCW 42.56.070 and RCW 42.56.080, and a willful disregard of Plaintiff's right to obtain government records essential to defending herself and protecting her children.
- 17.18 Plaintiff suffered material harm from this conduct. The false statements made by

  Det. Parnell damaged her credibility with multiple police departments, impaired her

  ability to obtain protection through the courts, and substantially interfered with her

  custody and civil rights litigation. Furthermore, the suppression of these records deprived

  Plaintiff of timely remedies and amounted to an intentional deprivation of due process.
- 17.19 Moreover, the withholding of critical records relating to a sexual assault report—records that were later shown to exist and were provided to another party—constitutes not merely negligence but knowing and willful conduct under RCW 42.56.550(4).

  Plaintiff was denied a meaningful opportunity to obtain evidence directly relating to her own victimization and law enforcement's handling of her report. LSPD's conduct reflects deliberate indifference and a pattern of obstructing Plaintiff's access to public records central to her claims of misconduct.
- 17.20 As a direct result of the City's unlawful withholding of records, Plaintiff suffered further deprivation of her rights, impediments to legal redress, and emotional distress.

  Pursuant to RCW 42.56.550(4), Plaintiff is entitled to:
  - Declaratory and injunctive relief;
  - A civil penalty of up to \$100 per day per record wrongfully withheld;

• Attorney's fees and litigation costs;

Any other relief the court deems just and proper

#### **XVIII. Prayer for Relief**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Gina Bloom prays that this Court enter judgment in her favor and grant the following relief against Defendants:

- 18.1 Compensatory Damages: An award of monetary damages in an amount to be determined at trial, sufficient to compensate Plaintiff for all harm suffered as a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, including economic losses, damage to reputation, loss of constitutional rights, emotional pain and suffering, and other non-economic damages, loss of crucial parenting time, preventing Plaintiff from protecting her children from ongoing abuse.
- 18.2 Punitive Damages: An award of punitive and/or exemplary damages against the individual Defendant (Detective Parnell) in an amount sufficient to punish her for her willful, malicious misconduct and to deter similar conduct in the future.
- 18.3 Injunctive and Equitable Relief: Appropriate injunctive relief to prevent ongoing or future violations of Plaintiff's rights. This may include, for example, an order requiring the City of Lake Stevens/LSPD to remove or retract any false information disseminated about Plaintiff, to cease any policy of blacklisting or undermining her reports, and to institute training or oversight measures to ensure that victims who engage in protected speech are not retaliated against. Additionally, injunctive relief may include prohibiting Defendant Parnell from further defamatory statements about Plaintiff and mandating that communications with other agencies regarding Plaintiff be truthful and in good faith.

	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4

18.4 Attorneys' Fees and Costs: An award of Plaintiff's reasonable attorneys' fees and litigation costs incurred in this action, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988 and any other applicable fee-shifting provisions, as well as prejudgment interest as allowed by law.

18.5 Any Other Relief: Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper, including declaratory relief that Defendants' actions violated Plaintiff's rights, and any relief to which Plaintiff is entitled in law or equity.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED.

Respectfully submitted this 18th day of June, 2025, counsel for and on behalf of Plaintiff.

/s/ Shannon Draughon
Shannon M. Draughon, WSBA #35424
Carnation Legal Services LLC
sdraughon@carnationlegal.com

/s/ Rasham Nassar

Rasham Nassar, WSBA #61436 Paroh Law PLLC

rnassar@pharoslaw.net

	Case 2:25-cv-01111-RSM Document 5 Filed 06/18/25 Page 72 01 72
1	
2	
3	
4	CERTIFICATE OF FILING
5	I, Shannon Draughon, am counsel of record in the above captioned matter in and for
6	Plaintiff Ms. Gina Bloom, over the age of eighteen and competent to testify herein. On the date
7	noted below, I provided a copy of the foregoing document to counsel of record in the manner
8	indicated:
9	I hereby certify that on June 18, 2025, I electronically filed the foregoing Initiating
10	Complaint document with the Clerk of the United States District Court using the CM/ECF system.
11	I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the
12	foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.
13	DATED: This 18 <sup>th</sup> day of June, 2025.
14	/s/ Shannon Draughon
15	Shannon M. Draughon, WSBA #35424
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	



<u>A</u>

From: jbarnes@lakestevenswa.gov [jbarnes@lakestevenswa.gov]
To: brian@yorksfamily.com [brian@yorksfamily.com]

Subject: RE: Parenting Plan

Date: Tuesday, September 07, 2021 00:07:02

Attachment 1: image014.png Attachment 2: image036.jpg Attachment 3: image037.jpg Attachment 4: image038.png Attachment 5: image039.jpg Attachment 6: image040.jpg Attachment 7: image041.png image012.png Attachment 8: image013.jpg Attachment 9: Attachment 10: image015.jpg Attachment 11: image016.png Attachment 12: image017.jpg Attachment 13: image018.jpg Attachment 14: image019.jpg Attachment 15: image020.jpg Attachment 16: image021.jpg Attachment 17: image022.jpg Attachment 18: image023.jpg

Brian,

Again, I suggest that you adhere to the parenting plan and DVPO exactly as written. This will allow you to show the court that you are following what the judge set out for both of you. Exactly...no variations. Residential days/times, where drop off/pickup is to occur, etc. Do not vary from the parenting plan.

I read nothing in the parenting plan that <u>requires</u> you to hire/use a third party to pickup/drop off the children. The parenting plan says that "the parents may use third parties to exchange the children so long as the third party is known to both parents and the children." It does not say you must use third parties.

I don't know the reasoning behind the DVPO, so I will not get into that.

Please understand that these confusions are best dealt with through attorneys and the court system. Communication seems to have broken down between you and Gina.

I cannot give you any other advice other than to follow the DVPO and the parenting plan

exactly. No variations whatsoever.

Regards,

### JIM BARNES, SUPPORT SERVICES SERGEANT CITY OF LAKE STEVENS

LAKE STEVENS POLICE DEPARTMENT

1825 South Lake Stevens Road, Lake Stevens, WA 98258

Phone: 425.622.9379 Fax: 425-334-9842 Web: www.lakestevenswa.gov/police

"We serve the Lake Stevens Community, by enhancing public safety and quality of life, through professional police services, organizational excellence, and community interaction."

https://www.facebook.com/lakestevenspolice/ https://twitter.com/LKS\_POLICE\_https://www.instagra\_m.com/lakestevenspd/

NOTICE: All emails and attachments sent to and from Lake Stevens are public records and may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the Public Records Act (RCW 42.56).

From: Brian Yorks <a href="mailto:spring">spring</a> Yorks <a href="mailto:spring</a> Yorks <a href="mailto:spring">spring</a> Yorks <a href="mailto:spring">spring</a> Yorks <a href="mailto:spring">spr

Subject: Re: Parenting Plan

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Sorry for another message here. Gina continues to tell me I need to find a 3<sup>rd</sup> party to take the kids to school and is refusing to cooperate so I will speak to my attorney this week about the path forward. But she sent me this message through Our Family Wizard, and I really don't know what to make of it in how she speaking to you means anything different than what we spoke about. Would you be able to give me a call about this? Or an email.

From: James Barnes < ibarnes@lakestevenswa.gov > Date: Wednesday, September 1, 2021 at 10:50 AM

To: Brian Yorks <bri>orks <bri>orksfamily.com>

Subject: RE: Parenting Plan

Brian,

Speak with your attorney, but you cannot send someone else to pick up the kids if you are prevented from picking up the kids at school. That would be a third-party contact, which is a violation of the order.

Thanks,

JIM BARNES, SUPPORT SERVICES SERGEANT CITY OF LAKE STEVENS

LAKE STEVENS POLICE DEPARTMENT

1825 South Lake Stevens Road, Lake Stevens, WA 98258

Phone: 425.622.9379 Fax: 425-334-9842 Web: www.lakestevenswa.gov/police

"We serve the Lake Stevens Community, by enhancing public safety and quality of life, through professional police services, organizational excellence, and community interaction."

https://www.facebook.com/lakestevenspolice/ https://twitter.com/LKS\_POLICE https://www.instagra\_m.com/lakestevenspd/

NOTICE: All emails and attachments sent to and from Lake Stevens are public records and may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the Public Records Act (RCW 42.56).

From: Brian Yorks < brian@yorksfamily.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 1, 2021 9:53 AM
To: James Barnes < jbarnes@lakestevenswa.gov>

Subject: Re: Parenting Plan

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Sorry to reach out to you again. It appears that we are going to file a motion to get this clarified with the court which I will expect it will be. But do you read things that also prevent me having someone take the boys to and from school for me?

From: Brian Yorks < brian@yorksfamily.com > Date: Monday, August 30, 2021 at 9:16 AM

To: James Barnes < jbarnes@lakestevenswa.gov>

Subject: Re: Parenting Plan

Okay. Hopefully the very last this gets corrected in court this week. It's not to why we are going this week but I think for the sake of our boys it should be allowed. We are also in front of the same commissioner that we were who put in the current parenting plan,

tough it was written by my attorney.

From: James Barnes < ibarnes@lakestevenswa.gov>

Date: Monday, August 30, 2021 at 8:04 AM To: Brian Yorks <a href="mailto:springle-strength-st

Subject: RE: Parenting Plan

Brian,

We do not provide letters of interpretation on these issues. It is for attorneys to do that. Ultimately, it will be the judge that is the final interpreter of the order and what was written. You have an email chain of the items that I have addressed, so that should be sufficient for your attorney. It doesn't really matter what Gina thinks the order says. As stated before, you must adhere 100% to what the order says and requires of you. If you don't, it leaves the window open for a vindictive person to go to court and say that you violated the order. I emphasize with you on this issue, but I cannot give you legal advice.


Best of luck with this,

JIM BARNES, SUPPORT SERVICES SERGEANT
CITY OF LAKE STEVENS

LAKE STEVENS POLICE DEPARTMENT

1825 South Lake Stevens Road, Lake Stevens, WA 98258

Phone: 425.622.9379 Fax: 425-334-9842 Web: www.lakestevenswa.gov/police



 $\mathbf{B}$ 

Document 5-2 Case 2:25-cv-01111-RSM Filed 06/18/25 Page 2 of 2 Animal Control FOR Pets Left in Vehicles de or an airto their se in cool ents of cool an for an 1825 S Lake Ste Lake Stevens, **Business Hours:** After Hours: 4

P	laini	tiff	S	$\mathbf{E}\mathbf{x}$	hil	hi	t
<b>.</b>	IUIII		0		LIL		·

 $\underline{\mathbf{C}}$ 



Gina Yorks <ginayorks24@gmail.com>

### Request for internal investigation

3 messages

**Gina Yorks** <ginayorks24@gmail.com> To: HR@lakestevenswa.gov Wed, Sep 28, 2022 at 4:07 PM

To whom it may concern:

Requesting internal investigation for cases ##22-00001416 and #22-00016829

Failure to make a mandated report about child abuse and neglect on both cases.

Please advise if another Department would be better to contact in regards to this.

Thank you.

Olimpia Yorks 206 786 7000

**Anya Warrington** <a warrington@lakestevenswa.gov> To: Gina Yorks <ginayorks24@gmail.com>

Thu, Sep 29, 2022 at 11:35 AM

Hi Olimpia,

After consultation with the Chief of Police it is my understanding that internal investigations and administrative reviews have occurred on your referenced cases.

Let me know if you have any other questions.

Take care,

Anya Warrington, HR Director

City of Lake Stevens | Human Resources



1812 Main Street | PO Box 257

Lake Stevens, WA 98258

(425) 622-9419

awarrington@lakestevenswa.gov

**NOTICE:** All emails and attachments sent to and from the city of Lake Stevens are public records and may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the Public Records Act (RCW 42.56).

From: Gina Yorks <ginayorks24@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 28, 2022 4:07 PM
To: Human Resources <HR@lakestevenswa.gov>

Subject: Request for internal investigation

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

[Quoted text hidden]

**Gina Yorks** <ginayorks24@gmail.com>
To: Anya Warrington <a href="mailto:<a href="mailto:Anya Warrington">awarrington@lakestevenswa.gov></a>

Thu, Sep 29, 2022 at 12:00 PM

Anya,

That is incorrect.

The latest incident from September 18th, 2022 is the main issue.

Law enforcement are mandated reporters and no child abuse report was made until 3 days later when I came into LSPD to demand answers.

If the law isn't being followed, consequences should be in place, otherwise why should civilians follow the law?

This isn't the first time officers from LSPD failed to make a mandatory CPS report.

The chief of police can and will lie to protect the department, but I will take this as far as possible as it is absolutely outrageous and unacceptable!

[Quoted text hidden]

Plaintiff's	Exhibit

### **Jeff Young**

From: Tift, Jason <jason.tift@snoco.org>
Thursday Sostember 20, 2022 10:20 A

Sent: Thursday, September 29, 2022 10:20 AM

To: Jeff Young Cc: Huri, Ian

**Subject:** FW: Online Form Submission #126384 for Sheriff's Office Complaints & Commendations

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Chief Young - In speaking with Detective Kristen Parnell, it is to my understanding you are aware of Mrs. Yorks. Please see the below for your records.

Respectfully,

### Sergeant J. Tift 1403

Snohomish County Sheriff's Office Office of Professional Accountability

3000 Rockefeller Ave MS 606

Everett, WA 98201 Office: (425) 388-3249 Cell: 425-754-6057

NOTICE: All emails, and attachments, sent to or from Snohomish County are public record and maybe subject to disclosure pursuant to the Public Records Act (RCW 42.56).



Lead the Way

**From:** noreply@civicplus.com <noreply@civicplus.com>

Sent: Wednesday, September 28, 2022 11:11 PM

To: Tift, Jason < jason.tift@snoco.org>

Subject: Online Form Submission #126384 for Sheriff's Office Complaints & Commendations

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of this organization. Please exercise caution with links and attachments.

### Sheriff's Office Complaints & Commendations

Office of Professional Accountability Complaints and Commendations
Just as deputies are free to initiate law enforcement action in a reasonable, lawful,
and impartial manner, citizens are also free to file a complaint against Sheriff's
Office employees without fear of reprisal, retribution, or harassment. The Office of
Professional Accountability receives and investigates those complaints and is

responsible for initiating disciplinary action when appropriate. Our goal is to resolve the issues in a thorough, timely, and courteous manner.

More information about the Office of Professional Accountability

More information about the Office of Professional Accountability

#### Your privacy

We respect your privacy and will not distribute your personal information except as necessary to resolve your request or complaint. However, you should be aware that this information is subject to the Washington State public disclosure laws and may be disclosable upon request. While we encourage those who make complaints to provide their names and other information, we do accept anonymous complaints. However, an anonymous complaint can be very difficult to investigate. During the course of the investigation, additional information may be required from you to ensure a successful conclusion.

Best way to contact you	E-mail
This is a:	Complaint
Your First Name	Olimpia
Your Last Name	Yorks
Your E-mail	ginayorks24@gmail.com
Street Address	PO BOX 1761
City	Marysville
State	Wa
ZIP	98258
Contact phone	2067867000
Date and time of incidence	9/18/2022 6:15 PM
Location of incident	Frontier Village- Starbucks parking lot
Employee name	Osholz
Employee badge numer	Lake Stevens PD
Witness name(s)	Olimpia Yorks/ go pro camera evidence
Description of incident. Please be as detailed as you can.	Requesting internal investigation for cases #22-00001416 and #22-00016829.  LAKE STEVENS POLICE DEPARTMENT.
	Failure to make a mandated report about child abuse and

neglect in both cases. No CPS report made even though an 8 year old child disclosed " my daddy almost killed me a year ago when he held me upside down over a railing".

Please advise if another Department would be better to contact in regards to this.

Email not displaying correctly? View it in your browser.

### **Jeff Young**

From: Kristen Parnell

Sent: Thursday, September 29, 2022 7:22 AM

**To:** Jeffrey Beazizo; Jeff Young

**Subject:** FW: Olimpia Yorks

Just an FYI. Agent Peterson with the FBI sent this to me yesterday after a brief phone call about the report Olimpia made to them.



Kristen Parnell Detective

**Lake Stevens Police Department** 

1825 S Lake Stevens Road Lake Stevens, WA 98258 Phone: (425) 622-9374 Fax: (425) 334-9842

Web: www.lakestevenswa.gov/police



Mission Statement: "We serve the Lake Stevens community by enhancing public safety and quality of life through professional police services, organizational excellence, and community interaction."

NOTICE: All emails and attachments sent to and from Lake Stevens are public records and may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the Public Records Act (RCW 42.56).

**From:** Abel Peterson <ajpeterson2@fbi.gov> **Sent:** Wednesday, September 28, 2022 5:13 PM **To:** Kristen Parnell <a href="mailto:kparnell@lakestevenswa.gov">kparnell@lakestevenswa.gov</a>

Subject: Olimpia Yorks

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

See below for allegations made by Olimpia Yorks.

Olimpia Yorks, date of birth 02/24/1986, cellular telephone number 206-786-7000, email account <a href="mailto:ginayorks24@gmail.com">ginayorks24@gmail.com</a>, residential address, Lake Stevens, WA 98258, Internet Protocol (IP) address 2607:fb91:1598:b563:99f1:d3b2:7d7b:2fb, which resolves to Seattle, Washington 98101, reported allegations of child abuse and police misconduct in Lake Stevens, WA.

Yorks provided the following information:

I called 911 because I couldn't convince my two young boys to go back to their dads car after a visit with me.

My children were scared and crying.

Scared of their dad who is abusive.

My 8 year old told the police officer that "my daddy almost killed mr a year ago when he held me over a railing just by my arms and I thought I was going to die".

That information is not part of the police report.

No CPS report was called in on Sunday.

It wasn't until Wednesday, September 21st, 2022 when I went to the LSPD to complain that finally a CPS report was called in.

I lost custody of my two children through Snohomish Superior Court as I was held in contempt for failing to deliver the children back to their father.

#### 

My children were crying and visibly scared of their father.

The LSPD failed to take further action and protect my children.

They are back with their abuser who continues to hurt them and continued to neglect them.

LSPD failed to protect my children by doing absolutely nothing for their safety.

This isn't the first time this police department endangered my life and the life of my children.

They have dismissed many incidents in the past when I had a DVPO and my abuser was keeping me under surveillance in my neighborhood.

Thanks, Abel

SA Abel Peterson FBI Seattle-Everett RA

 $\underline{\mathbf{E}}$ 

From:

MicrosoftExchange329e71ec88ae4615bbc36ab6ce41109e@lakestevens.onmicrosoft.com on behalf of Kristen

Parnell

To: Subject: Brian Yorks RE: Michael

Subject: Date:

Tuesday, November 1, 2022 10:26:23 AM

Attachments:

RE Michael.msg

Sender: kparnell@lakestevenswa.gov

Subject: RE: Michael

Message-Id:

<CO6PR09MB7912197588D2D766D9F80EF7D0369@CO6PR09MB7912.namprd09.prod.outlook.com>

To: brian@yorksfamily.com

From:

kparnell@lakestevenswa.gov [kparnell@lakestevenswa.gov]

To:

brian@yorksfamily.com [brian@yorksfamily.com]

Subject: Date:

Tuesday, November 01, 2022 10:26:20

I didn't see any accusations against you in those messages. How did those come up?

https://www.lakestevenswa.gov/ImageRepository/Document?documentId=10588

https://www.lakestevenswa.gov/ImageRepository/Document?documentId=10479

Kristen Parnell
Detective Corporal
Lake Stevens Police Department
1825 S Lake Stevens Road
Lake Stevens. WA 98258

Phone: (425) 622-9374 Fax: (425) 334-9842

Web: www.lakestevenswa.gov/police

https://facebook.com/lakestevenspolice

https://instagram.com/lakestevenspd

https://twitter.com/LKS\_POLICE

Mission Statement: "We serve the Lake Stevens community by enhancing public safety and quality of life through professional police services, organizational excellence, and community interaction."

NOTICE: All emails and attachments sent to and from Lake Stevens are public records and may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the Public Records Act (RCW 42.56).

From: Brian Yorks <a href="mailto:spring">brian Yorks <a href="mailto:spring">brian Yorks <a href="mailto:spring">brian Yorks <a href="mailto:spring">brian @yorksfamily.com</a>>
Sent: Tuesday, November 1, 2022 9:33 AM

To: Kristen Parnell <a href="mailto:kparnell@lakestevenswa.gov">kparnell@lakestevenswa.gov</a>

Subject: Re:

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open

attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Sorry, forgot to attach the messages.

My thought is that wasn't going to cooperate and or it was too risky for her to want to have examined by Dr. St. Claire, then started having no more blood and I don't think she would have taken him in. We wouldn't know since I went to ex parte the day before the appointment and the boys were returned to me.

From: Brian Yorks < brian@yorksfamily.com>
Date: Tuesday, November 1, 2022 at 9:23 AM

To: <kparnell@lakestevenswa.gov>

Subject:

Hi Detective Parnell,

Attached is a photo Gina sent to Dr. St. Claire on 9/17/22, along with the messages with it and the next few days. The online portal is a shared login between us so typically we say which one of us is sending a message. I didn't send any of the messages aside from the one I said it was me writing. I also wasn't aware of the messages until I think that Monday when I received a notification of a message from Dr. St. Claire. Later in the week I did take in to be seen by her and I am attaching the summary report, along with the report form the ER that Sunday.

From:

MicrosoftExchange329e71ec88ae4615bbc36ab6ce41109e@lakestevens.onmicrosoft.com on behalf of Brian Yorks

To:

kparnell@lakestevenswa.gov

Subject:

Re: Michael

Date:

Tuesday, November 1, 2022 9:33:11 AM

Attachments:

Re Michael.msg

Sender: brian@yorksfamily.com

Subject: Re: Michael

Message-Id: <9211EF1C-3457-4783-8333-E270EAAF9F21@yorksfamily.com>

Recipient: kparnell@lakestevenswa.gov

Dr. Alexandria St Claire Sep 20, 2022 04:12 PM (-07:00) To: Yorks Hi Brian,

Thank you for this update. I will cancel tomorrow's appointment. If anything changes or you have concerns for please reach out.

Warmly, Dr. St. Claire Sprout Birth Center & Natural Health Phone: 425-678-9070

Fax: 833-898-4931

Yorks Sep 20, 2022 04:01 PM (-07:00) To: Alexandria St Claire Hi Dr. St. Claire,

This is Brian Yorks. As you are aware, Gina has had no medical decision-making ability and there should not have been any appointment made for please cancel this appointment. I am not sure why this would have been made without even a discussion with me.

Gina had kidnapped the boys since this past weekend and falsified that image she sent of blood. Furthermore, Gina's residential rights that she did have been suspended pending a hearing next month, and a restraining order has been granted. As I was quickly escorted out of court with the Sherriff, I wasn't given a copy of the new orders yet but will forward them once I receive them. For now, I also have changed the password to the portal here.

Yorks
Sep 20, 2022 09:43 AM (-07:00)
To: Alexandria St Claire
had a stool this morning.

He had eggs, strawberries and pancakes for breakfast with whole milk.

No blood in his stool and no straining.

Gina Yorks.

Dr. Alexandria St Claire Sep 20, 2022 10:04 AM (-07:00) To: Yorks Hi Gina,

Thank you for the update. I'm glad to hear his stools are normal. Would you like to keep his appointment tomorrow?

Warmly, Dr. St. Claire Sprout Birth Center & Natural Health

Phone: 425-678-9070 Fax: 833-898-4931

Yorks

Sep 19, 2022 01:19 PM (-07:00)

To: Alexandria St Claire

had no stool yesterday, Sunday the 18th and so far no stool today.

Dr. Alexandria St Claire Sep 19, 2022 04:26 PM (-07:00)

To: Yorks
Good Afternoon,

I would like to start on fiber daily and the one you mentioned is safe however he should only have 3-5 grams of fiber at a time. Also drinking 40oz of water daily. Eating fruits and vegetables with every meal is important as well. This looks like the hemorrhoid may have been aggravated from his constipation. I saw in the message from today that he has not had a stool in 48 hours. This may require more treatment if he does not have a healthy bowel movement in the next day or two.

I can see him for constipation Wednesday at 10:30am to discuss treatment options if this works for you. I will have the front desk reach out to you this afternoon.

Warmly,

Dr. St. Claire

Sprout Birth Center & Natural Health

Phone: 425-678-9070 Fax: 833-898-4931 Dr. Alexandria St Claire

Sep 19, 2022 04:26 PM (-07:00)

To: Yorks
Good Afternoon,

I would like Michael to start on fiber daily and the one you mentioned is safe however he should only have 3-5 grams of fiber at a time. Also drinking 40oz of water daily. Eating fruits and vegetables with every meal is important as well. This looks like the hemorrhoid may have been aggravated from his constipation. I saw in the message from today that he has not had a stool in 48 hours. This may require more treatment if he does not have a healthy bowel movement in the next day or two.

I can see him for constipation Wednesday at 10:30am to discuss treatment options if this works for you. I will have the front desk reach out to you this afternoon.

Warmly, Dr. St. Claire

Sprout Birth Center & Natural Health

Phone: 425-678-9070 Fax: 833-898-4931 Yorks Sep 17, 2022 01:14 PM (-07:00) To: Alexandria St Claire Dr. St. Claire,

had to rush to the bathroom today in the middle of eating lunch ( turkey sandwich, cheese stick and carrot sticks) and had blood in his poop again.

I have no information from Brian in regards to Michael taking any supplements or anything fiber related since has been seen at your office.

I have purchased High Fiber liquid fiber for kids by Medrition and have given a serving today, along with some apple sauce to ease his stomach. We went over some foods he's eaten in the last few days, as much as he can remember, and he said he had chips and salsa and it was spicy on his lips.

also mentioned he had diarrhea at school this week.

For his upcoming 9 year well-check, would an allergy test be appropriate? Considering I have certain food allergies, is this something could possibly have too? I am deeply concerned about what is causing Michael his tummy pains as well as blood in his stool.

Sorry about the picture.

$\mathbf{r}$			• 1	_ 1	l • 1	• ,
P	l 20 1111	t1	′C	$\vdash$	<b>h</b> 1	h1t
	lain	LLLI	<b>D</b> 1	$\Box \Lambda$	יבנו	υπ

F





Jan 10, 2023 at 4:04 PM

What is the status of your investigation that started back in July?

I just spoke to Michael Boska and he confirmed that no new information has been received by his office. What's the delay?

As I have previously explained to you, I have a very large case load that I have to work through. I have cases older than yours that are still open. Neither of your cases have been sent to the prosecutor's office for that reason

Jan 16, 2023 at 11:19 AM

Do you really want me to believe you are investigating this after the traumatic meeting with you back in October where you called me a liar and attempted to intimidate me by using evil tactics? Saying I accused one of your officers of assault? I've never been touche...







# Do you really want me to believe you ar...

Do you really want me to believe you are investigating this after the traumatic meeting with you back in October where you called me a liar and attempted to intimidate me by using evil tactics? Saying I accused one of your officers of assault? I've never been touched or assaulted by any of the LSPD officers and there's no proof of me ever saying that. And then you completely ignored my November email with my traumatic brain injury diagnosis?

I had so much respect for you and praised you in front of Deputy Jeff Young as well as Mayor Gailey. I had respect for you when other officers failed me, as my abuser was stalking me and keeping me under surveillance in my neighborhood. I had nothing but respect for you and have told you multiple times how grateful and humbled I was by your help.

You asked me why I haven't disclosed this earlier.

First of all, I tried to disclose back in January 2022 with Robert Miner and asked him to pull up records from the couples therapist that I disclosed previous acts by Brian Yorks.

Second of all, look at what you've done to me once I did disclose.

Why would any victim of horrific abuse by their spouse would want to go through an interview with a detective she trusts only to be blindsided, yelled at and called a liar?



## Do you really want me to believe you ar...

blindsided, yelled at and called a liar?

You mentioned all your training in child abuse as well as sexual assault investigation. But you are being manipulated by Brian Yorks and his narrative, as he is brilliant about recruiting flying monkeys in his corner.

I am slowly gathering all the evidence in regard to my traumatic brain injury and with the help of my DV advocate (thank God she was there to witness that traumatic meeting with you) I will pursue legal action against the entire Lake Stevens PD.

Thanks to you, I now have zero trust in law enforcement and I feel like a criminal on probation when it comes to police officers. I've raised my boys to respect and praise all police officers, and we have baked cookies and brought goodies into the LSPD many times in appreciation for the hard work and dedication we believed the officers were doing. Little did my boys know, that when they needed help the most, they were failed by the same Police Department that I have thought them to respect and obey.

My boys are with a rapist who strangled me until I passed out and continued to abuse me for 11.5 years. As the 2016 police report shows scratches on my neck from his hands just days before, your officers assumed these were from a newborn baby who was less than a month old and capable of scratching my neck to the point of making it visible for your officers to notice. It's absolutely incredible and ambelievable.



## Do you really want me to believe you ar...

most, they were failed by the same Police Department that I have thought them to respect and obey.

My boys are with a rapist who strangled me until I passed out and continued to abuse me for 11.5 years. As the 2016 police report shows scratches on my neck from his hands just days before, your officers assumed these were from a newborn baby who was less than a month old and capable of scratching my neck to the point of making it visible for your officers to notice. It's absolutely incredible and unbelievable. When victims die at the hands of their abusers, society says "

Wow what a tragedy and completely unexpected".

Except most victims beg and plead for help with law enforcement, either through words or through marks on their bodies made by their abusers.

I have nothing else to tell you and in the future I will have my attorney communicate with you. I've moved away from Lake Stevens, as a rapist lives freely in your city while your department turns a blind eye and blames and terrorizes the victim into complete silence.

Please contact my attorney Jody Cloutier with any questions.

Do not contact me as I wish to never speak with you again.

$\mathbf{T}$	1 •	1.00	9		l • 1	1 · 4
Ρ	1911	ntiff	^ C'	HV	<b>1</b> 1	h1t
1	ıan	11111	3		יבבו	om

 $\underline{G}$ 



### **Lake Stevens Police Department Compact**

Print Date/Time: 04/04/2025 09:00 Lake Stevens Police Department

Login ID: ss0179 **ORI Number:** WA0311900

**Case Number:** 2025-00005778

Case Details:

Case Number: 2025-00005778 Incident Type: Domestic - No Assault Location: 1526 85TH AVE NE Occurred From: 03/30/2025 19:48

LAKE STEVENS, WA 98258 Occurred Thru: 03/30/2025 20:15

Reported Date: 03/30/2025 19:48 Sunday

**Reporting Officer ID:** SS0189-Savchuk Status: Status Date: 03/31/2025 Closed

**Offenses** 

No.	Group/ORI	Crime Code	Statute	Description	Counts
-----	-----------	------------	---------	-------------	--------

**Subjects** 

Туре	No.	Name	Address	Phone	Race	Sex	DOB/Age
Contact	1	YORKS, JULITA ANDREA	1526 85TH AVE NE		Unknown	Female	
			LAKE STEVENS,WA 98258				41
Contact	2	YORKS, BRIAN CHRISTOPHER	1526 85TH AVE NE	(206) 395-4501	Unknown	Male	
			LAKE STEVENS,WA 98258				45
Reporting Party	1		1526 85TH AVE NE		White	Male	1
			LAKE STEVENS,WA 98258				11

Unknown

Unknown

**GRN** 

White

Subject # 1-Contact

Primary:

Name: YORKS, JULITA ANDREA Race: Address: 1526 85TH AVE NE

Height: Weight: 125.0 lbs. 5ft 1 in LAKE STEVENS WA 98258 Eyes: **BRO** Age: 41

State:

Resident Status: Full-Time Resident

**Domestic Violence Referrals:** 

Subject # 2-Contact

Primary: Nο

YORKS, BRIAN CHRISTOPHER Name:

Address: 1526 85TH AVE NE

LAKE STEVENS WA 98258

**Primary Phone:** (206) 395-4501

Weight: 200.0 lbs. 6ft 2 in

Sex:

Hair:

Sex:

Sex:

Female

Male

BLN

Male

DOB:

DOB:

Age:

DOB:

45

Eyes: State:

Race:

Race:

Height:

**Domestic Violence Referrals:** 

Subject # 1-Reporting Party

Primary: No

Name:

Address: 1526 85TH AVE NE

LAKE STEVENS WA 98258 **GRN BRO** Eyes: Hair: 11 Age:

State:

**Resident Status:** Part-Time Resident

**Domestic Violence Referrals:** 

**Arrests** 

Page 3 of 40 Case 2:25-cv-01111-RSM Document 5-7 Filed 06/18/25



**Case Number:** 

### **Lake Stevens Police Department Compact**

Print Date/Time: 04/04/2025 09:00 Lake Stevens Police Department

Login ID: ss0179 **ORI Number:** WA0311900

Date/Time Address Arrest No. Name

**Type** 

Age

**Property** 

Date Code Make Model Description Tag No. Item No. Type

**Vehicles** 

No. Role Vehicle Type License Plate Year Make Model Color State 1 Other Vehicle Passenger Car 2009 Prius CHV9331 WA Toyota Vehicle # 1 Make: Toyota Model: Prius

Passenger Car Year: 2009 License Plate: CHV9331 State: WA

2025-00005778

Date/Time: 03/30/2025 19:48 Location: 1526 85TH AVE NE

LAKE STEVENS,WA 98258

П	Liquor Board
	Dawson Place
	Juvenile Court
	Juvenile Prosecutor
	Mental Health
	APS
	District Court
	Municipal Court
	DOL
	CPS
	Other
	City Attorney
	County Prosecutor
	Federal Prosecutor
	Domestic Violence Unit

☐ City Prosecutor □ Detectives

LAKE STEVENS POLICE DEPARTMENT

Initial Case Report

### SS Case, Officer: SS0189, Supervisor: SS0133, Merged By: SS0195

		e Stevens Road ns, WA 98258 401			Case R	eport#	2025-0000	)5778
EVENT	OCCURRED INCIDENT LOCATION OF OCCUR 1526 85TH AVE NE LAKE STEVENS, WA	Domestic - N RENCE	No Assault	03/3 OCC 03/3 OCC	E/TIME REPORTI 80/2025 19: URRED DATE/TII 80/2025 19: URRED THROUG 80/2025 20:	48 ME 48 GH	ASSOCIATE	D CASES
OFFENSES		STA	TUTE / DESCRI	PTION			Count	s Attempt/Commit
SUBJECT	□ NON-DISCLOSURE SUBJECT TYPE Reporting Party ADDRESS 1526 85TH AVE NE LAKE STEVENS, WA  RACE White DL NUMBER	NAME Juvenile / 98258	SEX Male DL STATE	HEIGHT	WEIGHT	HAIR	DOB / AGE F PRIMARY PH SECONDARY BRO	HONE
SUBJECT	NON-DISCLOSURE SUBJECT TYPE Contact ADDRESS 1526 85TH AVE NE LAKE STEVENS, WA	- st	(S, JULITA AN		WEIGHT	HAIR	DOB / AGE F	HONE
	Unknown DL NUMBER Drivers License Number	<b>.</b>	Female DL STATE	5' 1 VA		ER	OLOR	BRO
VEHICLE	TYPE / MAKE / PLATE  DESCRIPTION	STATE VI	MODEL /				LUE	
PROPERTY	PROPERTY CODE  SERIAL NUMBER  TYPE / MAKE / DESCRIPTION	QTY/U	JNIT OF MEASU	JRE V	/ALUE	co	LOR	
A C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	PORTING OFFICER / ID wchuk, Elizabeth			ROVING SUI nemann, G				



#### LAKE STEVENS POLICE DEPARTMENT 1825 S Lake Stevens Road Lake Stevens, WA 98258 (425) 622-9401

### Initial Case Report

Page: 4 of 7

Case Report # 2025-00005778

ji.			ADI	NOITIC	AL SUBJEC	TS			
	☐ NON-DISCLOSURE								
	SUBJECT TYPE Contact	NAME Adult / YORKS	S, BRIAI	N CHRIS	STOPHER			DOB / AGE R	ANGE
SUBJECT	ADDRESS 1526 85TH AVE NE							PRIMARY PH (206)395-45	501
UBJ	LAKE STEVENS, WAS	98258				×	6	SECONDARY	
S	RACE Unknown		SEX Male		HEIGHT 6' 2"	WEIGHT 200	HAIR	BLN	GRN
	DI_NUMBER Drivers License Number		DL STA	TE WA	\	EMPLOYER	3		
	□ NON-DISCLOSURE								
	SUBJECT TYPE	NAME						DOB / AGE R	ALVOLOGO AVECUA
SCT	ADDRESS							PRIMARY PH	ONE
SUBJECT								SECONDARY	PHONE
S	RACE		SEX	Î	HEIGHT	WEIGHT	HAIR	1.00	EYE
	DL NUMBER		DL STA	TE		EMPLOYER	2	į,	
_	☐ NON-DISCLOSURE	-			-				
	SUBJECT TYPE	NAME						DOB / AGE RANGE	
占	ADDRESS							PRIMARY PHONE	
SUBJECT							SECONDARY PHONE		
ร	RACE		SEX		HEIGHT	WEIGHT	HAIR	8	EYE
	DL NUMBER			TE		EMPLOYER	2	,	
	☐ NON-DISCLOSURE								
	SUBJECT TYPE NAME						DOB / AGE RANGE		
S	ADDRESS							PRIMARY PHONE	
UBJECT								SECONDARY	PHONE
യ	RACE		SEX		HEIGHT	WEIGHT	HAIR		EYE
	DL NUMBER		DL STA	DL STATE EMPLOYER					
	☐ NON-DISCLOSURE	2							
	SUBJECT TYPE	NAME						DOB / AGE R	ANGE
占	ADDRESS						PRIMARY PH	ONE	
SUBJECT								SECONDARY	PHONE
S	RACE		SEX		HEIGHT	WEIGHT	HAIR		EYE
	DL NUMBER		DL STA	TE		EMPLOYER	2		
	PORTING OFFICER / ID #	01	189		VING SUPERVI emann, Gavin	SOR			

Page: 5 of 7



### LAKE STEVENS POLICE DEPARTMENT 1825 S Lake Stevens Road Lake Stevens, WA 98258 (425) 622-9401

### Initial Case Report

Case Report # 2025-00005778

9					CASE VEHIC	LES						
	VEHICLE Other	E ROLE Vehicle			ATE / STATE HV9331 / WA		REG YEAR	VIN JTDKB20U997825038				
ES	YEAR	TYPE / Auto		170	2000000000							
ᅙ	2009	MAKE / Toyo	ota	TOP 0	MODEL / Prius	S	РОТТОМ	201.00				
VEHICLES	STYLE			TOP C	OLOR		воттом	COLOR				
_	ADDITIO	NAL DESCRIP	TION									
	VEHICLE	EROLE		PL	ATE / STATE	1	REG YEAR	VIN				
ES	YEAR	TYPE /										
VEHICLES	STYLE	MAKE /		TOP C	MODEL / OLOR		воттом	COLOR				
ΛĒ	ADDITIO	NAL DECODID	TION									
la .	ADDITIO	NAL DESCRIP	TION									
	ADDITIONAL VEHICLES as PROPERTY											
	PROPER	RTY CODE					YEAR	COLOR				
E.	TYPE /			MOE	NEL /				10			
VEHICLE	MAKE / PLATE		STATE	VIN	DEL /			VALUE				
7	DESCRI	PTION							-			
	69											
	PROPER	RTY CODE					YEAR	COLOR				
쁫	TYPE / MAKE /			MOE	NEL /	•						
VEHICLE	PLATE		STATE	VIN	,LL /			VALUE				
>	DESCRI	PTION										
-	DDODE	RTY CODE				1	YEAR	COLOR				
		KIT CODE					ILAN	COLOR				
_	TYPE / MAKE /			MOE	DEL /							
VEH	PLATE		STATE	VIN				VALUE				
_	DESCRI	PTION		100								
	PROPER	RTY CODE					YEAR	COLOR				
щ	TYPE /											
VEHICLE	MAKE / PLATE		STATE	VIN	DEL /			VALUE				
Ž		(13.5T)	SIAIL	VIIV				VALUE				
	DESCRI	PTION										
D='	DODTING	OFFICER 415	и		ADDDOL/NO SI	IDED. "S	OD					
		OFFICER / ID Elizabeth	#	0189	APPROVING SU Heinemann, (		OCK					

#### Initial Case Report

Case Report # 2025-00005778

#### NARRATIVE

Officer E. Savchuk #SS0189 Lake Stevens Police Department Case Report

Case Number: 2025-00005778

Incident Location: 1526 85th Ave NE, Lake Stevens, WA, 98258

Incident Type: Domestic Violence Verbal

BWC Footage Available: Yes

I, E. Savchuk, am a fully commissioned police officer assigned to the Patrol Division of the Lake Stevens Police Department. I am authorized to enforce the laws of the State of Washington and the City of Lake Stevens. I was operating a fully marked, patrol vehicle with emergency lights and siren, and was dressed in a full uniform with Lake Stevens Police Department patches on both shoulders and my badge on the front.

At the time of this incident, I was wearing a body worn camera which was activated. While the following is not a verbatim account of what was said to me during the incident, it is a summary of the facts and circumstances surrounding the case as I understand them. For further details, please refer to the body worn camera footage that was uploaded to the LSPD secure server.

Narrative: On March 30th, 2025, at approximately 1948 hours, I was dispatched to report of verbal domestic violence at 1526 85th Ave NE, Lake Stevens, WA. The reporting party identified himself as a juvenile by the name of The Juvenile reported that his father was yelling at his stepmom and threatening her. Juvenile also said he wanted to go back home to moms house which is in Bellevue.

I arrived on scene and located an adult male and adult female in the driveway, along with two young boys running around in the driveway. The female had entered her vehicle which was parked along the driveway and the male was standing near the vehicle. I approached both adults and notified them that they were being audio and video recorded.

I informed the male that we got called out to the location due to a child calling in about an argument between parents. Male responded saying that he and his wife had a disagreement, and the son got scared. The male was identified as Brian Yorks and the female was identified as Julita Yorks.

This report was submitted from an electronic device owned, issued, or maintained by a law enforcement agency using my user ID and password. I certify or declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct.

REPORTING OFFICER / ID#		APPROVING SUPERVISOR
Savchuk, Elizabeth	0189	Heinemann, Gavin
LOCATION SIGNED Snohomish County, WA		DATE SIGNED 03/31/2025



LAKE STEVENS POLICE DEPARTMENT 1825 S Lake Stevens Road Lake Stevens, WA 98258 (425) 622-9401

#### Initial Case Report

Case Report # 2025-00005778

#### NARRATIVE (continuation)

Julita exited her vehicle and contacted me. She stated, "everything is ok." Julita then explained that she had said something about leaving and it sounds like the kids just got worried that she was going to leave. Julita explained that she had talked to her husband about his children's friends coming over to the residence and said that she then has more responsibility. Julita explained that she was the stepmom of the two older boys at the residence. Based on what Julita had explained to me, it sounds like the husband tells the boys to call the police whenever he and Julita have an argument. There were no reports of physical altercation.

Attachments: None.

Recommendations: Closed.

I CERTIFY UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE AND CORRECT (RCW 9A.72.085) AND I AM ENTERING MY AUTHORIZED USER ID AND PASSWORD TO AUTHENTICATE IT.

Officer E. Savchuk #0189 3/30/2025 Lake Stevens, WA

Officer Date Location Signed

This report was submitted from an electronic device owned, issued, or maintained by a law enforcement agency using my user ID and password. I certify or declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct.

The state of the s	0189	APPROVING SUPERVISOR Heinemann, Gavin
LOCATION SIGNED Snohomish County, WA		DATE SIGNED 03/31/2025



## **Incident Report**

Print Date/Time: 04/04/2025 09:30

Login ID: ss0179 Lake Stevens Police Department

Tag No.

Item No.

**ORI Number:** WA0311900

Incident: 2025-00005778

Incident Date/Time: 3/30/2025 7:48:27 PM

Location: 1526 85TH AVE NE

LAKE STEVENS WA 98258

Phone Number: (206) 385-2124

Report Required: Yes **Prior Hazards:** No

LE Case Number: 2025-00005778 Incident Type: DV

Venue:

Lake Stevens

Source: 911 **Priority:** 3 3 Status:

Description

Nature of Call: CONTACT

Unit/Personnel

Unit Personnel

Involved Party

Code

1915 SS0133-Heinemann 1950 SS0189-Savchuk

Person(s)

Phone No. Role Name Address Race Sex DOB 1 Involved Party

YORKS, BRIAN CHRISTOPHER

2 Involved Party YORKS, JULITA ANDREA

Vehicle(s)

3

Role Туре Year Make Model Color License State

Involved Vehicle CHV9331

Make

Disposition(s)

Date/Time Disposition Count R 03/30/2025 20:09

Type

Date

Property

Model

Page 10 of 40

#### **CAD Narrative**

03/30/2025: 20:09:18 ss0189 Narrative: CONTACTED MALE AND FEMALE IN DRIVEWAY, NOTHING PHYSICAL OCCURED. JUST A VERBAL ARGUMENT.

Page: 2 of 2

03/30/2025 : 20:00:28 sn1194 Narrative: 1950 - OUT W/ SUBJ

03/30/2025: 19:52:45 sn1202 Narrative: RP STATED, "I'M JUST GONNA CALL MY MOMMY" AND HU, LR1202

03/30/2025: 19:52:21 sn1202 Narrative: RP DIDN'T KNOW ADDRESS OR PHONE NUMBER

03/30/2025: 19:51:52 sn1202 Narrative: HX OF FATHER THREATENING RP AS WELL, SAYS HIS DAD ALWAYS LIES

03/30/2025: 19:51:00 sn1202 Narrative: RP IS IN BACKYARD, STEP MOM AND DAD ARE STILL INSIDE

03/30/2025 : 19:50:37 sn1202 Narrative: STATES HE WANTS TO GO BACK TO HIS MOM IN BELLEVUE, THIS IS DADS

**HOUSE** 

03/30/2025: 19:49:28 sn1202 Narrative: RP IS A JUV STATING THAT FATHER IS YELLING AT STEP MOM, THREATENING

**HER** 

Date/Time User Act	tion Description MachineID === =================================
03/30/2025 20:09:33	JDaly SN1194 Disposition Changed Added: R Count 1 SNC69
03/30/2025 20:09:33	JDaly SN1194 Unit Status Action Unit 1950 Available SNC69
03/30/2025 20:09:33	JDaly SN1194 Unit Status Action Unit 1915 Available SNC69
03/30/2025 20:09:33	JDaly SN1194 Call Cleared Close Call SNC69
03/30/2025 20:09:18	ESavchuk SS0189 Narrative Added CONTACTED MALE AND FEMALE IN
03/30/2025 20:08:10	NG PHYSICAL OCCURED. JUST A VERBAL ARGUMENT. SS-3384 GHeinemann SS0133 Person Added Person Added: Last Name - YORKS; First Name -
Height 5'1": Weight	e - ANDREA; Role - Involved Party; Driver License - Driver
03/30/2025 20:00:49	GHeinemann SS0133 Unit Status Action Unit 1915 On Scene SS-2213
03/30/2025 20:00:43	JDaly SN1194 Vehicle Added Vehicle Added: Plate Number - CHV9331; Role - Involved
Vehicle; SNC69	July 51v1174 venicle Added Venicle Added. Trate Trumber - C11v7551, Role - Involved
03/30/2025 20:00:43	JDaly SN1194 Plate History Found Plate History found for CHV9331. Call 850 - DVV
SNC69	Thate History Tourid Thate History Tourid for CITY 7551. Can 650 BY
03/30/2025 20:00:28	JDaly SN1194 Narrative Added 1950 - OUT W/ SUBJ SNC69
03/30/2025 19:59:50	JDaly SN1194 Unit Status Action Unit 1950 On Scene SNC69
03/30/2025 19:59:29	GHeinemann SS0133 Person Added Person Added: Last Name - YORKS; First Name -
	- CHRISTOPHER; Role - Involved Party; Driver License -
	ght - 6'1"; Weight - 200.0; Performed by Mobile Unit 1915 SS-2213
03/30/2025 19:52:52	JDaly SN1194 Alerts Accessed Viewed Alerts Tab SNC69
03/30/2025 19:52:45	SCardenas SN1202 Narrative Added RP STATED, "I'M JUST GONNA CALL MY
MOMMY" AND HU, I	
03/30/2025 19:52:38	JDaly SN1194 Unit Status Action Unit 1950 Enroute (Status Override) SNC69
03/30/2025 19:52:38	JDaly SN1194 Unit Location Unit 1950 Secondary Location: Secondary Location Cleared
SNC69	
03/30/2025 19:52:21	SCardenas SN1202 Narrative Added RP DIDN'T KNOW ADDRESS OR PHONE
NUMBER SN-C09	
03/30/2025 19:51:52	SCardenas SN1202 Narrative Added HX OF FATHER THREATENING RP AS WELL,
SAYS HIS DAD ALW	
03/30/2025 19:51:00	SCardenas SN1202 Narrative Added RP IS IN BACKYARD, STEP MOM AND DAD
ARE STILL INSIDE	SN-C09
03/30/2025 19:50:37	SCardenas SN1202 Narrative Added STATES HE WANTS TO GO BACK TO HIS MOM
	IS DADS HOUSE SN-C09
03/30/2025 19:50:09	JDaly SN1194 Unit Status Action Unit 1915 Enroute SNC69
03/30/2025 19:50:00	SCardenas SN1202 Call Updated Nature Of Call Changed To CONTACT SN-C09
03/30/2025 19:49:53	SCardenas SN1202 Call Updated Caller Updated: Name Changed from YORKS, BRIAN to SN-C09
YORKS, MICHAEL 03/30/2025 19:49:51	JDaly SN1194 Call Ready for Dispatch Call marked ready for dispatch SNC69
03/30/2025 19:49:51	JDaly SN1194 Unit Status Action Unit 1915 Dispatched SNC69
03/30/2025 19:49:51	JDaly SN1194 Unit Location Unit 1915 Dispatched SNC09  JDaly SN1194 Unit Location Unit 1915 Secondary Location: Secondary Location Cleared
SNC69	July 511174 Onit Location Onit 1713 Secondary Location. Secondary Location Cleared
03/30/2025 19:48:27	JDaly SN1194 Incident Created Added Incident Number, ORI: WA0311900, Number: 2025
00005778	Tudou incluent rumoci, Ort. W110311700, 14dilloci. 2023
03/30/2025 19:49:42	JDaly SN1194 Alerts Accessed Viewed Alerts Tab SNC69
03/30/2025 19:19:12	SCardenas SN1202 Agency Context Added/Updated Police Call Type Added. Call Type:
DVV, Status: 3, Priorit	
03/30/2025 19:49:30	SCardenas SN1202 Call Assigned Added Police Dispatch Position EAST-POLICE SN-C09
03/30/2025 19:49:30	User, System - System Call Assigned Added Police Area Position EAST-POLICE SN-C09

#### 

03/30/2025 19:49:28 SCardenas SN1202 Narrative Added RP IS A JUV STATING THAT FATHER IS YELLING AT STEP MOM, THREATENING HER SN-C09

03/30/2025 19:48:29 SCardenas SN1202 Location Cross streets updated, 15TH PL NE / 15TH ST NE, 16TH ST NE SN-C09

03/30/2025 19:48:28 User, System - System Alerts Retrieval Alerts Were Successfully Gathered For Location At Address 1526 85TH AVE NE TTP2-CAD01

03/30/2025 19:48:27 SCardenas SN1202 Call Created New call created. Call Type: NEW CALL, Location: 1526 85TH AVE NE, Caller Phone: (206) 385-2124, Source: E911 (03/30/2025 19:48:23) SN-C09

03/30/2025 19:48:27 SCardenas SN1202 Call Updated Caller Added: Last Name - YORKS; First Name - BRIAN; Role - Involved Party; SN-C09

#### Case 2:25-cv-01111-RSM Document 5-7 Filed 06/18/25 Page 13 of 40

Date/Time

03/30/2025 20:09:33

1915

Unit Number Status Log Description Action 03/30/2025 19:49:51 1915 Dispatched Dispatched Call Number: 754, Assigned Location: 1526 85TH AVE NE, Unit Status Change Lake Stevens, Call Type: DVV 03/30/2025 19:49:51 Dispatched Secondary Location Cleared Unit Location 1915 03/30/2025 19:50:09 1915 Enroute Enroute Unit Status Change 03/30/2025 19:52:38 1950 Enroute Dispatched (Status Override) Call Number: 754, Assigned Location: 1526 85TH AVE NE, Lake Stevens, Call Type: DVV Unit Status Change Enroute Enroute Unit Status Change 03/30/2025 19:52:38 1950 Enroute Secondary Location Cleared Unit Location 03/30/2025 19:52:38 1950 Enroute Vehicle - Plate: csa8426 NCIC Request 03/30/2025 19:53:46 1950 Enroute Vehicle - Plate: cpp6477NCIC Request 03/30/2025 19:54:38 1915 Enroute Person - Last Name: yorks; First Name: br NCIC Request 1915 03/30/2025 19:55:25 1915 Enroute Person - Last Name: YORKS; First Name: BRIAN; Middle Name: 03/30/2025 19:55:29 CHRISTOPHER; DOB: 5/3/1979; Sex: Male; Race: Unknown; DL Number: Drivers License Number DL State: WA; SSN: Social Security Jacket Type: Adult; Local ID: A746593; Phone Number: (206) 395-4501 NCIC Request Enroute Person - Last Name: ANDERSON: First Name: KATHERINE: Middle Name: 03/30/2025 19:56:44 1915 ASTRID; DOB: 8/10/1974; DL Number: Drivers License Number DL State: WA **NCIC** Request Enroute Vehicle - Plate: cpg5903 NCIC Request 03/30/2025 19:57:56 1950 1950 On Scene On Scene Unit Status Change 03/30/2025 19:59:50 03/30/2025 20:00:37 1915 Enroute Vehicle - Plate: chv9331 NCIC Request 03/30/2025 20:00:43 1950 On Scene Request #4179056 - \*\*\*TERMINAL ORI: WA031J63N; LicensePlate: CHV9331; LicenseState: WA; **NCIC** Request 03/30/2025 20:00:49 1915 On Scene On Scene Unit Status Change 03/30/2025 20:01:22 1950 On Scene Unit Check In On Scene Override time = 2073600 03/30/2025 20:06:23 1915 Timer Override 1950 On Scene Override time = 600 Timer Override 03/30/2025 20:06:40 1950 On Scene Person - Last Name: YORKS; First Name: JULITA; Middle Name: 03/30/2025 20:09:22 ANDREA; DOB: 1/28/1984; DL Number: Drivers License Number NCIC Request 03/30/2025 20:09:33 1950 Available Available Unit Status Change Available Unit Cleared From Call Unit Cleared 03/30/2025 20:09:33 1950 03/30/2025 20:09:33 1915 Available Unit Cleared From Call Unit Cleared

Available Available Unit Status Change

## **Redaction Log**

Reason	Page (# of occurrences)	Description		
Drivers License Number	3 (1) 4 (1) 10 (2) 12 (3)	Driver's license number(s) are REDACTED as personal information under RCW 42.56.230(5) and RCW 9.35.005(1)		
Social Security	<b>12</b> (1)	Social Security Number(s) are REDACTED under RCW 42.56.230(5)		

## Call For Service Detail Report - CFS 754

Address	1526 85TH AVE NE, Lake Stevens					
Common Name						
Custom Layer		Census Tract	527.06			
Beat	LKSW	Quadrant	AG1618C	District		
Caller Name		Caller Phone	(206) 385-2124	Call Taker	sn1202	
Create Date	3/30/2025 7:48:27 PM	Clear Date	3/30/2025 8:09:33 PM	Nature Of Call	CONTACT	

_				•
Ca	ш	-	aı	ш

Call Type	Status	Priority	Dispatcher	Created Date
DVV	3	3	sn1202	3/30/2025 7:48:27 PM

#### **Call Narrative**

#### \*\*\* 3/30/2025 \*\*\*

Time	Description	User	Unit #	Machine
8:09:18 PM	CONTACTED MALE AND FEMALE IN DRIVEWAY. NOTHING PHYSICAL OCCURED. JUST A VERBAL ARGUMENT.	Savchuk, Elizabeth	1950	SS-3384
8:00:28 PM	1950 - OUT W/ SUBJ	Daly, Josh		SNC69
7:52:45 PM	RP STATED, "I'M JUST GONNA CALL MY MOMMY" AND HU, LR1202	Cardenas,Scott		SN-C09
7:52:21 PM	RP DIDN'T KNOW ADDRESS OR PHONE NUMBER	Cardenas,Scott		SN-C09
7:51:52 PM	HX OF FATHER THREATENING RP AS WELL, SAYS HIS DAD ALWAYS LIES	Cardenas,Scott		SN-C09
7:51:00 PM	RP IS IN BACKYARD , STEP MOM AND DAD ARE STILL INSIDE	Cardenas,Scott		SN-C09
7:50:37 PM	STATES HE WANTS TO GO BACK TO HIS MOM IN BELLEVUE, THIS IS DADS HOUSE	Cardenas,Scott		SN-C09
7:49:28 PM	RP IS A JUV STATING THAT FATHER IS YELLING AT STEP MOM, THREATENING HER	Cardenas,Scott		SN-C09

#### **EMD Narrative**

Time Description User

### **Call Persons**

Name	Date of Birth	Contact Phone	Machine
			SN-C09
YORKS,BRIAN		<del></del>	SS-2213
YORKS, JULITA			SS-2213

#### **Call Vehicles**

Vehicle Type	Make	Model	Role	Year	License State	License Number
			Involved Veh	icle		CHV9331

### **Call Dispositions**

Name Count R 1

### **Unit Dispositions**

Name Count Unit Number Disposition Date

#### **Call Log**

*** 3/30/202	25 ***			
Time	Action	Description	Name	Machine
8:09:33 PM	Call Cleared	Close Call	Josh Daly	SNC69
8:09:33 PM	Unit Status Action	Unit 1915 Available	Josh Daly	SNC69
8:09:33 PM	Unit Status Action	Unit 1950 Available	Josh Daly	SNC69
8:09:33 PM	Disposition Changed	Added: R Count 1	Josh Daly	SNC69
8:09:18 PM	Narrative Added	CONTACTED MALE AND FEMALE IN DRIVEWAY. NOTHING PHYSICAL OCCURED. JUST A VERBAL ARGUMENT.	Elizabeth Savchuk	SS-3384
8:08:10 PM	Person Added	Person Added: Last Name - YORKS; First Name - JULITA; Middle Name - ANDREA; Role - Involved Party; Driver License - OLN Height - 5'1"; Weight - 125.0; Performed by Mobile Unit 1915	Gavin Heinemann	SS-2213
8:00:49 PM	Unit Status Action	Unit 1915 On Scene	Gavin Heinemann	SS-2213
8:00:43 PM	Plate History Found	Plate History found for CHV9331. Call 850 - DVV	Josh Daly	SNC69
8:00:43 PM	Vehicle Added	Vehicle Added: Plate Number - CHV9331; Role - Involved Vehicle;	Josh Daly	SNC69
8:00:28 PM	Narrative Added	1950 - OUT W/ SUBJ	Josh Daly	SNC69
7:59:50 PM	Unit Status Action	Unit 1950 On Scene	Josh Daly	SNC69
7:59:29 PM	Person Added	Person Added: Last Name - YORKS; First Name - BRIAN; Middle Name - CHRISTOPHER; Role - Involved Party; ; Driver License - OLN Height - 6'1"; Weight - 200.0; Performed by Mobile Unit 1915	Gavin Heinemann	SS-2213
7:52:52 PM	Alerts Accessed	Viewed Alerts Tab	Josh Daly	SNC69
7:52:45 PM	Narrative Added	RP STATED, "I'M JUST GONNA CALL MY MOMMY" AND HU, LR1202	Scott Cardenas	SN-C09
7:52:38 PM	Unit Location	Unit 1950 Secondary Location: Secondary Location Cleared	Josh Daly	SNC69
7:52:38 PM	Unit Status Action	Unit 1950 Enroute (Status Override)	Josh Daly	SNC69
7:52:21 PM	Narrative Added	RP DIDN'T KNOW ADDRESS OR PHONE NUMBER	Scott Cardenas	SN-C09
7:51:52 PM	Narrative Added	HX OF FATHER THREATENING RP AS WELL, SAYS HIS DAD ALWAYS LIES	Scott Cardenas	SN-C09
7:51:00 PM	Narrative Added	RP IS IN BACKYARD , STEP MOM AND DAD ARE STILL INSIDE	Scott Cardenas	SN-C09
7:50:37 PM	Narrative Added	STATES HE WANTS TO GO BACK TO HIS MOM IN BELLEVUE, THIS IS DADS HOUSE	Scott Cardenas	SN-C09
7:50:09 PM	Unit Status Action	Unit 1915 Enroute	Josh Daly	SNC69
7:50:00 PM	Call Updated	Nature Of Call Changed To CONTACT	Scott Cardenas	SN-C09
7:49:53 PM	Call Updated	Caller Updated: Name Changed from YORKS, BRIAN to	Scott Cardenas	SN-C09
7:49:51 PM	Unit Location	Unit 1915 Secondary Location: Secondary	Josh Daly	SNC69

## Case 2:25-cv-01111-RSM Document 5-7 Filed 06/18/25 Page 17 of 40

		Location Cleared		
7:49:51 PM	Unit Status Action	Unit 1915 Dispatched	Josh Daly	SNC69
7:49:51 PM	Call Ready for Dispatch	Call marked ready for dispatch	Josh Daly	SNC69
7:49:42 PM	Alerts Accessed	Viewed Alerts Tab	Josh Daly	SNC69
7:49:30 PM	Call Assigned	Added Police Area Position EAST-POLICE	System User	SN-C09
7:49:30 PM	Call Assigned	Added Police Dispatch Position EAST-POLICE	Scott Cardenas	SN-C09
7:49:30 PM	Agency Context Added	Police Call Type Added. Call Type: DVV, Status: 3, Priority: 3	Scott Cardenas	SN-C09
7:49:28 PM	Narrative Added	RP IS A JUV STATING THAT FATHER IS YELLING AT STEP MOM, THREATENING HER	Scott Cardenas	SN-C09
7:48:29 PM	Location	Cross streets updated, 15TH PL NE / 15TH ST NE, 16TH ST NE $$	Scott Cardenas	SN-C09
7:48:28 PM	Alerts Retrieval	Alerts Were Successfully Gathered For Location At Address 1526 85TH AVE NE	System User	TTP2-CAD01
7:48:27 PM	Call Updated	Caller Added: Last Name - YORKS; First Name - BRIAN; Role - Involved Party;	Scott Cardenas	SN-C09
7:48:27 PM	Incident Created	Added Incident Number, ORI: WA0311900, Number: 2025-00005778	Josh Daly	
7:48:27 PM	Call Created	New call created. Call Type: NEW CALL, Location: 1526 85TH AVE NE, Caller Phone: (206) 385-2124, Source: E911 (03/30/2025 19:48:23)	Scott Cardenas	SN-C09

## Unit Log

***	2	/2	n	12	กว	E	***

Time	Action	Description	Unit	Status	Name	Machine
8:09:33 PM	<b>Unit Status Change</b>	Available	1915	Available	Josh Daly	SNC69
8:09:33 PM	Unit Cleared	Unit Cleared From Call	1915	Available	Josh Daly	SNC69
8:09:33 PM	<b>Unit Status Change</b>	Available	1950	Available	Josh Daly	SNC69
8:09:33 PM	Unit Cleared	Unit Cleared From Call	1950	Available	Josh Daly	SNC69
8:09:22 PM	NCIC Request	Person - Last Name: YORKS;		On Scene	Elizabeth Savchuk	SS-3384
		First Name: JULITA; Middle				
		Name: ANDREA; ; DL Number:				
		OLN Number.				
8:06:40 PM	Timer Override	Override time = 600	1950	On Scene	Josh Daly	SNC69
8:06:23 PM	Timer Override	Override time = 2073600	1915	On Scene	Josh Daly	SNC69
8:01:22 PM	Unit Check In		1950	On Scene	Josh Daly	SNC69
8:00:49 PM	Unit Status Change	On Scene	1915	On Scene	Gavin Heinemann	SS-2213
8:00:43 PM	NCIC Request	Request #4179056 -	1950	On Scene	Josh Daly	SNC69
		***TERMINAL ORI:				
		WA031J63N; LicensePlate:				
0.00.27 DM	NCIC Dogwood	CHV9331; LicenseState: WA;	1015	Enrouto	Cavin Hainamann	CC 2212
8:00:37 PM 7:59:50 PM	NCIC Request	Vehicle - Plate: chv9331 On Scene	1915 1950	Enroute On Scene	Gavin Heinemann	SNC69
	Unit Status Change				Josh Daly	
7:57:56 PM	NCIC Request	Vehicle - Plate: cpg5903	1950	Enroute	Elizabeth Savchuk	
7:56:44 PM	NCIC Request	Person - Last Name: ANDERSON; First Name:		Enroute	Gavin Heinemann	33-2213
		KATHERINE; Middle Name:				
		ASTRID; ;_DL				
		Number: OLN DL				
		State: WA				
7:55:29 PM	NCIC Request	Person - Last Name: YORKS;		Enroute	Gavin Heinemann	SS-2213
		First Name: BRIAN; Middle				
		Name: CHRISTOPHER; DOB:				

#### 

		; Sex: Male; Race: Unknown; DL Number: OLN DL State: WA; SSN: SSN Jacket Type: Adult; Local ID: A746593; Phone Number: (206) 395-4501				
7:55:25 PM	NCIC Request	Person - Last Name: yorks; First Name: br	1915	Enroute	Gavin Heinemann	SS-2213
7:54:38 PM	NCIC Request	Vehicle - Plate: cpp6477	1915	Enroute	Gavin Heinemann	SS-2213
7:53:46 PM	NCIC Request	Vehicle - Plate: csa8426	1950	Enroute	Elizabeth Savchuk	SS-3384
7:52:38 PM	Unit Location	Secondary Location Cleared	1950	Enroute	Josh Daly	SNC69
7:52:38 PM	Unit Status Change	Enroute	1950	Enroute	Josh Daly	SNC69
7:52:38 PM	Unit Status Change	Dispatched (Status Override) Call Number: 754, Assigned Location: 1526 85TH AVE NE, Lake Stevens, Call Type: DVV	1950	Enroute	Josh Daly	SNC69
7:50:09 PM	Unit Status Change	Enroute	1915	Enroute	Josh Daly	SNC69
7:49:51 PM	Unit Location	Secondary Location Cleared	1915	Dispatched	Josh Daly	SNC69
7:49:51 PM	Unit Status Change	Dispatched Call Number: 754, Assigned Location: 1526 85TH AVE NE, Lake Stevens, Call Type: DVV		Dispatched	Josh Daly	SNC69

#### Incidents

Incident NumberJurisdictionType2025-00005778WA0311900:LakeStevensPolice DV

Department

#### Units

Unit	Radio Number	Personnel	Jurisdiction			
1915	1915	SS0133 Heinemann	WA0311900:	Lake	Stevens	Police
			Department			
1950	1950	SS0189 Savchuk	WA0311900:	Lake	Stevens	Police
			Department			

#### **Attachments**

File Name File Description Attached By

## **Redaction Log**

Total Number of Redactions in Document: 6

## **Redaction Reasons by Page**

Page	Reason	Description	Occurrences
2	OLN	Operator License Numbers RCW 42.56.230(5) Driver's License, Permit, and Identicard Numbers: These identification numbers are defined as financial information in RCW 9.35.005(1) and exempt from disclosure by state law, due to the risks of identity theft.	2
3	OLN	Operator License Numbers RCW 42.56.230(5) Driver's License, Permit, and Identicard Numbers: These identification numbers are defined as financial information in RCW 9.35.005(1) and exempt from disclosure by state law, due to the risks of identity theft.	2
4	OLN	Operator License Numbers RCW 42.56.230(5) Driver's License, Permit, and Identicard Numbers: These identification numbers are defined as financial information in RCW 9.35.005(1) and exempt from disclosure by state law, due to the risks of identity theft.	1
4	SSN	Social Security Number RCW 42.56.230 Social Security Number exempt from disclosure by state law.	1

## **Redaction Log**

## **Redaction Reasons by Exemption**

Reason	Description	Pages (Count)
OLN	Operator License Numbers RCW 42.56.230(5) Driver's License, Permit, and Identicard Numbers: These identification numbers are defined as financial information in RCW 9.35.005(1) and exempt from disclosure by state law, due to the risks of identity theft.	2(2) 3(2) 4(1)
SSN	Social Security Number RCW 42.56.230 Social Security Number exempt from disclosure by state law.	4(1)

# TRANSCRIPT IN THE MATTER OF:

BRIAN YORKS V. GINA BLOOM FKA OLIMPIA YORKS

Cause no. 20-1-00465-31

Sunday, March 30, 2025

ANDERSON TRANSCRIPTION SOLUTIONS LLC
335 W Middle Rd.
Lykens, PA 17048-8823
(704) 840-9351
danderson@andersontranscriptions.com

1	STATE OF WASHINGTON
2	SNOHOMISH COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT
3	CASE NAME: BRIAN YORKS v. GINA BLOOM FKA OLIMPIA YORKS
4	SNOHOMISH COUNTY CAUSE NO. 20-1-00465-31
5	TYPE OF AUDIO: AXON File
6	A/V I.D.: Axon Body 3 X60AC442C
7	DATE: Sunday, March 30, 2025 TIME: 7:59:54 p.m.
8	PARTIES: Brian Yorks Julita Yorks
9	Gina Bloom Officer Savchuck
10	Sergeant
11	DISCLAIMER: The following <u>may</u> contain indiscernible or inaudible words due to the recording quality and/or accents and speech patterns of the individuals.
12	
13	TRANSCRIPT OF AUDIO-RECORDED BODY-CAM VIDEO
14	OFFICER SAVCHUCK: 9-5-0 plate.
15	Hello. Officer Savchuck, Lake Stevens
16	Police Department.
17	Charles-Henry-Victor-9331.
18	All right. Just to let you know, you're
19	all being audio-video recorded. So we got called out
20	here. I believe it was your son that got called us.
21	MR. YORKS: Uh-huh.
22	OFFICER SAVCHUCK: And he's just concerned
23	that there's some argument going on between husband and
24	wife? Are you
25	MR. YORKS: Yeah,

```
OFFICER SAVCHUCK: -- husband-wife?
1
 2
                    MR. YORKS: -- we just had a disagreement,
 3
     and he just got scared. I mean, there was no --
 4
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: He just got scared?
 5
                    MR. YORKS: -- fighting or yelling --
 6
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Okay.
 7
                    MR. YORKS: -- or anything, so.
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Well, the fact that it's
 8
 9
     domestic violence, if it's verbal then we still have to
     document it.
10
11
                    MR. YORKS: Sure.
12
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: You know, document what
13
     happened, so.
14
                    MS. J. YORKS: Hi.
15
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Hello.
16
                    MS. J. YORKS: How are you doing?
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: We just got called out
17
18
    here and so we're just here to investigate. My sergeant's
19
     also here. And I just want to make sure everything's
20
     okay.
21
                    MS. J. YORKS: Oh, no. I say everything is
22
     okay. It's only --
23
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Everything's okay?
24
                    MS. J. YORKS: It's only -- it's the --
25
     it's the leaving and the -- and big boy, is, Oh, maybe
```

```
Julita leaving?
1
 2
                    But I am not leaving. And he is maybe
 3
     nervous about me leaving the home because I -- he tell me,
 4
    Well, when you leaving?
 5
                    I tell him, see, I am leaving for my new
     home. And --
 6
 7
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Okay.
 8
                    MS. J. YORKS: -- he -- they -- ah, ah.
 9
    But --
10
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: So you no longer live
11
    here? Is that what --
12
                    MS. J. YORKS: I -- I am wife.
13
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: You're wife?
14
                    MS. J. YORKS: Yes.
15
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Okay. But you're just
16
     going somewhere else right now?
17
                    MS. J. YORKS: I'm sorry. It's okay. I
18
    have the problem with my -- I have the infection in my --
19
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Okay.
20
                    SERGEANT: Brian, can I talk to you now?
21
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Can you talk to me
22
     facing the other way then so --
23
                    MS. J. YORKS: Yeah.
24
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: -- that way -- I mean,
25
     your -- can you --
```

1	MS. J. YORKS: This way.
2	OFFICER SAVCHUCK: No, no. So
3	MS. J. YORKS: Do you want to take him
4	because a scared baby is inside car.
5	OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Okay. Or you can open
6	the door if you want.
7	MS. J. YORKS: Yes.
8	Hi.
9	OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Hi, baby.
10	MS. J. YORKS: We got a hi.
11	OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Hello.
12	MS. J. YORKS: Yes.
13	OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Then
14	CHILD: Hello.
15	OFFICER SAVCHUCK: All right. So if you
16	want to talk to him. If you want to turn the other way to
17	me, that way your other here
18	MS. J. YORKS: Yes.
19	OFFICER SAVCHUCK: ear, and you can talk
20	to me.
21	MS. J. YORKS: Yeah.
22	OFFICER SAVCHUCK: So tell me what's going
23	on today regarding like right before we came? You're
24	telling me your
25	MS. J. YORKS: My English is very basic.

```
OFFICER SAVCHUCK: My parents are from a
1
 2
    different country, so I understand --
 3
                    MS. J. YORKS: Yes.
 4
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: -- people with accents.
 5
     It's totally fine.
                    MS. J. YORKS: Oh, okay. Perfect.
 6
 7
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Yeah.
 8
                    MS. J. YORKS: You want talking about
 9
     the --
10
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Just in general what
11
    happened before we came here.
12
                    MS. J. YORKS: No, nothing.
13
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK:
                                       Nothing?
14
                    MS. J. YORKS: No.
15
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Just was it an argument
16
    between you and your husband?
                    MS. J. YORKS: No. Only they tell about
17
18
     the -- why is the -- I don't like it so much seeing that
19
     they -- they making home and the -- my calling home,
20
     because it's another baby son, and he's responsible for me
21
     and for home.
22
                    So the -- the tell he, Why is there another
23
    voice in home? I don't like this. There are no other
     friends in home.
24
25
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: So you don't like it
```

```
when other friends come over in the house?
1
                    MS. J. YORKS: No, because he's responsible
 2
     for -- maybe for home, maybe one accident or maybe the
 3
 4
              It's just like the whole -- I don't like this.
 5
    And for me -- you not listen to me. They have --
 6
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: He's saying that you're
 7
     not --
 8
                    MS. J. YORKS: Yes.
 9
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: -- listening to him?
                    MS. J. YORKS: Yeah. Yes. He no listen to
10
11
    me because I -- this is the fear attack for me. You not
12
     listen to me.
13
                    And for me maybe -- maybe leaving to here
14
    because you no listen to me. Where it is my up in your
15
    new home because I need protection home, protection of
16
    baby, and protection all baby have in home.
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Yeah.
17
18
                    MS. J. YORKS: Because I am Mommy, I need
19
     protection of family.
20
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK:
                                       I agree.
21
                    MS. J. YORKS: Yes.
22
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: I get that.
23
                    MS. J. YORKS: And is the -- for me, Daddy,
24
    no, I need to live in with (indiscernible). I -- I am
25
     come into home. I am come into car and the babies listen
```

```
this. They --
1
 2
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Oh, so you just don't
 3
     want --
 4
                    MS. J. YORKS: They -- they, no, yes, yes.
 5
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK:
                                       They --
                    MS. J. YORKS: I know there's two babies
 6
 7
     and -- when I -- I tell my (indiscernible) babies. And
     this is his -- this is it for me.
 8
 9
                    Oh, no, maybe I need to leaving with me to
10
    hear because you no listen me.
11
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Mm-hmm.
12
                    MS. J. YORKS: I need that you listen me.
13
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: So you just basically
14
     said that, Hey, maybe I shouldn't live here?
15
                    MS. J. YORKS: This is so --
16
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Is that what you say?
17
                    MS. J. YORKS: -- goodbyes --
18
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Yeah.
19
                    MS. J. YORKS: -- no more.
20
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK:
                                       Okay.
21
                    MS. J. YORKS: And that --
22
                    Okay. Come on. I'm sorry, because if they
23
     -- he have them more then Mommy. And, Mommy, every time
24
    used to tell about then maybe have the discussion and
25
    maybe talking with my husband. Her mom take Mommy babies
```

1	because I do not it's I don't (audio-break).
2	OFFICER SAVCHUCK: You're not the mom.
3	MS. J. YORKS: Stepmom.
4	OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Okay.
5	MS. J. YORKS: Them.
6	OFFICER SAVCHUCK: I see. Those two?
7	MS. J. YORKS: Uh-huh.
8	OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Okay. I see.
9	MS. J. YORKS: Their mommy talk about the
10	call the police all the time. Maybe have bad maybe
11	interaction and maybe, Oh no, he and anyway passed
12	back. Here they call the police. And
13	OFFICER SAVCHUCK: So he's always saying
14	that?
15	MS. J. YORKS: Yes.
16	OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Okay.
17	MS. J. YORKS: And every chance they call.
18	But that's
19	OFFICER SAVCHUCK: I I see.
20	MS. J. YORKS: Because they have the
21	problem with ex, right?
22	OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Mm-hmm.
23	MS. J. YORKS: And he have the problem.
24	OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Yeah.
25	MS. J. YORKS: And she one got he big

1	problems.
2	OFFICER SAVCHUCK: I see why it makes a
3	problem.
4	MS. J. YORKS: Exactly.
5	OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Yeah.
6	MS. J. YORKS: Maybe a little problem, not
7	my problem
8	OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Yeah.
9	MS. J. YORKS: to the rest
10	OFFICER SAVCHUCK: That's normal.
11	MS. J. YORKS: she if
12	OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Yeah. Absolutely.
13	MS. J. YORKS: She want to leave they
14	OFFICER SAVCHUCK: And
15	MS. J. YORKS: Until they
16	OFFICER SAVCHUCK: So what she
17	MS. J. YORKS: And he tell me, Why do you
18	call the police? And for me this is my first call the
19	police.
20	OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Yeah.
21	MS. J. YORKS: Why did you I mean
22	OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Yeah.
23	MS. J. YORKS: Because it's not my
24	OFFICER SAVCHUCK: But otherwise are you
25	you feel safe and

```
1
                    MS. J. YORKS: Yeah, except -- no, no
 2
    nothing.
 3
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Okay.
 4
                    MS. J. YORKS: Nothing.
 5
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Okay. Just --
 6
                    MS. J. YORKS: Only because I no see one
 7
     paper, my passport and my papers. I mean, he -- I tell
    him, Where is my papers?
 8
 9
                    And he grabbed the phone, and he say, Hey,
10
    Brian, give me my papers.
11
                    And he said, and I don't know where it is?
12
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Yeah.
13
                    MS. J. YORKS: And for me then -- so then
14
    he have -- but I do not remember this. Under my -- on my
15
    bed, I forget. And for me it's a little sad because where
16
     did my papers --
17
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Yeah.
18
                    MS. J. YORKS: But on phone -- I called
19
     police, but he thinks it's my fault, but it is inside on,
20
     on their bed. But --
21
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Okay.
22
                    MS. J. YORKS: -- no nothing. Maybe have
23
     the problem, maybe now is cry and --
24
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Okay.
25
                   MS. J. YORKS: -- no, nothing.
```

```
1
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Well, I just wanted to
 2
    make sure that nothing physical happened --
 3
                    MS. J. YORKS: No.
 4
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: -- and you're not hurt.
 5
                    MS. J. YORKS: No. And --
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: The kids are--
 6
 7
                    MS. J. YORKS: And -- and I'm sorry about
     this.
 8
 9
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: It's okay.
10
                    MS. J. YORKS: They pushed it at Mommy.
11
    But I don't want talking about so much the baby because
12
    have a problem with (indiscernible).
13
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Okay. Well, it sounds
14
     like everything's peaceful and --
15
                    MS. J. YORKS: But it's good for them
16
    because and we'll have big problems. He -- and maybe I
17
    need it to help. Not so much --
18
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Yeah.
19
                    MS. J. YORKS: (Indiscernible-simultaneous
                Yes, but --
20
     speaking).
21
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: That's why we show up
22
     and we want to make sure everything's at peace and
23
     everyone's okay and no one's hurt, so.
24
                    MS. J. YORKS: No, no, no.
25
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK:
                                       Okay.
```

```
1
                   MS. J. YORKS: Thank you for your help, but
 2
     no.
 3
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: All right.
 4
                    MS. J. YORKS: Everything is -- yeah,
 5
     absolute, so --
 6
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: And your name was
 7
     Juliet, or?
                    MS. J. YORKS: Julita.
 8
 9
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Julita?
10
                    MS. J. YORKS: Yes.
11
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Oh, very nice.
12
                    MS. J. YORKS: Thank you.
13
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Okay.
14
                    Office Savchuck.
15
                    MS. J. YORKS: Savchuck. Okay. Thank you
16
     so much.
17
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Alrighty.
18
                    MS. J. YORKS: Okay.
19
                    You tell her, bye? Goodbye.
20
                    OFFICER SAVCHUCK: Yep. Goodnight.
21
     care.
22
     (Body-Cam Video concluded at 8:07:23 p.m.)
     ///
23
24
25
```

1	CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER
2	
3	I, Deborah S. Anderson, a court-approved
4	transcriber, certify that the foregoing is a full,
5	true, and correct transcript, transcribed to the best
6	of my ability from the official electronic sound
7	recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled
8	matter;
9	That I am neither an attorney, not employed by,
LO	related to, nor of counsel for any of the parties named
L1	herein, nor otherwise interested in the outcome of this
L2	action.
L3	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto sent my hand:
L 4	
L 5	Debash Sanderson
L 6	Deborah S. Anderson, CET-998
L7	Anderson Transcription Solutions LLC
L8	335 W Middle Road
L 9	Lykens, PA 17048-8823
20	704.840.9351
21	
22	Date: May 1, 2025
23	AAERT Certification effective until February 8, 2027
24	
25	

# TRANSCRIPT IN THE MATTER OF:

BRIAN YORKS V. GINA BLOOM, OLIMPIA YORKS

Case no. 23-2-03799-31

Sunday, March 30, 2025

ANDERSON TRANSCRIPTION SOLUTIONS LLC 335 W Middle Rd.
Lykens, PA 17048-8823
(704) 840-9351
danderson@andersontranscriptions.com

1	STATE OF WASHINGTON
2	SNOHOMISH COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT
3	CASE NAME: BRIAN YORKS v. GINA BLOOM, OLIMPIA YORKS
4	SNOHOMISH COUNTY CAUSE NO. 23-2-03799-31
5	TYPE OF AUDIO: .WAV File
6	A/V I.D.: SS25-5778_911_194823
7	DATE: Sunday, March 30, 2025 TIME: 07:48:27 p.m.
8	PARTIES: Operator
9	DISCLAIMER: The following may contain indiscernible or inaudible
10	words due to the recording quality and/or accents and speech patterns of the individuals.
11	
12	TRANSCRIPT OF AUDIO-RECORDED TELEPHONE CALL
13	OPERATOR: 9-1-1, what is the address of
14	the emergency?
15	My dad has been threatening me.
16	OPERATOR: Okay. What's your address?
17	I don't know.
18	OPERATOR: You don't know your address?
19	Yeah.
20	OPERATOR: Okay. Do you know what's
21	your phone number?
22	I don't know.
23	OPERATOR: Okay. What whose phone are
24	you calling on right now?
25	The house phone.

1	OPERATOR: The house phone?						
2	Yeah.						
3	OPERATOR: Okay. And where is your dad						
4	right now?						
5	M. YORKS: In my house yelling at my						
6	stepmom.						
7	OPERATOR: Okay. Has anyone been physical?						
8	Hitting or punching? Or just yelling?						
9	M. YORKS: Yelling, but just threatening.						
10	OPERATOR: What is he saying?						
11	M. YORKS: I don't know. He's just always						
12	forcing my stepmom and stuff.						
13	OPERATOR: He's just he's doing what to						
14	her?						
15	M. YORKS: Forcing her to do stuff.						
16	OPERATOR: Okay. Like what? What is he						
17	doing?						
18	M. YORKS: It's hard to explain, but I want						
19	to go back to my mom.						
20	OPERATOR: Okay. Stay with me if you can,						
21	if it's safe to do so. What's your name?						
22	M. YORKS:						
23	OPERATOR: Michael?						
24	M. YORKS: Uh-huh.						
25	OPERATOR: Okay, Michael. I'm right here						

```
with you. Okay. Is your mom still inside the house?
1
 2
                   M. YORKS: It's my stepmom is it.
 3
                   OPERATOR: It's your stepmom?
                   M. YORKS: They're come -- they're coming
 4
 5
     out. I think I -- I think -- stop the call.
                   OPERATOR: Like, are you outside?
 6
                   M. YORKS: Yeah.
 7
                   OPERATOR: Okay. If you need to hang up,
 8
 9
     that's fine, okay? I want you to keep yourself safe.
10
                   M. YORKS: I want to go back to my mom.
11
                   OPERATOR: Okay. What --
12
                   M. YORKS: She lives in Bellevue.
13
                   OPERATOR: Oh, she lives in Bellevue?
14
                   M. YORKS: Yeah.
15
                   OPERATOR: Okay. How long have you been --
16
    is this your dad's house?
17
                   M. YORKS: Yeah.
18
                   OPERATOR: Okay. And where are you right
19
    now in the house?
20
                   M. YORKS: In the backyard.
21
                   OPERATOR: Okay. And your stepmom and your
22
    father are still inside?
23
                   M. YORKS: Yeah, my dad's always
24
    threatening me though.
25
                   OPERATOR: What did he -- did he do
```

```
anything today?
1
 2
                    M. YORKS: No, I was with my mom.
    barely with her though.
 3
 4
                    OPERATOR: Okay. And what did your -- what
 5
     did your dad -- how did your dad threaten you today? What
 6
     did he say?
 7
                    M. YORKS: He was threatening my stepmom,
 8
    but he didn't threaten me today, 'cause I just got back
 9
     from my mom's house like an hour ago.
10
                    OPERATOR: Okay. So just since you got
11
    home, you noticed this?
12
                    M. YORKS: Yeah.
13
                    OPERATOR: Okay.
14
                    M. YORKS: Can you take me back to my mom?
15
                    OPERATOR: Well, I'm going to go ahead and
16
     at least let officers know what's going on, okay? I'm
17
     going to ask them to come out there, okay?
18
                    M. YORKS: And my dad always lies.
19
                    OPERATOR: And check on everything? He
     lies?
20
21
                    M. YORKS: Mm-hmm.
22
                    OPERATOR: Have the police been out there
23
    before?
24
                   M. YORKS: I don't know.
25
                    I -- I was just calling mommy.
```

```
(Telephone call concluded at 7:51:55 p.m.)
1
     ///
 2
 3
                     CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER
 4
          I, Deborah S. Anderson, a court-approved
 5
     transcriber, certify that the foregoing is a full,
 6
 7
     true, and correct transcript, transcribed to the best
     of my ability from the official electronic sound
 8
 9
     recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled
10
    matter;
11
          That I am neither an attorney, not employed by,
12
     related to, nor of counsel for any of the parties named
13
     herein, nor otherwise interested in the outcome of this
14
     action.
15
          IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto sent my hand:
16
          ebash Andersan
17
     Deborah S. Anderson, CET-998
18
19
    Anderson Transcription Solutions LLC
     335 W Middle Road
20
21
    Lykens, PA 17048-8823
     704.840.9351
22
23
    Date: April 18, 2025
24
25
    AAERT Certification effective until February 8, 2027
```

$\mathbf{r}$	.1 •		• -	_ 1	l • 1	• .
Ρ	lain	t1††	'C	$oldsymbol{H} \mathbf{v} oldsymbol{I}$	h1	h1t
1	Iam	LILL	<b>O</b> .		יעעו	or

 $\underline{\mathbf{H}}$ 

## City of Lake Stevens

NextRequest

## Request Visibility: W Unpublished





## Request 24-1210 🗹 Closed







42 of 65

## **Dates**

#### Received

July 31, 2024 via web

## Requester







**2**067867000

The Dissolution Advocates NW,LLC

## Invoices

## Request

Please release all communication between Rosanna Aho and Lake Stevens Police Department. To include any sworn statements, recorded interviews and all other information.

Mention: Brian Christopher Yorks, Olimpia "Gina" Yorks, and

## **Timeline**

## **Documents**

☑ Request closed with access to this request

We have provided all records responsive to your request.

August 15, 2024, 11:04am by Staff

No invoices due

### Staff assigned

**Departments** 

Police

Point of contact Brittany Suarez

## ✓ Message to requester + Staff Hello,

Attached you will find all responsive records with the redactions or exemptions made listed on the last page of the document.

The City of Lake Stevens has now fulfilled your request for public records. According to our records, the City provided you copies of all available records that are responsive to your request. The City now considers your request as closed, and therefore does not intend to further address the request. Any actions to seek judicial review of the City's response to your request must be filed within one year of this notice in accordance with RCW 42.56.550.

If you believe that additional responsive records have not been provided or if have any questions, you may contact office at 425 622-9401 or by email at pdrecords@lakestevenswa.gov within 30 days of this message.

Sincerely,

**Records Division** 

Lake Stevens Police Department

August 15, 2024, 11:03am by Staff

# Document(s) released to the Staff requester

Complaince Search.pdf

August 15, 2024, 11:03am by Staff

## Message to requester + Staff Hello,

The City is and has been in the process of locating, reviewing and processing the records responsive to your request. Pursuant to RCW 42.56.520 the City requires additional time to process your request.

The City anticipates a response to your request by August 16, 2024

If you have any questions, please contact our office at 425-622-9401 during normal business hours.

Sincerely,

**Records Division** 

Lake Stevens Police

August 7, 2024, 3:16pm by Staff

# oxdot Message to requester + Staff

Dear Olimpia,

This request has been paused as it is part of a group of 4 requests you submitted

simultaneously. Per the City's public records policy, if multiple requests are submitted at the same time by the same requester, we may pause requests in the group and handle in the order received (see excerpt from the public records policy below).

### Multiple Requests by the same party.

When the same requestor simultaneously submits separate requests or makes one or more additional requests when previous are open, staff may queue the requests in the order in which they are received. Staff is not required to work on additional requests until the initial requests are completed and closed. Requestors are responsible for informing the Public Records Officer if they want to reprioritize the fulfillment of their requests.

List of Requests in order they were received:

### 1) 24-1209 (CURRENTLY WORKING THIS **REQUEST)**

Please provide all communication records between the Lake Stevens Police Department and the following jurisdictions:

Mukilteo PD

Kirkland PD

Renton PD

**Everett PD** 

**Edmonds PD** 

Seattle PD

Tacoma PD

Mention: Brian Christopher Yorks,
Olimpia "Gina" Yorks,
and

### 2) 24-1210

Please release all communication between Rosanna Aho and Lake Stevens Police Department. To include any sworn statements, recorded interviews and all other information.

Mention: Brian Christopher Yorks,
Olimpia "Gina" Yorks,

### 3) 24-1211

Please release all communication between Jason Tift, Office of Professional Accountability, and the Lake Stevens Police Department.

Mention: Brian Christopher Yorks,
Olimpia "Gina" Yorks,

To include Mayor Brett Gailey.

#### 4) 24-1212

Please release all communication between Mayor Brett Gailey and all entities to include any and all public officials, and

any and all personal contacts regarding Brian Christopher Yorks, Olimpia "Gina" Yorks, and

As soon as we have completed request #24-1209 we will move the next request on the list from paused to active, and work on completion. Please let us know if you have any questions at any time during this process at 425-622-9401.

Sincerely,

**Records Staff** 

Lake Stevens Police

August 5, 2024, 8:28am by Staff

# Message to requester + Staff

The City received your request for public records today and will respond as required by RCW 42.56.520, within five business days.

In calculating the five business days, the following are not counted: the day the City receives the request, Saturdays, Sundays and holidays. RCW 1.12.040. See also WAC 44-14-03006. If the request is received by the City after City business hours, the request shall be deemed to have been received by the City on the next business day.

A response may be (a) providing the records, (b) providing a link to records available on line, (c) providing a reasonable estimated date of when the records will be available, (d) requesting clarification, or (e) denial of the request.

July 31, 2024, 12:02pm

## □ Department assignment request

Police

July 31, 2024, 12:02pm by the requester

# Request opened the access to this request

Request received via web

July 31, 2024, 12:02pm by the requester

### City of Lake Stevens

NextRequest

#### Request Visibility: W Unpublished



### ➤ Request 24-1210 Closed



42 of 65

#### Dates

Received

July 31, 2024 via web

### Request

Please release all communication between Rosanna Aho and Lake Stevens Police Department. To include any sworn st all other information.

Mention: Brian Christopher Yorks, Olimpia "Gina" Yorks,

and

### Requester

- A Gina Bloom
- ginayorks24@gmail.com
- PO BOX 257 PMB 9800, Olympia, WA, 98507
- **2** 2067867000
- The Dissolution
  Advocates NW,LLC

#### **Invoices**

No invoices due

### Staff assigned

Departments

Police

Point of contact Brittany Suarez

### Timeline Documents

All documents

1-1 / 1 [ < ] [ > ]

#### **Folders**

Filter by folder name

filter by folder name

All Documents

Documents not in folders

71/1 results in 'All Documents'

Filter by document name

filter by document name

Select all 🖧

Uploaded: 08/15/2024

Complaince Search.pdf

To:

swarbis@lakestevenswa.gov
New voice message from "ROSANNA AHO" <253-444-7021> for "Steve Warbis" <382> on Wednesday, December 22, 2021 at 11:53:27 AM Wednesday, December 22, 2021 11:53:29 AM Subject:

Date:

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content

#### **VOICEMAIL NOTIFICATION**

#### You received a voicemail.

Call From: "ROSANNA AHO" <253-444-7021>

Call To: "Steve Warbis" <382>

Call Duration: 0:36

Received On: Wednesday, December 22, 2021 at 11:53:27 AM

**Download Delete** Save

To view your voicemail or manage your preferences, click here.

$\mathbf{r}$			• 1	_ 1	l • 1	• ,
P	l 20 1111	t1	′୯	$\vdash$	<b>h</b> 1	h1t
	lain	LLLI	<b>D</b> 1	$\Box \Lambda$	יבנו	υπ

I

### City of Lake Stevens

NextRequest

### Request Visibility: W Unpublished





# Request 24-1106 ✓ Closed







1 of 1

### **Dates**

#### Received

July 16, 2024 via web

### Requester



Confidential, Marysville, WA, 98271

**2** 2062901554

### **Invoices**

No invoices due

### Request

Please provide all police reports that reference Brian Yorks and Olimpia/Gina Yorks.

All relevant dates.

### **Timeline**

### **Documents**

Request closed with access to this request

All records have been released, and your request has been fulfilled

August 30, 2024, 2:24pm by Staff

## Staff assigned

**Departments** 

Police

Point of contact

**Brittany Suarez** 

# ✓ Message to requester + Staff Hello,

6/9/25, 10:43 AM

Attached you will find all responsive records with the redactions or exemptions made listed on the last page of the document.

The City of Lake Stevens has now fulfilled your request for public records. According to our records, the City provided you copies of all available records that are responsive to your request. The City now considers your request as closed, and therefore does not intend to further address the request. Any actions to seek judicial review of the City's response to your request must be filed within one year of this notice in accordance with RCW 42.56.550.

If you believe that additional responsive records have not been provided or if have any questions, you may contact office at 425 622-9401 or by email at pdrecords@lakestevenswa.gov within 30 days of this message.

Sincerely,

**Records Division** 

Lake Stevens Police Department

August 30, 2024, 2:23pm by Staff

# Document(s) released to requester

BATCH 3 REDACTED.pdf

August 30, 2024, 2:23pm by Staff

# **■ Message to requeste**<sup>Requester + Staff</sup>

Good afternooon,

The City has been in the process of locating, reviewing and processing records that may be responsive to your request, and at this time provides the [Second] installment to your request, consisting of: Case Reports

Attached you will find all responsive records with the redactions or exemptions made listed on the last page of the document.

The City continues to be in the process of locating, reviewing and processing records that may be responsive to your request. Pursuant to RCW 42.56.520 the City requires additional time.

The City estimates Installment No.2 will be available to you by **August 30, 2024** 

If you have any questions, you may contact office at 425 622-9401 or by email at pdrecords@lakestevenswa.gov within 30 days of this message.

Sincerely,

**Records Division** 

Lake Stevens Police Department

August 21, 2024, 1:06pm by Staff

# Document(s) released to Staff requester

Batch 2.pdf-redacted.pdf

August 21, 2024, 1:06pm by Staff

# **■ Message to requeste**<sup>Requester + Staff</sup>

Good morning,

The City has been in the process of locating, reviewing and processing records that may be responsive to your request, and at this time provides the [FIRST] installment to your request, consisting of:

### **Case Reports**

Attached you will find all responsive records with the redactions or exemptions made listed on the last page of the document.

The City continues to be in the process of

locating, reviewing and processing records that may be responsive to your request. Pursuant to RCW 42.56.520 the City requires additional time.

The City estimates Installment No.2 will be available to you by **August 23, 2024** 

**If you** have any questions, you may contact office at 425 622-9401 or by email at pdrecords@lakestevenswa.gov within 30 days of this message.

Sincerely,

**Records Division** 

Lake Stevens Police Department

August 16, 2024, 10:41am by Staff

# Document(s) released to requester

Batch 1.pdf-redacted.pdf

August 16, 2024, 10:41am by Staff

# ■ Message from requester + Staff

All dates regarding Brian Yorks and Olimpia Gina Yorks. Starting with the first and ending with the last date regarding Lake Stevens Police Department.

August 5, 2024, 8:49am by the requester

# ■ Message to requester + Staff

Good afternoon,

The City received your request for public records by email on [July 16, 2024.

We have reached out to you via email to get clarification on what records you are requesting. It is critical for our search process that we are given guidance from you on what records are desired. With "All relevant dates.", I am not able to identify what date range you are referring to.

If I don't hear back from you by,Friday, August 16, 2024\_I will have to close this request as unfulfillable with the amount of information provided. Please reach out to me with any questions or information you can give. We are here to assist you and connect you with the records if you can clarify.

Thank you.

Sincerely.

Lake Stevens Police Records Department

August 2, 2024, 3:16pm by Staff

The City is and has been in the process of locating, reviewing and processing the records responsive to your request. Pursuant to RCW 42.56.520 the City requires additional time to process your request.

The City anticipates a response to your request by **August 02, 2024** 

If you have any questions, please contact our office at 425-622-9401 during normal business hours.

Sincerely,

**Records Division** 

Lake Stevens Police

July 23, 2024, 1:06pm by Staff

# ■ Message to requester + Staff

The City received your request for public records today and will respond as required by RCW 42.56.520, within five business days.

In calculating the five business days, the following are not counted: the day the City receives the request, Saturdays, Sundays and holidays. RCW 1.12.040. See also WAC 44-14-03006. If the request is received by the City after City business hours, the request shall be deemed to have been received by the City on the next business day.

A response may be (a) providing the records, (b) providing a link to records available on line, (c) providing a reasonable estimated date of when the records will be available, (d) requesting clarification, or (e) denial of the request.

July 16, 2024, 12:16am

## me Department assignment request

Police

July 16, 2024, 12:16am by the requester

# Request opened the access to this request

Request received via web

July 16, 2024, 12:16am by the requester

### SS Case Supplement, Officer: ss0112, Supervisor: ss0095, Merged By: ss0145

COLUMN	LAKE STEVENS POLICE DEPARTMENT	Case Supplement Report	
	1825 S Lake Stevens Road Lake Stevens, WA 98258 (425) 622-9401	Case Report # 2020-00002980	

DATE/TIME REPORTED		
	02/23/2022	12:30

m	STATUTE / DESCRIPTION							Co	ounts	Attempt/Commit
OFFENSES	<u> </u>							350		50
FEN										
OF								-		e
	□ NON-DISCLOSURE									57
		NAME						DOB / AG	SE RAI	NGE
	ADDRESS							PRIMARY	/ DUO	NE.
SCT	ADDRESS							PRIMARY	r PHUI	NE
SUBJECT								SECOND.	ARY F	HONE
	RACE		SEX	HEIGH	fΤ	WEIGHT	HAIR	120	ΙE	YE
	MONORCE DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PRO								PRINCE X	
	DL NUMBER		DL STATE			EMPLOYE	:R			
SUBJECT	□ NON-DISCLOSURE									_
	SUBJECT TYPE N	NAME						DOB / AG	SE RAI	NGE
	- ADDRESS PRIM								MARY PHONE	
	ANALI CHETTA CAPA 2							SECOND	ADV F	HONE
UB,								SECOND.	AKIF	TIONE
S	RACE		SEX	HEIGH	П	WEIGHT	HAIR	041	E	YE
	DL NUMBER		DL STATE	36		EMPLOYER				
	PROPERTY CODE		th:			YEAR	Ic	OLOR		
	PROPERTY CODE					ILAK		OLOR		
Y.E	TYPE /									
VEHICLE	MAKE / PLATE ST/	ATE V	MODEL /				VAI	LUE		
7		1942-1940   1947 20	7.670				950000			
	DESCRIPTION									
-	PROPERTY CODE									
≽	SERIAL NUMBER	IOTV/I	JNIT OF MEAS	NIDE	VALUE		lco	LOR		
PROPERTY	- Commissions	Q117	JINII OI WILAG	JONE	VALUE		00	LOIX		
OP	TYPE /	***					-11-			
PR	MAKE / DESCRIPTION		MODEL /							
	and and a state of the state of									

APPROVING SUPERVISOR

Miner, Robert

0112

REPORTING OFFICER / ID #

Warbis, Steve



### Case Supplement Report

Case Report # 2020-00002980

#### NARRATIVE

Case: 2020-02980

Location: 1825 S. Lake Stevens Rd.

Incident: Assault

I, Detective S. Warbis, am a fully commissioned Police Officer assigned as a detective, located in the city of Lake Stevens, county of Snohomish, State of Washington.

On 02/23/2022, at approximately 1230 hours, I contacted Rosanna Aho for a recorded interview at the request of the Snohomish County prosecutor's office. I contacted Rosanna via telephone which was audio recorded and booked into evidence. The following is a brief synopsis of the interview, refer to the recording for additional information.

I began by advising Rosanna that the interview was being audio recorded which she was agreeable too. I asked Rosanna to give me a narrative of what happened when Olympia Yorks originally disclosed being raped. Rosanna stated that she was friends with Olympia who was part of a stay-at-home mother's support group. Olympia sent out a group text that asked for someone to watch her kids. Rosanna called Olympia to tell he she could watch the kids and learned that Olympia had been assaulted by her husband a couple days prior to the text message. Rosanna told Olympia that she could bring the kids over and stay with her until she figured some other living arrangements. Rosanna said that Olympia was crying while on the phone and was still crying and shaking when she arrived at her house.

Rosanna said that she listened while Olympia told her how she had sex with her husband that she said was not consensual because it was anal sex, and she has never agreed to do that. Olympia also reported that she had taken medication that hindered her ability to resist the sexual advances. Rosanna asked her if she planned on calling 911 to report the assault and was told by Olympia that she was not going to call. Rosanna told Olympia that if she did not report the assault, she would call on her behalf. Olympia reportedly changed her mind at that time and called 911.

I asked Rosanna to explain the group text Olympia sent out. Rosanna stated that she sent the message asking for someone to watch her kids for her. The message went out to the members of her stay-at-home mother's support group. Rosanna did not have the text messages any longer.

Rosanna confirmed her address and date of birth and state that she had nothing further to add. I ended my conversation with Rosanna with nothing further.

This ends my involvement in this incident, no further.

This report was submitted from an electronic device owned, issued, or maintained by a law enforcement agency using my user ID and password. I certify or declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct.

REPORTING OFFICER / ID#		APPROVING SUPERVISOR
Warbis, Steve	0112	Miner, Robert
LOCATION SIGNED Snohomish County, WA		DATE SIGNED 02/23/2022

### Case Supplement Report

Page: 875 of 910

Case Report # 2020-00002980

#### NARRATIVE (continuation)

I CERTIFY UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON THAT THE FOREGOING STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT, THAT I HAVE ISSUES THIS ON THE DATE AND AT THE LOCATION ABOVE, AND I AM ENTERING MY AUTHORIZED USER ID AND PASSWORD TO .AUTHENTICATE IT.

S. Warbis 112 2/23/2022 Lake Stevens, WA

This report was submitted from an electronic device owned, issued, or maintained by a law enforcement agency using my user ID and password. I certify or declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct.

REPORTING OFFICER / ID#		APPROVING SUPERVISOR
Warbis, Steve	0112	Miner, Robert
LOCATION SIGNED Snohomish County, WA		DATE SIGNED 02/23/2022

Page: 749 of 910

### SS Case Supplement, Officer: ss0112, Supervisor: ss0095, Merged By: ss0153

TOTHER	LAKE STEVENS POLICE DEPARTMENT	Case Supplement Report
	1825 S Lake Stevens Road Lake Stevens, WA 98258 (425) 622-9401	Case Report # 2020-00002980

DATE/TIME REPORTED		
	02/11/2020	13:00

	STATUTE / DESCRIPTION							ts	Attempt/Commit
OFFENSES									
SS	*						295		5
出									
PF									8
:: <del>57</del> -0							di		67
2	□ NON-DISCLOSURE								
	SUBJECT TYPE NAME						DOB / AGE	RAI	NGE
	ADDDESO						DDMAADVE	1101	KIP .
C	ADDRESS						PRIMARY F	HUI	NE
믝							SECONDAR	ΥF	PHONE
SUBJECT							020011071		
S	RACE	SEX	HEIGH	r V	VEIGHT	HAIR		E	YE
	DL NUMBER	DL STATE		E	MPLOYE	R			
-	ET NON DISCUSSION	<u> </u>		40					
	□ NON-DISCLOSURE SUBJECT TYPE NAME						DOB / AGE	DΔI	NGE
	OODGEOT THE TOTAL						DODINOL	10.0	VOL.
-	- ADDRESS PRIM							HOI	NE
S									
SUBJECT							SECONDAR	YF	PHONE
SU	RACE	SEX	HEIGH	T IV	VEIGHT	HAIR	Q6	Te	YE
•	RACE	SEX	neign	ı v	VEIGHT	HAIR		-	.TE
	DL NUMBER	DL STATE	30	le le	MPLOYE	R		282	
	10 data	II TORONOMONIMONOS				-0.2			
	PROPERTY CODE	VAX.		Y	'EAR	C	OLOR		
111				(4)		40			
7	TYPE / MAKE /	MODEL /							
VEHICLE	PLATE STATE	VIN				VAI	UE		
男		1 (2000) 24				S. 55.55			
	DESCRIPTION	241							
	PROPERTY CODE								
≽	SERIAL NUMBER	QTY/UNIT OF MEASUR	DE.	VALUE		COL	_OR		
H	SERIAL NOWIDER	Q1170NII OI WILASOI	VL.	VALUE		001	LOIN		
PROPERTY	TYPE /			L.		100			
N.	MAKE /	MODEL /							
ш	DESCRIPTION								

REPORTING OFFICER / ID #		APPROVING SUPERVISOR
Warbis, Steve	0112	Miner, Robert

### Case Supplement Report

Case Report # 2020-00002980

#### NARRATIVE

 Case:
 2020-02980

 Location:
 1526 85th Ave N.E.

 Incident:
 Rape 2nd Degree

I, Detective S. Warbis, am a fully commissioned Police Officer assigned as a detective, located in the city of Lake Stevens, county of Snohomish, State of Washington.

On 12/22/2021 at approximately 1122 hours, I contacted Rosanna Aho at the request of the prosecutor for a follow up related to the listed rape allegations. Aho was reported to have been a witness to the incident and a follow up with her was requested.

I introduced myself to Aho and told her why I was calling. Aho stated that she remembered the incident and identified herself as the person that Olimpia had called after the reported rape. Aho stated that Olimpia sent out a group text asking for someone to watch her son Bradley. Aho responded and told her to bring him to her house. Aho stated that Olimpia told her what had happened to which Aho told her to call the Police. Aho said that Olimpia and Bradley stayed with her for approximately 3 nights until they were told that Brian had been arrested and it was safe for them to return home.

Aho told me that she met Olimpia at a party held by a mutual friend and the two became friends and still see each other. Aho said that she never seen any violence firsthand between Olimpia and Brian but claimed that their relationship was strained. Aho stated that Olimpia told her how her and Brian mostly slept in separate bedrooms. Aho said that Brian was very standoffish with her and was not warm and welcoming so she would only visit when Brian was at work. Aside from what she was told by Olimpia, Aho had no firsthand knowledge any discretions between the two.

Aho couldn't think of anything else to add or that she felt was relevant to this case. I told Aho that if anything came to mind, she could call me back and let me know. We ended our conversation with nothing further to add.

No further.

I CERTIFY UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON THAT THE FOREGOING STATEMENT IS TRUE AND CORRECT, THAT I HAVE ISSUES THIS ON THE DATE AND AT THE LOCATION ABOVE, AND I AM ENTERING MY AUTHORIZED USER ID AND PASSWORD TO .AUTHENTICATE IT.

S. Warbis 112 12/22/2021 Lake Stevens, WA

This report was submitted from an electronic device owned, issued, or maintained by a law enforcement agency using my user ID and password. I certify or declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct.

REPORTING OFFICER / ID#		APPROVING SUPERVISOR
Warbis, Steve	0112	Miner, Robert
LOCATION SIGNED Snohomish County, WA		DATE SIGNED 12/22/2021

	1 •		• 7	□ 1	• 1	• ,
Р	lain	t1††	'S	$H.\mathbf{X}$ $\mathbf{I}$	ገ1 <b>¦</b>	ን1†
	LULL				. 1 1 (	$\mathcal{I}$

J

From: Schiessl, Jillian

/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP

/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=C48002BFCF924C2DAE458C2125DA676E-SCHIESSL

Subject: DEADLINE REQUEST - LKS

Date: February 13, 2020 at 8:55 AM

To: Lake Stevens PD - Records Unit pdrecords@lakestevenswa.gov

#### Good morning,

Please upload the reports for the following DEADLINE cases through \*NEW\* Sharepoint. If held, the deadline will be noon, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2020. If you could forward prior to that time, it would be greatly appreciated.

RPT# 20-002980
DEF'S NAME: YORKS, BRIAN
DEP: PARNELL

Jillian Schiessl
Law Office Assistant
Snohomish County Prosecutor's Office
3000 Rockefeller Ave., M/S 504 | Everett, WA 98201
(425) 262-2178 | jillian.schiessl@co.snohomish.wa.us

NOTICE: All emails and attachments sent to and from Snohomish County are public records and may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the Public Records Act (RCW 42.56).

#### \*\*CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT\*\*

This message may contain information that is protected by the attorney-client privilege. If this message was sent to you in error, any use, disclosure or distribution of its contents is prohibited. If you receive this message in error, please contact me at the telephone number or e-mail address listed above and delete this message without printing, copying, or forwarding it. Thank you.

JS

From: Affronte, Kelsey

Subject: Request for Investigation - Yorks
Date: June 2, 2020 at 10:13 AM
To: pdrecords@lakestevenswa.gov



Dated: June 2, 2020

Police Agency: Agency #:	LAKE STEVENS PD 20002980
Contact:	RECORDS
Agency email	pdrecords@lakestevenswa.gov
Lead LEO:	KRISTIN PARNELL
Suspect:	BRIAN CHRISTOPHER YORKS
Crime(s):	<ol> <li>SECOND DEGREE RAPE DOMESTIC VIOLENCE (DV) (RCW 10.99.020 HOUSEHOLD OR FAMILY MEMBER RELATIONSHIP)</li> </ol>
DOV:	February 8, 2020
PA #:	20-2305
Court/Division:	

#### I. Case status

[X] B. We need additional reports or information in order to file a violent/sex felony charge. Due to the sensitive nature of this case, we will keep our file open until <u>July 6</u>, 2020, awaiting receipt of the requested items below.

#### II. Requested items

a. Photos booked into evidence

Return requested items **WITH A COPY OF THIS FORM** via **SharePoint**.

If you have any questions regarding this request please contact: **DPA:**KELSEY LYNN AFFRONTE, WSBA #: 52527

**Phone number:** (425) 262-2002

**E-mail address:** kelsey.affronte@co.snohomish.wa.us

#### \*\*\*\*ATTENTION \*\*\*\*

- RETURN THIS REQUEST WITH ITEMS LISTED ABOVE via SHAREPOINT IF YOUR AGENCY HAS ACCESS
- · SEND COPIES ONLY, DO NOT SEND ORIGINALS.
- · DO NOT SEND DUPLICATES OF THE INITIAL REFERRAL.
- DO NOT SEND FOLLOW-UP VIA E-MAIL

ONLY E-MAIL DPA'S WITH QUESTIONS / CLARIFICATION.

Request for Investigation.rtf
97 KB

From: Boska, Michael

/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP /CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=07263A7DC88C4D4AA3B076C56E1BFBF7-BOSKA

Ø

Subject: Request for Investigation (2)
Date: November 2, 2021 at 9:53 AM
To: PDRECORDS@lakestevenswa.gov

Cc: Boska, Michael

/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group /cn=Recipients/cn=07263a7dc88c4d4aa3b076c56e1bfbf7-Boska, Mich>

Dated: November 2, 2021

Police Agency: Agency #:	LAKE STEVENS PD 20002980
Contact:	RECORDS
Agency email	pdrecords@lakestevenswa.gov
Lead LEO:	KRISTIN PARNELL
Suspect:	BRIAN CHRISTOPHER YORKS
Crime(s):	<ol> <li>SECOND DEGREE RAPE DOMESTIC VIOLENCE (DV) (RCW 10.99.020 HOUSEHOLD OR FAMILY MEMBER RELATIONSHIP)</li> </ol>
DOV:	February 8, 2020
PA #:	20-2305
Court/Division:	

#### I. Case status

[X] B. We need additional reports or information in order to file a violent/sex felony charge. Due to the sensitive nature of this case, we will keep our file open until **December 2, 2021**, awaiting receipt of the requested items below.

#### II. Requested items

- [X] 1. Officer's report: A- Please send all associated reports for associated case LSPD 2020-3137.
- [x ] 2. Written statement from: Please contact Victim's friend (not mentioned by name in reports, but referenced generally) who Victim says that she disclosed the rape to prior to calling 911, and obtain a statement from them documenting Victim's demeanor, what Victim told them, and their knowledge of past DV or issues between Victim and Defendant.
- [X] 3. Other: A- Please send copy of Detective Warbis's audio recorded interview with Victim (we received the photographs, but never received this). B- If 911 recording was preserved by law enforcement prior to destruction, please send copy.

Return requested items **WITH A COPY OF THIS FORM** via **SharePoint**.

If you have any questions regarding this request please contact:

**DPA:** MICHAEL J BOSKA, WSBA #: 40497

**Phone number:** (425) 388-3960

E-mail address: michael.boska@co.snohomish.wa.us

\*\*\*\*ATTENTION \*\*\*\*

- RETURN THIS REQUEST WITH ITEMS LISTED ABOVE via SHAREPOINT IF YOUR AGENCY HAS ACCESS
- · SEND COPIES ONLY, DO NOT SEND ORIGINALS.
- DO NOT SEND DUPLICATES OF THE INITIAL REFERRAL.
- DO NOT SEND FOLLOW-UP VIA E-MAIL
  ONLY E-MAIL DPA'S WITH QUESTIONS / CLARIFICATION.

Request for Investigation (2).rtf



From: Boska, Michael

/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP /CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=07263A7DC88C4D4AA3B076C56E1BFBF7-BOSKA

Subject: Updated Request for Investigation (3) Date: November 5, 2021 at 5:18 PM To: PDRECORDS@lakestevenswa.gov

Cc: Boska, Michael

/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group /cn=Recipients/cn=07263a7dc88c4d4aa3b076c56e1bfbf7-Boska, Mich>

Dated: November 5, 2021

Police Agency: Agency #:	LAKE STEVENS PD 20002980
Contact:	RECORDS
Agency email	pdrecords@lakestevenswa.gov
Lead LEO:	KRISTIN PARNELL
Suspect:	BRIAN CHRISTOPHER YORKS
Crime(s):	<ol> <li>SECOND DEGREE RAPE DOMESTIC VIOLENCE (DV) (RCW 10.99.020 HOUSEHOLD OR FAMILY MEMBER RELATIONSHIP)</li> </ol>
DOV:	February 8, 2020
PA #:	20-2305
Court/Division:	

#### I. Case status

[X] B. We need additional reports or information in order to file a violent/sex felony charge. Due to the sensitive nature of this case, we will keep our file open until December 5, 2021 (Note: This amends / supplants the earlier request, additional information being requested based on victim meeting), awaiting receipt of the requested items below.

#### II. Requested items

- [ **X** ] Officer's report: **Describing follow-up work; thank you.**. 1.
- [X ] Written statement from: A- Please contact Victim's friend (not mentioned by name in reports, but referenced generally) who Victim says that she disclosed the rape to prior to calling 911, and obtain a statement from them documenting Victim's demeanor, what Victim told them, and their knowledge of past DV or issues between Victim and Defendant.
- Medical Records- Victim states that she has medical records [x] from the date of the car accident and ongoing prior / up to the date of the rape, which detail the medications she was prescribed. She is willing to provide a copy directly to Detective Parnell and/or sign any medical privacy consent waiver forms needed. Victim believes these medical records will help establish her lack of consent and context on DOV.
- [x ] 4. Other: A- Please send copy of Detective Warbis's audio recorded interview with Victim (we received the photographs, but never received this).

Return requested items WITH A COPY OF THIS FORM via SharePoint

If you have any questions regarding this request please contact:

**DPA:** MICHAEL J BOSKA, WSBA #: 40497

**Phone number:** (425) 388-3960

E-mail address: michael.boska@co.snohomish.wa.us

#### \*\*\*\*ATTENTION \*\*\*\*

- RETURN THIS REQUEST WITH ITEMS LISTED ABOVE via SHAREPOINT IF YOUR AGENCY HAS ACCESS
- · SEND COPIES ONLY, DO NOT SEND ORIGINALS.
- · DO NOT SEND DUPLICATES OF THE INITIAL REFERRAL.
- DO NOT SEND FOLLOW-UP VIA E-MAIL

ONLY E-MAIL DPA'S WITH QUESTIONS / CLARIFICATION.

Request for Investigation (3).rtf



$\mathbf{r}$			9 7	<b>-</b> 1	• •	• ,
P	101101	f1	′C	$\vdash \mathbf{v}$	<b>h</b> 1	<b>h</b> 1t
	lain	$\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}$	<b>D</b>	$\mathbf{L}^{\prime}\mathbf{A}$	ш	υπ

<u>K</u>

# TRANSCRIPT IN THE MATTER OF:

IN RE OLIMPIA GEORGIANA YORKS V.

Case no. 2021-00015883

Wednesday, July 28, 2021

ANDERSON TRANSCRIPTION SOLUTIONS LLC 335 W Middle Rd.
Lykens, PA 17048-8823
(704) 840-9351
danderson@andersontranscriptions.com

1	STATE OF WASHINGTON
2	SNOHOMISH COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT
3	CASE NAME: IN RE OLIMPIA GEORGIANA YORKS
4	SNOHOMISH COUNTY CAUSE NO. 2021-00015883
5	TYPE OF AUDIO: MP4 File
6	A/V I.D.: Video Jul 28 2021, 8 32 33 AM
7	DATE: Wednesday, July 28, 2021 TIME: 08:33:32 a.m.
8	PARTIES: Male 1 Mr. Yorks
9	DISCLAIMER: The following <u>may</u> contain indiscernible or inaudible words due to the recording quality and/or accents and speech patterns
LO	of the individuals.
L1	TRANSCRIPT OF AUDIO-RECORDED VIDEO
L2	OFFICER 1: Then you're going to have to
L3	deal with it through the court. You know what I mean?
L 4	MR. YORKS: I know. I mean, we're already
L 5	planning. Last week she purposely didn't show up on
L 6	Thursday. 'Cause I there was a mix up in the days, I
L7	think, and so I got them, like, basically my four my
L8	three night with them.
L 9	OFFICER 1: Yeah.
20	MR. YORKS: I got them that the ruling
21	was on two Thursdays ago and so I understood it. I think
22	we all understood I was going to have them until that
23	Sunday. But when I went back and looked when I got home,
24	I was like, Whoa. They should be going back Friday. I
25	should have had them on Wednesday, but she said to keep

```
them till Sunday and then she just didn't show up last
1
 2
     Thursday. 'Cause last Thursday was my long week 'cause
     it -- it goes with my work 'cause I work 12-hour shifts.
 3
 4
                    OFFICER 1: So do you have an attorney
 5
     involved in all this?
 6
                    MR. YORKS: I do. I mean, we're planning
 7
     on filing something here --
                    OFFICER 1: Yeah.
 8
 9
                    MR. YORKS: -- based on these new
10
     allegations.
11
                    OFFICER 1: Yeah, I could tell.
12
    Absolutely. In your situation, I would absolutely give
13
     them a call.
14
                    MR. YORKS: Mm-hmm.
15
                    OFFICER 1: Because I don't think there's
16
     going to be any other way to resolve this with her and the
17
     way things have been going and all the reports we've
18
     gotten.
19
                    MR. YORKS: Yeah.
20
                    OFFICER 1: I mean --
21
                    MR. YORKS: I mean, are the kids saying
22
     anything right now? Like, they don't want to go or --
23
                    OFFICER 1: All I heard was something about
24
     they just didn't want to go.
25
                    MR. YORKS: Okay. Yeah, and I mean, I
```

```
don't believe that.
1
2
                    OFFICER 1: But don't leave yet. I'm going
 3
     to go up there and find out more and then I'll -- I'll let
 4
     you know what's up.
 5
                    MR. YORKS:
                                Yeah. Okay. Yeah, I was going
     to say too, I mean, even the quardian ad litem said they
 6
 7
     was strong evidence of her coaching the boys when she
    brought them in.
 8
 9
                    OFFICER 1: Yeah.
10
                    MR. YORKS: And even like the -- now the
11
     sexual allegation with my oldest, you know, I --
12
                    OFFICER 1: I have no doubt.
13
                    MR. YORKS:
                                Yeah.
                                       So --
14
                    OFFICER 1: Okay. I mean, I obviously
15
     can't take sides or anything like that.
                                Yeah. Understandable.
16
                    MR. YORKS:
17
                    OFFICER 1:
                                But I get what you're saying.
18
                    MR. YORKS:
                                Yeah.
19
                    OFFICER 1:
                                Okay.
20
                    MR. YORKS:
                                Yeah.
21
                                I'll be right back. Okay.
                    OFFICER 1:
22
                    MR. YORKS:
                                Okay. All right. Thanks.
23
                                All right.
                    OFFICER 1:
24
                    [On phone] I just spoke to an officer and
25
     she's saying that the boys don't want to go, but there's
```

```
nothing that they can actually do, period. They asked me
1
 2
     what I wanted to do and I said I want them to come, of
 3
     course, period. I, kind of, explained what was going on,
     new allegations. And officer I spoke to said he hasn't
 4
 5
     dealt with her before, comma, I think that's what he said,
 6
     comma, but he thinks no doubt to my speaking about the
 7
     kids being coached and whatnot, period.
 8
                    OFFICER 1:
                                Nothing we can do to make
 9
    him -- make them go.
10
                    MR. YORKS:
                                Okay.
11
                    OFFICER 1: -- at this point.
12
                    MR. YORKS:
                                Were --
13
                    OFFICER 1:
                                So the best recourse, like I
14
     told you before, is that's it.
15
                    MR. YORKS:
                                Okay. Can you tell me what the
16
     kids are saying anything?
                                Like --
                                That they just don't feel safe.
17
                    OFFICER 1:
18
                    MR. YORKS:
                                Okay.
19
                                They feel like you're going to
                    OFFICER 1:
     hurt them.
20
21
                    MR. YORKS:
                                Yeah.
                                       Okay. All right.
22
                    OFFICER 1: And do I think that's what's
23
     going on, no.
24
                    MR. YORKS:
                                Yeah.
25
                    OFFICER 1: But is that for me to say?
```

Anderson Transcription Solutions LLC (704)840-9351

```
It's -- I mean --
1
 2
                    MR. YORKS: I know.
                    OFFICER 1: -- so I mean your best recourse
 3
 4
     is obviously through your attorney and try to work it out
 5
     that way.
 6
                    MR. YORKS: Okav. All right. Well I
 7
     appreciate it. And when -- 'cause I drove by a few
    minutes earlier and I saw that she was here with her
 8
 9
    hazards on 'cause -- 'cause she has a protection order, so
10
     I can't be around her except for changing the kids so I
11
     didn't come here until 3:30. But I saw she was here with
12
    her hazards on. Did she call 9-1-1 --
13
                    OFFICER 1: No, it's --
14
                    MR. YORKS: -- earlier or when did she
15
     call? Because you guys rolled up, like, right when I got
16
    here.
17
                    OFFICER 1: Okay. Well, all I know is that
     we get the call about her having to try -- trying to deal
18
19
     with this. As far as the parenting plan goes and stuff,
20
     you can talk to her related to the children; is that
21
     correct?
22
                    MR. YORKS: Well, that's correct. What I'm
23
     trying to find out is, I think, she had already called you
24
     guys before I even showed up here.
25
                    OFFICER 1: Well that could have been
```

```
because if she called, it was because of -- oh, and then
1
 2
    we showed up immediately, as soon as she pulled in.
 3
                    MR. YORKS: As soon as I pulled up, you
 4
     guys were rolling --
 5
                    OFFICER 1: Then she had called prior.
                    MR. YORKS: -- driving right by and I was
 6
 7
     like, what -- what's going on? Like, why --
8
                    OFFICER 1: She called prior probably
 9
     'cause she couldn't talk him into going.
10
                    MR. YORKS:
                                Okay. Maybe, yeah.
11
                    OFFICER 1: Maybe, I don't know.
12
                    MR. YORKS:
                                Yeah.
13
                    OFFICER 1:
                                Okay. So -- all right?
14
                    MR. YORKS:
                                All right.
15
                    OFFICER 1:
                                Anything else I can do for you,
16
    Brian?
                    MR. YORKS:
                                No, I guess that's it.
17
18
                    OFFICER 1:
                                Sorry, man.
19
                    MR. YORKS:
                                No problem.
20
                    OFFICER 1:
                                Yeah, it's a rough thing here.
21
     So you're going through, I -- I get that.
22
                    MR. YORKS:
                                It is. I mean, trying to --
23
     trying to just get divorce and peace and, like, just
24
     constantly -- I don't know why she doesn't stop. I
25
    mean --
```

```
OFFICER 1: Yeah, I don't think you're
1
 2
     going to get to peace for a long time.
 3
                    MR. YORKS:
                                No.
 4
                    OFFICER 1: I mean, I've been through a
 5
     divorce and all that stuff and it was a long time ago and
     my kids are out of the house now, but going through that
 6
 7
     time, it was tough as hell.
 8
                    MR. YORKS: I always knew divorce to her
 9
     would be worse than married. I mean, it's -- she doesn't
10
     think the kids are -- they're mine. They're only hers.
11
     (Indiscernible.)
12
                    OFFICER 1: Yeah.
13
                    MR. YORKS:
                                (Indiscernible.)
                                                  She keeps
14
    making allegations. I mean, I allegations against you
15
     guys even.
16
                    OFFICER 1: Oh yeah, yeah. We're aware.
17
                    MR. YORKS: Yeah, allegations against
18
     people that she had renting the house and stuff, and it's
19
     like, first of all, I don't understand why she just -- you
20
     guys know that she lies about things and, like, nothing
21
    happens. It's like --
22
                    OFFICER 1: There's not much we can do
23
     until we can absolutely prove it beyond a reasonable
24
     doubt.
25
                    MR. YORKS: I know, I get that. And man, I
```

Anderson Transcription Solutions LLC (704)840-9351

```
wish -- I wish the original stuff with me -- I don't know
1
 2
     if she told you or you know, that she accused me of rape
 3
     and being abusive and stuff. And, like, I just remember
 4
     reading that police report. There's so many -- so many
 5
     things in there I -- I know I can disprove text messages
     and stuff that she lied, but I can't speak about it all
 6
 7
     and it's frustrating.
                    OFFICER 1:
 8
                                Yeah.
 9
                    MR. YORKS: But, you know, I made peace
10
     that nothing will happen with that. It's just the
11
     ongoing, what it's doing to the kids. You know, it's --
12
     when I saw the police report about the -- you know, the --
13
     a week ago or last week, like, man, that --
14
                    OFFICER 1: Yeah.
15
                    MR. YORKS: -- that really upset me.
16
                    OFFICER 1:
                                Yeah.
17
                    MR. YORKS:
                                Like, not to do anything
18
     criminal or anything, but just what she's doing to the
19
     kids. I'm just like, I can't believe that. Like --
20
                    OFFICER 1:
                                Yeah.
                                       So --
21
                    MR. YORKS:
                                Yeah.
22
                    OFFICER 1: Dude, I'm so sorry.
23
                    MR. YORKS:
                                So --
24
                    OFFICER 1:
                                Wish I could do more.
25
                    MR. YORKS:
                                I appreciate it.
```

Anderson Transcription Solutions LLC (704)840-9351

```
1
                     OFFICER 1:
                                  Okay.
 2
                     MR. YORKS:
                                  Okay.
 3
                                  Take care. All right?
                     OFFICER 1:
 4
                     MR. YORKS: Thanks. You too.
 5
     (Video concluded.)
     ///
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER 2 I, Deborah S. Anderson, a court-approved 3 4 transcriber, certify that the foregoing is a full, 5 true, and correct transcript, transcribed to the best of my ability from the official electronic sound 6 7 recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled 8 matter; 9 That I am neither an attorney, not employed by, 10 related to, nor of counsel for any of the parties named 11 herein, nor otherwise interested in the outcome of this 12 action. 13 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto sent my hand: 14 15 16 Deborah S. Anderson, CET-998 Anderson Transcription Solutions LLC 17 18 335 W Middle Road 19 Lykens, PA 17048-8823 20 704.840.9351 21 22 Date: June 13, 2025 AAERT Certification effective until February 8, 2027 23 24 25

$\mathbf{r}$	.1 •		•	_ 1	l • 1	• .
Ρ	lain	t1††	'C	$oldsymbol{H} \mathbf{v} oldsymbol{I}$	h1	h1t
1	Iam	LILL	<b>O</b> .		יעעו	or

 $\underline{\mathbf{L}}$ 



# Lake Stevens Police Department Compact

Print Date/Time: Login ID: 07/29/2021 15:16

Login ID: ss0143 Case Number: 2021-00

2021-00015883

ORI Number:

Lake Stevens Police Department

WA0311900

Case Details:

Case Number:

2021-00015883

Location:

523 SR 9 NE

LAKE STEVENS,WA 98258

Incident Type: Occurred From: Civil

07/28/2021 15:14 07/28/2021 15:14

Occurred Thru: Reported Date:

07/28/2021 15:14 Wednesday

Reporting Officer ID:

SS0126-Hingtgen

Status:

Open

Status Date:

07/29/2021

Offenses

No. Gr	oup/ORI	Crime Code	Statute	Description			Counts
Subjects							
Туре	No.	Name	Address	Phone	Race	Sex	DOB/Age
Other Invol	lved 1	YORKS, BRIAN	1410 HOYT AVE	(206) 395-4501	Unknown	Male	05/03/1979
		CHRISTOPHER	EVERETT,WA 98201				42
Other Invol	lved 2	YORKS, OLIMPIA GEORGIANA	1526 85TH AVE NE	(425) 535-6334	White	Female	02/24/1986
			LAKE STEVENS,WA 98	258			35
Other Invol	lved 3	Child Victim of	sexual Assault LAKE STEVENS,WA 98	258	White	Male	10/21/2013 7
Subject #	1-Other	Involved					
Primary: Name: Address:	No YORKS, 1410 HC	BRIAN CHRISTOPHER	Race: Unknown Height: 6ft 1 in	Sex: Male Weight: 180	e DOB	:	05/03/1979
Primary Phor	EVERET	T WA 98201 ) 395-4501	Eyes: BRO State:	Hair: BRO			42
Subject # Primary: Name: Address: Primary Phor	No YORKS, 1526 85 LAKE ST	Involved OLIMPIA GEORGIANA ITH AVE NE EVENS WA 98258 ) 535-6334	Race: White Height: 5ft 4 in Eyes: BRO State:	Sex: Ferr Weight: 180. Hair: BRC	0 lbs.	-	02/24/1986 35
Subject #	3-Other	Involved					,
Primary: Name: Address:	No Child V	ictim of sexual	Race: White	Sex: Male	e DOB	:	10/21/2013
Audress:	LAKE ST	EVENS WA 98258	Hair: BRO	Age:	7		

#### **Arrests**

State:

Arrest No.	Name		Address		Date/Time	Туре	Age
Property							
Date	Code	Туре	Make	Model	Description	Tag No.	Item No.



# Lake Stevens Police Department Compact

Print Date/Time Login ID:

Print Date/Time: 07/29/2021 15:16

ss0143

**Case Number:** 2021-00015883

ORI Number:

Lake Stevens Police Department

WA0311900

Ve	sh	ic	10	
V t	:11	10.	ıı	-

No.	Role	Vehicle Type	Year	Make	Model	Color	License Plate	State

Liquor Board
Dawson Place
Juvenile Court
Juvenile Prosecutor
Mental Health
APS
District Court
Municipal Court
DOL
CPS
Other
City Attorney
County Prosecutor
Federal Prosecutor
Domestic Violence Unit

☐ City Prosecutor☐ Detectives

### SS Case, Officer: ss0126, Supervisor: ss0126, Merged By: ss0163

LAKE STEVENS POLICE DEPARTMENT	Initial Case Report
1825 S Lake Stevens Road Lake Stevens, WA 98258 (425) 622-9401	Case Report # <b>2021-00015883</b>

	OCCURRED INCIDENT TYPE	_		1		REPORTED		ASSO	CIATED	CASES	
	Civi				7/28/202						
氙	LOCATION OF OCCURRENCE			loc	CURRE	DATE/TIME	Ξ				
EVENT	523 SR 9 NE				7/28/202						
	LAKE STEVENS, WA 98258			1		) THROUGH					
			7.555 / D500015		7/28/202	<u>1 15:14</u>		<u> </u>		1	
ťΛ		SIAI	UTE / DESCRIF	HON					Counts	Attempt/Commit	
OFFENSES											
ž									~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~		
H											
느			<del></del>	······································		······································					
_											
	☐ NON-DISCLOSURE										
	SUBJECT TYPE NAM	1E				WARRANCE CARLO CONTROL		DOB /	AGE RA	NGE	
	Other Involved Adu	It / YORK	S, BRIAN CHR	ISTOPH	ER				5/03/1979		
<u> </u>	ADDRESS							PRIMA	ARY PHO	NE	
SUBJECT	1410 HOYT AVE								06)395-4		
2	EVERETT, WA 98201							SECO	NDARY	PHONE	
$\Xi$		······	<b>.</b>					<u> </u>			
V)	RACE		SEX	HEIGH		1	HAIR		ĮE	EYE	
	Unknown		Male	6'	1	180		BRO		BRO	
	DL NUMBER		DL STATE			EMPLOYER	· ·				
	Drivers License  ☐ NON-DISCLOSURE		W.	Α							
								DOB /	AGE RA	NGE	
	Other Involved Adult / YORKS, OLIMPIA GEORGIANA							ł	02/24/1986		
<u></u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							PRIMARY PHONE			
ပ္ပ	1526 85TH AVE NE								(425)535-6334		
$\Xi$							SECONDARY PHONE				
SUBJECT											
ဟ	RACE		SEX	HEIGH	Γ	WEIGHT	HAIR		E	EYE	
	White		Female	5'	4	180		BRO		BRO	
	DL NUMBER		DL STATE	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •							
	Drivers License Number		W	<u> </u>		VEAD	- 10	AL AA			
	PROPERTY CODE					YEAR	Ic	OLOR			
ш	TYPE /										
2	MAKE /										
	PLATE STATE	VIN					VA	UE			
3			-								
	DESCRIPTION						. 1				
	PROPERTY CODE										
>					T				······		
R	SERIAL NUMBER	QTY/UI	NIT OF MEASUR	₹E	VALUE COL			LOR			
밀	TYPE /				<u></u>				A		
~	TYPE / MAKE /		MODEL /								
古	DESCRIPTION		WODEL!								
	Carolin Hola										

REPORTING OFFICER / ID #		APPROVING SUPERVISOR
Hingtgen, Michael	0126	Hingtgen, Michael

Case Number: 2021-00015883. ORI: WA0311900.

Page: 4 of 6



#### LAKE STEVENS POLICE DEPARTMENT 1825 S Lake Stevens Road Lake Stevens, WA 98258

Lake Stevens, WA 98258 (425) 622-9401

### Initial Case Report

Case Report # 2021-00015883

			ADDITION	IAL SUBJEC	TS			
	☐ NON-DISCLOSURE							
	SUBJECT TYPE Other Involved	NAME Juvenile / Child	d Victim of sexual /	Assault			DOB / AGE R 10/21/2013	ANGE
S	ADDRESS Child Victim of sexual							ONE
SUBJECT	LAKE STEVENS, WAS	98258					SECONDARY	PHONE
S	RACE White		SEX Male	HEIGHT	WEIGHT	HAIR	BRO	EYE
	DL NUMBER		DL STATE WA	4	EMPLOYER	ŧ .		
	☐ NON-DISCLOSURE					***************************************		
	SUBJECT TYPE	NAME					DOB / AGE R	ANGE
ᅜ	ADDRESS						PRIMARY PH	ONE
SUBJECT							SECONDARY	PHONE
တ	RACE		SEX	HEIGHT	WEIGHT	HAIR		EYE
	DL NUMBER		DL STATE	•	EMPLOYER	ŧ		
	☐ NON-DISCLOSURE							
	SUBJECT TYPE	NAME					DOB / AGE R	ANGE
당	ADDRESS						PRIMARY PH	ONE
SUBJECT							SECONDARY	PHONE
ဟ	RACE		SEX	HEIGHT	WEIGHT	HAIR		EYE
	DL NUMBER		DL STATE		EMPLOYER	Į.		
	☐ NON-DISCLOSURE							
	SUBJECT TYPE	NAME					DOB / AGE R	ANGE
ECT	ADDRESS						PRIMARY PH	ONE
SUBJECT							SECONDARY	PHONE
တ	RACE		SEX	HEIGHT	WEIGHT	HAIR		EYE
	DL NUMBER		DL STATE		EMPLOYER	t.		
	☐ NON-DISCLOSURE							
	SUBJECT TYPE	NAME					DOB / AGE R	
ECT	ADDRESS						PRIMARY PH	
SUBJECT							SECONDARY	
ဟ	RACE		SEX	HEIGHT		HAIR		EYE
	DL NUMBER		DL STATE		EMPLOYER	Ĺ		
	PORTING OFFICER / ID #	-		VING SUPERVI	SOR			
_ t	lingtgen, Michael	01	26 Hing	tgen, Michael				·····

Case Number: 2021-00015883. ORI: WA0311900.

Page: 5 of 6



#### Initial Case Report

Case Report # 2021-00015883

#### **NARRATIVE**

#### Sergeant M. Hingtgen #126 Lake Stevens Police Department

Case Number: Incident Location: 2021-15883 523 SR 9 NE

Incident Type:

Civil

On the time and date of this incident, I, Michael Hingtgen, was assigned to patrol in the city of Lake Stevens, WA. I was operating a fully marked patrol car with large reflective words "POLICE" on both the driver and passenger side of the vehicle. My patrol vehicle has an attached overhead emergency light bar with both red and blue LED lighting. My vehicle is also equipped with an external audible siren. During patrol, I was wearing a uniform with

the department patches on each shoulder and the words "Police" on the chest and back.

#### Narrative:

On 7/28/21 at approximately 1517 hrs., I was dispatched to a suspicious complaint near the TJ Maxx, 523 SR 9 NE. The reporting party, Yorks, Olimpia G, indicated that she was attempting to do a custody exchange with her exhusband Yorks, Brian C (5/3/79) and their son refused to go with him.

I arrived onscene and contacted Olimpia in the parking lot near her black Jeep Grand Cherokee. Olimpia was at the rear drivers side door talking with her son, Child I could hear Child crying in the back. Olimpia kept repeating questions similar to, "Why don't you want to go to your dads," and "How does he hurt you?" The only thing I could clearly hear from him as a response was "I don't like the food."

I asked Olimpia what I could help her with. Olimpia informed me that approximately two weeks prior, Child Violim disclosed to her that Brian had assaulted him by touching his, "private parts." She stated that this was the first time that she has tried to get Child to go with Brian since then. I asked Olimpia if this had previously been reported. She stated that CPS and Lake Stevens PD had already been informed. See also LSPD #2021-15449.

I told Olimpia that we would not be assisting with forcefully removing anyone from the vehicle and would not be enforcing a civil parenting plan. I told Olimpia that her compliance with the parenting plan was a decision between her and Brian. Olimpia stated that she was going to take the children home and Brian left as well.

#### Recommendations:

N/A

#### Attachments:

N/A

This report was submitted from an electronic device owned, issued, or maintained by a law enforcement agency using my user ID and password. I certify or declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct.

REPORTING OFFICER / ID#		APPROVING SUPERVISOR
Hingtgen, Michael	0126	Hingtgen, Michael
LOCATION SIGNED Snohomish County, WA		DATE SIGNED 07/29/2021



#### LAKE STEVENS POLICE DEPARTMENT 1825 S Lake Stevens Road Lake Stevens, WA 98258 (425) 622-9401

#### Initial Case Report

Case Report # 2021-00015883

#### NARRATIVE (continuation)

I CERTIFY UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON THAT THE FOREGOING STATEMENT IS TR	UE
AND CORRECT, AND I AM ENTERING MY AUTHORIZED USER ID AND PASSWORD TO AUTHENTICATE IT.	

Michael Hingtgen #126

7/29/2021

Lake Stevens, WA

Officer

Date

**Location Signed** 

This report was submitted from an electronic device owned, issued, or maintained by a law enforcement agency using my user ID and password. I certify or declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct.

REPORTING OFFICER / ID#		APPROVING SUPERVISOR
Hingtgen, Michael	0126	Hingtgen, Michael
LOCATION SIGNED Snohomish County, WA		DATE SIGNED 07/29/2021

## **Redaction Log**

Reason	Page (# of occurrences)	Description
Child Victim of sexual Assault	1 (1) 2 (1) 3 (2) 6 (2) 7 (4)	Child victim of sexual assault's name, address, phone number, email address, usernamepassword, location, and photograph (and, in cases where the victim is a relative, step-sibling, or step-child of the alleged perpetrator, the child's relationship to the perpetrator) are REDACTED pursuant to RCW 42.56.240(5).
Drivers License Number	<b>5</b> (2)	Driver's license number(s) are REDACTED as personal information under RCW 42.56.230(5) and RCW 9.35.005(1)