the State in an adversarial judicial system. As for my questionable incarceration, Erick Thomson did his job well, my court appointed counsel did not. Based upon this previous performance I supposed Mr. Thomson would take the special responsibilities for a Prosecutor seriously & would act as outlined in I.C.R.3.8, which I mention in the second paragraph of the letter; clearly expressing the duties of a minister of Justice with specific obligations to rectify the conviction of innocent persons

- (D.) When I drafted the letter of 9/29/16, I was operating as Pro-Se due to confusion regarding the status of court appointed counsel & my unanswered objection. I am seeking an informal resolution through mitigation
- (E.) I believed Erick Thomson could be an appropriate mitigator because he is Not an actor in the Post-Conviction Relief Case. The letter was sent to Mr. Thomson, at the Prosecutor's Office, in an attempt to be transparent & give parties the ability to say "Thanks, but No Thanks". Language indicates this is not a threat, but an offer which can be refused, i.e., "...asking you to consider..." doing this and such. "...let us mitigate... decide what action may be acceptable to all parties," etc.
- (F.) Logic dictates that it would be stupid for me to threaten someone who can't do what I want in the first place. NO THREAT was made beyond the Lawful threat to continue taking legal action against the State in an adversarial Judicial process. When Judge Smith commented upon this letter, which he read & reviewed; Judge Smith stated in court on 10/19/16, with myself present telephonically, Richard Linville the Prosecuting Attorney of Gem County present & Counsel Rolfe Kehne present: That he saw No threat in my letter. I allege that Gem County was answer shopping. When Judge Smith, who is familiar w/ the entire context of the case, stated in court there was no threat, the prosecution sought a change of venue to find an environment more favorable to the State, & less informed.
- (G.) My attempts to prick the State's conscience w/ references to a Just God, whom I believe to exist; should have no effect on a Godless State. I fear God's Justice & Retribution. You can do as you please.
- (H.) The State refused my offer several months ago. I have moved my chess pieces & contacted the parties, who awaited instructions, & have done the things I said I would do none of which have been unlawful & am continuing to execute my plan as we speak; I believe w/ the help of a Just God. i still sit in prison past my fixed time, w/ my children in harm's way as the State obstructs my ability to be heard or released.

(I.) I allege malicious prosecution; there will be no plea. ELEMENTS: (1) The initiation of continuation of a lawsuit, (2) Lack of probable cause, (3) malice; & (4) Favorable termination of the lawsuit.

I only lack the final ELEMENT. What has happened has been your doing. I suggest a dismissal with prejudice. Retribution does not restore.

- (J.) According to Black's Law Dictionary
- 1. Threat: A communicated intent to inflict harm or loss on another on another's property, esp. one that might diminish a person's freedom to act voluntarily or w/ lawful consent <the kidnapper's threat was that if the magnate did not meet the demands, his son would never be seen again.>
 - 2. An indication of an approaching menace <the threat of bankruptcy>.
- 3. A person or thing that might well cause harm <Mrs. Harrington testified that she never viewed her husband as a threat. This definition as well as other definitions in Webster's Dictionary & the Oxford Dictionary agree that there are both lawful threats & unlawful threats. Kidnapping is unlawful, but going bankrupt is not. Both are unpleasant.

<Earthquakes are a constant threat in Japan.> <He threatened to beat me at checkers> <Rap music threatens sanity>.

(K.) Lawful threats are a well established part of an adversarial judicial process. They are frequently used by prosecutors to obtain plea agreements, deals & compromises which affect due process of law & pre-trial negotiations.

Other informal resolutions are used daily to resolve and mitigate legal issues; like my plea agreement.

The Prosecution communicated their intent to inflict harm & loss upon me, my property & my loved ones, unless I consented to entering guilty plea in the Felony injury of a child case, after they realized no aggravated assault had occurred, & I would go free. My personal freedom & ability to act voluntarily or w/ lawful consent was diminished. My wife w/ cancer was going to lose our home w/ me incarcerated, & I was afraid for my children's safety in the Idaho State Child Welfare System. After my arrest I lost everything & have spent no time w/ them since. Total loss. In the letter I drafted on 9/29/16, I admit I made "an indication of an approaching menace." I maintain that "I am coming to you from a position of legal strength..." I believe the time has passed for me to offer

other possible solutions besides seeing this through to the end. Make no mistake, I am threatening to beat the State at checkers. As for Erick's claim that he thought I meant him or his family some sort of actual injury... I find this claim offensive. I am not the party that deprives families of fathers. This claim of physical harm is repugnant to me & further evidence of intent to maliciously prosecute a man whom the State knows to be innocent... or perhaps a combination of an overactive imagination & guilty conscience. In either case - NONSENSE. I'm not responsible for another man's perception, only my intent to seek a semblance of justice. According to I.C.R.P. Rule 11; I STATE THAT ALL DATA INCLUDED IN THIS DOCUMENTIS TRUE & CORRECT TO MY KNOWLEDGE & BELIEF. "Let God be true, but all men liars." Dated this 20 of April, 2017. Byron Lee Sanchez STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO DISMISS - 4