

STATE OF ARIZONA ) IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA  
 ) ARFLP RULE 74 “PARENTING COORDINATORS”  
 ) (AND RELATED CAUSE NO. CV2015-014152)

PETITIONER, )  
 Martin Lynch ) RE: PETITION TO AMMEND  
 ) ARFLP RULE 74 R-16-000XX

NOTICE PROVIDED TO, )  
 Scott Bales, )  
 Chief Justice of the AZ State Supreme Court )  
 Janet Barton, )  
 Presiding Judge Maricopa County Superior Court )  
 Susan Pickard, Special Assistant to Judge Barton )  
 John and Jane Does )

### **Notice of Federal *Younger* Doctrine Alert**

It is a serious concern to this Petitioner that electronic files for other proposed Rule Changes previously submitted to this court forum have apparently been corrupted in a manner that might constitute “probable cause“ and that it was done intentionally, maliciously and unlawfully. Petitioner has no means of determining how or who or by what means these file were corrupted but, the FBI could find out. This document is an open declaration by Petitioner that “The Rule of Law Shall Prevail”. This includes respect for the due process right of those “Noticed” in this document to be duly informed in a timely manner of the full extent of current and actual, as well as potential subsequent charges that might arise and the associated remedies to which they might be exposed.

Therefore, comes now Petitioner, Martin Lynch, noticing the Court and all parties of the fact that he is giving his formal Federal *Younger* doctrine alert, as to any and all Federal questions raised within these proceedings that may still lack proper resolution in compliance with written

law and established due process, and providing fair and reasonable opportunity for the Arizona State court system to comply with all aspects of Federal law therein, by stating and providing thusly:

As shall be thoroughly detailed by the undersigned's arguments, testimonies, and exhibits as offered in this Rule Change petition and associated Civil action CV2015-014152 the Arizona Court now has the opportunity to correct the problems and breaches of law "Noticed" herein. The corruption of files, whether intentional or unintentional is not getting us off to a good start. Petitioner and all the people of the State of Arizona expect that all petitions submitted to this court be dispositioned in a manner that is reasonable, orderly and lawful.

The problems at hand are now manageable. Violations of the Public Meeting laws must be addressed, Rule 74 must be reviewed and revised in order to be lawful as prescribed by statute. At this time the worst thing that could happen to anyone is that someone might have to change jobs which is no big deal since many people do this every day.

Alternatively, should this orderly and lawful process be nefariously corrupted or subverted, then everything changes. Should the matters in question become so utterly defective and grossly inadequate as to deprive Petitioner and all the citizens of Arizona of even the most basic precepts in the well established course and due process of American jurisprudence and law; in particular, the sheer amount of ongoing bias, prejudice, and fraud exhibited within Rule 74 and the unlawful manner in which Rule 74 was formulated, perpetrated in order to actually aid, abet, conceal and cover-up *repeated* and *continual* acts of violations of established Public Meeting laws, State and Federal criminal statutes, and thus the due process rights of every citizen of the State of Arizona including not only Petitioner but also all the Families and Children past, present and future yet to be victimized by the Fraudulent Schemes and Artifices embedded within the past and present

versions of Rule 74 as created by the Arizona Judiciary. Petitioner would be forced to assert that these criminal acts not only violate ARS 13-2310 but also 18 USC 1341, 1349, and Chapter 96 and other Federal crimes exploiting vulnerable families in crisis and their minor children so that the friends of those crafting this Rule 74 can get money. Petitioner asserts that these crimes perpetrated upon the citizens of this State and their innocent minor children would not only be grossly disdainful and ghastly, but indeed, criminal.

As Petitioner previously pointed out, the most severe remedy currently sought in the State action resides within ARS 38-431.07 Public Meeting law. Alternatively, the remedies and sentences stated in 18 USC 1341 and other Federal statutes listed herein are quite different and nobody listed in this Notice or anywhere in the State Court system has any sort of immunity from actions or penalties prescribed by this or the other Federal statutes which might be violated in this case.

Should the State courts of Arizona be unable to render justice, the Federal court system shall not abstain from hearing and enjoining those same unlawful practices under either the *Younger* doctrine (e.g., see *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37 (1971), and its progeny), or the doctrines normally requiring exhaustion of all administrative remedies before applying for a Federal injunction to swiftly address flagrant human and civil rights violations. It would also be deemed unreasonable to presume that justice might assuredly be served in any court in the State of Arizona since the evidence might show that perpetrators of these fraudulent schemes and unlawful conduct to be the very people in charge of and directing the affairs of these very same judicial institutions.

Title 28 U.S.C. § 2283, the anti-injunction statute, prohibits Federal courts from enjoining state court proceedings, but the statute exempts from the scope of that prohibition any

injunctions which are “expressly authorized” by another Act of Congress. The United States Supreme Court has previously determined that actions brought under the Civil Rights Act of 1871, 42 U.S.C. § 1983, are well within the “expressly authorized” exception to the ban on Federal injunctions. *Mitchum v. Foster*, 407 U.S. 225 (1972).

By giving this formal written notice, Petitioner seeks to preclude any flagrant civil rights violations at play in this matter, and by giving the required formal opportunity for the state court system to now correct those same violations of basic, well established due process rights; the Federal courts would be free to, and indeed obligated to address the same matters if the Arizona State court system were to display itself unable to do so.

**WHEREFORE**, the Petitioner has now provided the above required and otherwise reasonable notice and alert, and all other parties, persons and entities herein are now deemed duly advised in conformance with all requirements of the Federal Courts should actions there become necessary.

Respectfully submitted,

*/s/ Martin Lynch*

---

Martin Lynch  
1120 W Broadway Rd, Apt 55  
Tempe, AZ, 85282-1255  
602-550-6304  
mdl222222222@gmail.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify: that on this 8th day of January, 2016, a true and complete copy of the foregoing *Notice of Federal Younger Doctrine Alert*, by physical delivery and certification of same, has been duly served upon the following:

Scott Bales - Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Arizona  
Janet Barton – Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of Maricopa County  
Susan Pickard – Special Assistant to Judge Barton  
John and Jane Does – As they emerge

*/s/ Martin Lynch*

---

Martin Lynch  
1120 W Broadway Rd, Apt 55  
Tempe, AZ, 85282-1255  
602-550-6304  
mdl222222222@gmail.com