

HONORABLE JAMES L. ROBERT

Harry E. Ries
P.O. Box 1849
Moses Lake, WA 98837



FEB 17 2017

CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
DEPUTY

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON**

STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Plaintiff,

v.

DONALD TRUMP, in his official capacity as President of the United States; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY; JOHN F. KELLY, in his official capacity as Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security; TOM SHANNON, In his official capacity as Acting Secretary of State; and the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:17-CV-00141-jlr

DECLARATION IN OPPOSITION TO POSITION TAKEN BY STATE OF WASHINGTON AND IN CONTINUED REPRESENTATION BY WASHINGTON ATTORNEY GENERAL

HARRY E. RIES hereby declares as follows:

I am a resident of the State of Washington, and have been since 1948. I reside in Grant County, Washington. I graduated from Moses Lake High School in 1966, served honorably in the United States Marine Corps from 1966 to 1968,

1 graduated from the University of Washington in 1977, and graduated with honors
2 from Gonzaga School of Law in December, 1979. I was admitted to the
3 Washington State Bar Association in the spring of 1980, and remain a member. I
4 was engaged in the private practice of law for approximately 35 years until I
5 accepted a judicial appointment as Commissioner of the Grant County Superior
6 Court in 2015.
7

8 I write this Declaration to voice my opposition to the position asserted by
9 the Attorney General of the State of Washington in his *COMPLAINT FOR*
10 *DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF* (hereinafter referred to as
11 “COMPLAINT”) filed with this Court. Further, I write this Declaration to
12 express my belief that the Attorney General of the State of Washington cannot
13 ethically or legally pursue this action on behalf of the corporations and
14 individuals that he purports to represent. I do not submit this declaration in any
15 professional capacity. Instead, I submit it merely as a lifelong resident of the
16 State of Washington.
17

18 I am one of over one million, two hundred thousand Washington residents
19 who voted for and supported, and still support, the Honorable Donald Trump,
20 President of the United States. In the COMPLAINT filed in this action, the
21 Attorney General of the State of Washington states:
22
23

1 “9. The State’s interest in preventing and
2 remediating injuries to the public’s health, safety, and
3 well-being extends to all of the State’s residents,
4 including individuals who suffer indirect injuries and
5 members of the general public.”

6 I am certainly a “resident”, as are many others whose interests are not being
7 represented by the Attorney General of the State of Washington in the present
8 litigation.

9 According to the language of the COMPLAINT, the action taken by the
10 Attorney General of the State of Washington arises as a reaction to Executive
11 Order 13769, signed by President Trump on January 27, 2017. According to the
12 plain language of that executive order, its purpose is to provide protection to the
13 citizens and residents of the United States, including residents of the State of
14 Washington. Executive Order 13769 is directly authorized by the United States
15 Congress in its grant of exclusive authority to the President under 8 U.S.C. §
16 1182(f) to suspend the entry of any or all aliens for such period as he shall deem
17 necessary, or impose any restrictions on entry that he deems appropriate.

18 The Attorney General of the State of Washington alleges that many
19 immigrants who are residents of the State of Washington are employed by
20 Microsoft, Amazon, Expedia and Starbucks, and states:
21

22 “The market for highly skilled workers and leaders
23 in the technology industry is extremely competitive.

1 Changes to U.S. immigration policy that restrict the flow
2 of people may inhibit these companies' ability to
3 adequately staff their research and development efforts
4 and recruit talent from overseas. If recruiting efforts are
5 less successful, these companies' abilities to develop and
6 deliver successful products and services may be
7 adversely affected."

8 COMPLAINT, ¶ 13.

9 Apparently, at least 76 Microsoft employees might be affected by the
10 executive order. Some Amazon employees may be affected. The executive order
11 may cause Expedia to incur increased business costs. The executive order may
12 impact 230 college students, 13 individuals, and "an unknown number of
13 Washington residents from the affected countries".

14 The COMPLAINT goes on to allege that the executive order (1) violates
15 the equal protection rights of these known and unknown persons; (2) violates the
16 establishment clause because it prefers one religion over another; (3) violates the
17 due process of these individuals; (4) discriminates in the issuance of visas; (5)
18 denies certain individuals the right to apply for asylum; (6) forecloses the ability
19 of some to apply for relief under the Convention Against Torture; (7) may
20 prevent certain people from practicing their religion while in detention, or from
21 taking religious holidays, and thereby violates the Religious Freedom Restoration
22 Act; and (8) somehow violates the Administrative Procedures Act. All of these

1 “causes of action”, so states the Attorney General of the State of Washington,
2 “causes ongoing harm to Washington residents.”

3 The COMPLAINT, while couched in terms of representing the State of
4 Washington, is nothing more than a civil action on behalf of Microsoft and some
5 of its employees, Amazon, Expedia, Starbucks, 230 college students, and some
6 other unknown persons. It is not, however, an action that “extends to all of the
7 State’s residents”.

8
9 The Attorney General of the State of Washington has stated on his official
10 website:

11 “State law *prohibits* the Attorney General, deputy
12 attorneys general, and assistant attorney generals from
13 engaging in the private practice of law.

14 This means that they cannot represent private citizens in
15 court either to bring an action on behalf of an individual,
or to defend an individual.

16 Any private citizen needing such representation should
17 consult a private attorney.”

18 Taken from the website of the Washington State Office of the Attorney General:
19 atg.wa.gov – Roles of the Office.

20 I have previously expressed my concerns to the Attorney General of the
21 State of Washington in a letter directed to Robert Ferguson dated February 8,
22 2017. I have attached a copy of that letter to this Declaration.
23

1 In that letter, I point out to the Attorney General that I believe he has a
2 conflict of interest. The Attorney General is representing one small class of
3 Washington residents (and non-residents) to the exclusion of the class of
4 residents to which I belong. I would define that class as a class of Washington
5 residents who believes that Executive Order 13769 as signed by the President of
6 the United States on January 27, 2017, is a lawful executive order by the
7 President designed to protect citizens and residents of the United States,
8 including residents of the State of Washington, without regard to their political
9 beliefs. Further, that class is made up of individuals who believe that additional
10 measures to screen immigrants are legal and appropriate to ensure the safety of
11 all members of the class, all residents of the State of Washington, and all other
12 citizens and residents of the United States. Finally, that class believes that the
13 plain language of the executive order does not implicate the religious beliefs or
14 freedoms of those who might be affected by its enforcement.
15
16

17 While Microsoft and Starbucks are certainly entitled to equal protection of
18 the law, so certainly am I and other similarly situated persons who are also
19 residents of the State of Washington. But, what neither Microsoft, Starbucks nor
20 I are entitled to is to have the Attorney General of the State of Washington bring
21 a civil action to protect our private interests. This would hold true for the 76
22
23

1 Microsoft employees, 230 college students and other individuals referred to the
2 COMPLAINT.

3 The Attorney General of the State of Washington also states in the
4 COMPLAINT that the issues raised are matters of public concern. With that I
5 agree. However, my public concern is quite different than the public concern
6 espoused by the Attorney General. The Attorney General also states:
7

8
9 “The State also has an interest in ensuring that its
10 residents are not excluded from the benefits that flow
11 from participation in the federal system, including the
rights and privileges provided by the U.S. Constitution
and federal law.”

12 COMPLAINT, ¶ 8

13 I can only assume that what is meant by the above-quoted language is that
14 being able to enjoy the benefits of the federal system, “including the rights and
15 privileges provided by the U.S. Constitution and federal law” only applies to
16 residents of the State of Washington who agree with the interpretation of the U.S.
17 Constitution and federal law as pronounced by the Attorney General of the State
18 of Washington. I do not agree with that interpretation. Nor, do I believe that the
19 Attorney General of the State of Washington should be able to force his
20 politically motivated interpretation upon me, in the name of protecting my
21 interests as a resident of this State.
22
23

1 I, and other similarly situated persons, have been labeled as deplorable,
2 bigot, racist, misogynist, narcissistic, fascist, Nazi, homophobic, uneducated,
3 unintelligent, and poorly informed, as well as countless other disparaging terms
4 (or non-disparaging depending upon your point of view) for voicing our support
5 for the President of the United States. While I could take the time to deny each
6 such label, that denial would be absolutely irrelevant and meaningless to those
7 who have placed those labels upon me. Whether I am any of those things, all of
8 those things, or none of those things, I am still entitled to the same representation
9 as those whom the Attorney General of the State of Washington purports to
10 represent in this litigation. My views, concerns and fears are no less important,
11 and no less worthy. Yet, in this litigation they are treated as if nonexistent.
12 While I am sure that we are all concerned with a better cup of coffee, is it really
13 the role of the Attorney General of the State of Washington to protect the
14 research and development capabilities of Starbucks, Microsoft, Expedia, and
15 Amazon, to the exclusion of the rights of other residents of the State of
16 Washington? I, for one, would hope not.

17
18
19
20 I am quite sure that the court is not interested in my views concerning the
21 merits of the action filed on behalf of the residents of the State of Washington.
22 This Declaration has nothing to do with the merits, if there are any. I simply
23

1 want to make sure that the court is aware that the interests of a large number of
2 Washington residents are not being addressed by the Attorney General of the
3 State of Washington, regardless of what he might say otherwise. In fact, quite to
4 the contrary, they are being ignored.

5
6 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of
7 Washington that the foregoing is true and correct.

8 Signed this 15 day of February, 2017 at Ephrata, Washington.

9
10
11 
12 HARRY E. RIES
13 Resident of the State of Washington
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

February 8, 2017

Robert W. Ferguson
Attorney General of the State of Washington
800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000
Seattle, WA 98104-3188

RE: State of *Washington v. Donald Trump, et al.*
United States District Court, Western District of Washington No. 17-35105

Mr. Ferguson:

I am a resident of Grant County, State of Washington. I have read and considered the *Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief* filed by you on behalf of a group of Washington residents, a small group of Washington businesses, and two public universities, in the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington. I have also read and considered Executive Order 13769, signed by President Donald Trump on January 27, 2017.

This letter is to formally advise you that I do not share the views that you allege in the *Complaint*. Nor do I share the legal conclusions you reach. I believe that Executive Order 13769 is a proper exercise of presidential authority as granted by the United States Constitution and the laws of the United States. I also firmly believe that the State of Washington lacks judicial standing to assert the claims it asserts, and lacks authority to prosecute this action on behalf of the individuals, companies and universities it purports to represent.

This letter will serve as my demand that, to the extent the State of Washington asserts any position in the above-entitled legal action, that it assert my position as well.

In *the Complaint* you allege:

“7. The State’s interest in protecting the health, safety, and well-being of its residents, including protecting its residents from harms to their physical or economic health, is a quasi-sovereign interest.

. . .

9. The State’s interest in preventing and remedying injuries to the public’s health, safety, and well-being extends to all of the State’s residents, including individuals who suffer indirect injuries and members of the general public.”

Mr. Robert Ferguson

February 8, 2017

Page 2

It is my belief that Executive Order 13769 is designed solely to protect me and my fellow citizens. I see your “political grandstanding” as a direct threat to my health and safety, and a direct threat to the health and safety of millions of other residents of this State, whether they share my views or not. I expect you to prevent and remedy injuries to my health, safety, and well-being. You specifically acknowledge that to be the “interest” of this State.

Rule 1.7 of the Rules of Professional Conduct states as follows:

“(a) Except as provided in paragraph (b), a lawyer shall not represent a client if the representation involves a concurrent conflict of interest. A concurrent conflict of interest exists if:

(1) the representation of one client will be directly adverse to another client; or
(2) there is a significant risk that the representation of one or more clients will be materially limited by the lawyer's responsibilities to another client, a former client or a third person or by a personal interest of the lawyer.

(b) Notwithstanding the existence of a concurrent conflict of interest under paragraph (a), a lawyer may represent a client if:

(1) the lawyer reasonably believes that the lawyer will be able to provide competent and diligent representation to each affected client;
(2) the representation is not prohibited by law;
(3) the representation does not involve the assertion of a claim by one client against another client represented by the lawyer in the same litigation or other proceeding before a tribunal; and
(4) each affected client gives informed consent, confirmed in writing (following authorization from the other client to make any required disclosures).”

Based upon what is asserted in the *Complaint*, I am of the opinion that you will be unable to “provide competent and diligent representation” to me. You have a conflict of interest. You do not have my consent to further the political agenda set forth in your *Complaint*. Nor do you have my consent to state, directly, indirectly or otherwise, that you represent the residents of the State of Washington.

Very truly yours,

HARRY E. RIES
P.O. Box 1849
Moses Lake, WA 98837

RIES
 P.O. Box 1849
 MOSES LAKE, WA
 98837



1007



98101

U.S. POSTAGE
 PAID
 EPHRATA, WA
 98823
 FEB 15, 17
 AMOUNT

\$23.75
 R2305E123433-03



E K 2 9 7 9 2 9 9 4 0 U S



**PRIORITY
 ★ MAIL ★
 EXPRESS™**

WRITE FIRMLY TO MAKE ALL COPIES LEGIBLE.

CUSTOMER USE ONLY

FROM: (PLEASE PRINT) _____ PHONE () _____

PAYMENT BY ACCOUNT (if applicable)

DELIVERY OPTIONS (Customer Use Only)

SIGNATURE REQUIRED Note: The mailer must check the "Signature Required" box if the mailer: 1) Requires the addressee's signature; OR 2) Purchases additional insurance; OR 3) Purchases COD service; OR 4) Purchases Return Receipt service. If the box is not checked, the Postal Service will leave the item in the addressee's mail receptacle or other secure location without attempting to obtain the addressee's signature on delivery.

Delivery Options

No Saturday Delivery (delivered next business day)

Sunday/Holiday Delivery Required (additional fee, where available*)

10:30 AM Delivery Required (additional fee, where available*)

*Refer to USPS.com® or local Post Office™ for availability.

TO: (PLEASE PRINT) _____ PHONE () _____

ZIP + 4® (U.S. ADDRESSES ONLY)

ORIGIN (POSTAL SERVICE USE ONLY)

1-Day 2-Day Military DPO

PO ZIP Code	Scheduled Delivery Date (MM/DD/YY)	Postage	
		\$	
Date Accepted (MM/DD/YY)	Scheduled Delivery Time	Insurance Fee	COD Fee
	<input type="checkbox"/> 10:30 AM <input type="checkbox"/> 3:00 PM <input type="checkbox"/> 12 NOON	\$	\$
Time Accepted	10:30 AM Delivery Fee	Return Receipt Fee	Live Animal Transportation Fee
<input type="checkbox"/> AM <input type="checkbox"/> PM	\$	\$	\$
Weight	Sunday/Holiday Premium Fee	Total Postage & Fees	
lbs. ozs.	\$	\$	
	Acceptance Employee Initials		

DELIVERY (POSTAL SERVICE USE ONLY)

Delivery Attempt (MM/DD/YY)	Time	Employee Signature
	<input type="checkbox"/> AM <input type="checkbox"/> PM	
Delivery Attempt (MM/DD/YY)	Time	Employee Signature
	<input type="checkbox"/> AM <input type="checkbox"/> PM	

- For pickup or USPS Tracking™, visit USPS.com or call 800-222-1811.
- \$100.00 insurance included.

LABEL 11-B, JANUARY 2014

PSN 7690-02-000-9996

3-ADDRESSEE COPY