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PROCEEDINGS

JUDGE HOWARD: All right, on the record.
Okay, good morning everyone. Let's be on the record. Today is Wednesday, May 26, 2021. The time is 9:38 a.m. This is Docket Tg-190793. This case is captioned in the matter determining the proper classification of and complete penalty against of Paul Henrickson as Concrete and More.

The issue in this case is whether Concrete and More has been operating as a solid waste carrier without the required certificate.

My name is Michael Howard and I am an administrative law judge presiding over today's Brief Adjudicative Proceeding.

Let's take appearances from both parties and then we will talk about how we are going to proceed this morning.

So let's start with commission staff.
MR. ROBERSON: Good morning. Attorney
General Jeff Roberson, R-O-B-E-R-S-O-N. My contact is on file in this docket. With me at counsel table is

1 staff investigator Kathryn McPherson.

JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
And for the company, Mr. Henrickson, if you can please state your first and last name, your position with your company and your contact information with the address.

MR. HENRICKSON: My name is Paul Henrickson. My address is 3706 103rd Avenue Southeast, Lake Stevens, Washington 98258. I have no idea what company you are talking about.

JUDGE HOWARD: Okay.
So Mr. Henrickson, when staff refers to the company Concrete and More, you are not the owner of that? Or what is your relationship to that?

MR. HENRICKSON: Concrete and More is something from ten-plus years ago, before $I$ lived in another country.

JUDGE HOWARD: Was it a company you used to own?

MR. HENRICKSON: It was a company we used to own. We did concrete and construction, Concrete and More.

JUDGE HOWARD: Okay.
And did you -- I don't believe you stated your email address, would you mind providing that?

MR. HENRICKSON: Email address is
pmatnric@yahoo.com.
JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
Since we are doing this hearing over the phone, I am going to ask the parties be aware of background noise and that you mute your microphone when you are not speaking. If you need to object or raise an issue, please identify yourself when you are speaking.

And we should make an effort not to talk over each other so the court reporter can make a clear record of our hearing today.

I will provide a brief roadmap for today's proceeding. I received staff's exhibit list with exhibits marked KM-1 through KM-5. I did not receive any exhibits from Mr. Henrickson.

Because this case began with the commission's complaint against Mr. Henrickson, I am going to ask the staff to present the case first and exhibits as necessary during the case. I will then allow Mr. Henrickson to testify and to present his case.

We can then end the hearing by allowing each party giving a closing statement, which is simply a chance to explain what you are asking the Commission to do and why.

Are there any questions before we proceed?

MR. HENRICKSON: Yeah.
JUDGE HOWARD: Go ahead, Mr. Henrickson.
MR. HENRICKSON: I did file a response document that was supposed to be sent to you directly. I am not sure if you received it.

JUDGE HOWARD: That's -- I did see your response document in the docket, and I did read that, and I will be sure to read it again before writing the order.

Did you have any other questions before we proceed, Mr. Henrickson?

MR. HENRICKSON: No.
JUDGE HOWARD: Okay.
Okay, Mr. Roberson, you may proceed with a brief opening statement or you may simply call your first witness.

MR. ROBERSON: Probably most efficient to call Ms. McPherson to the stand and I will just make a closing argument.

JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. McPherson, please raise your right hand, I will swear you in.

```
KATHRYN MCPHERSON, witness herein, having been
                first duly sworn on oath,
                was examined and testified
```

as follows:

THE WITNESS: I do.
JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
Mr. Roberson, you may proceed.
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. ROBERSON:
Q. Good morning, would you please state your name and spell your last name for the record.
A. Kathryn McPherson, $\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{N}$.
Q. Who employed you?
A. I was employed by the Washington State Utility and Transportation Commission.
Q. What position do you hold at the Commission?
A. I am a solid waste investigator for the Transportation Safety Division.
Q. How long have you worked for the Commission as an investigator?
A. As an investigator, I have worked for the Commission for approximately two-and-a-half years.
Q. Did you work for the Commission in another capacity before you became an investigator?
A. Yes. Previously I was a sewer protection investigating informal complaints for approximately four years.
Q. Now, what are your duties as an investigator?
A. I investigate the transportation of solid waste and residential recycling of companies who do not have a certificate from the Commission.
Q. Would you please describe your educational background and any training that you have received that will allow you to carry out your duties as an investigator?
A. I have an associate's degree from Pasco Hernandez State College, as well as completed the Washington State immediate and advanced investigator training.
Q. Now, you just mentioned that your duties include investigating companies that may be operating without Commission-issued authority, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you testified that solid waste companies require a certificate before they operate?
A. That is correct.
Q. How do you look into whether a company is operating without a permit?
A. I receive complaints via two manners: One is a company who has a certificate, or private citizen may file a complaint with the Commission, or I research advertising on social media to companies that are

1 advertising for solid waste services and research if they have a certificate to complete those services.
Q. And how do you research whether they have a certificate?
A. I use our company's database to see if they are solid waste carriers or possibly common carriers.
Q. What social media sites do you look on to see if you can find advertising?
A. Various forums. I use Instagram, Facebook, Marketplace, and Craigslist quite often.
Q. Did you look on social media in May to see if you could find any companies that were operating without authority?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And what day in May did you do that?
A. On May 3rd I was searching Craigslist for possible solid waste advertisements.
Q. Did you find any?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Okay, and what did you find, I guess?
A. On September 3rd I found a Craigslist advertising for the hauling of garbage services.
Q. Just to clarify, you said September 3rd. We are talking about May 3rd, correct?
A. I am sorry, yes, May 3rd, 2018.
Q. Did you take a screen capture of the advertisement you found on Craigslist?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Would you please go to the exhibit marked KM-1.
A. I have that in front of me.
Q. Would you please identify this exhibit.
A. It is a Craigslist's advertisement for an F250 hauling everything. Under the title it also lists that they will haul garbage.
Q. And is that a true and accurate copy of the advertisement you saw on Craigslist on May 3rd?
A. Yes, it is.

MR. ROBERSON: Staff moves to admit
Exhibit KM-1.
JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do we have any objection from Mr. Henrickson?

MR. HENDRICKSON: I object to all hearsay. JUDGE HOWARD: Sorry, Mr. Henrickson, go ahead.

MR. HENRICKSON: I object. JUDGE HOWARD: The primary basis -- is the basis for your objection hearsay?

MR. HENRICKSON: Correct.
JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I am going to
deny the objection and deem KM-1 admitted.

Mr. Roberson, you may proceed.
(Exhibit No. KM-1 was admitted.)
EXAMINATION (CONTINUED)
BY MR. ROBERSON:
Q. Now, Ms. McPherson, I'm sorry, did you describe how the person posting the advertisement stated that they would haul garbage?
A. The advertisement says they will haul, pick up, move, et cetera, in an F250.
Q. So a motor vehicle?
A. Yes.
Q. And did the advertisement identify the person posting it?
A. No. The only identification was a telephone number, (425) 686-5270.
Q. Did you attempt to identify the person who provided that phone number?
A. Yes, I did additional research to find a phone number.

MR. HENRICKSON: Objection. There is an association with the number that was provided. JUDGE HOWARD: I am sorry, did you say he was leading the witness?

Could you repeat yourself.
MR. HENRICKSON: Yeah, he was making a

1 statement, the attorney was testifying making a statement saying that, did you contact the person that provided the phone number.

I object to that statement overall because that person might not even -- it's just hearsay. That person might not have even provided the phone number.

JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Henrickson, I am going to deny the objection, but $I$ will let you have an opportunity to cross Ms. McPherson on that issue.

Mr. Roberson, you may proceed.
MR. ROBERSON: Thank you, Judge Howard.
EXAMINATION (CONTINUED)
BY MR. ROBERSON:
Q. So, Ms. McPherson, you attempted to find the person the phone number belonged to, correct?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. How did you do that?
A. I looked online using a search of that specific phone number and was able to identify a HireRush ad identifying Paul Henrickson, which also included additional advertisements for solid waste services.
Q. How did you connect the HireRush advertisement to Mr. Henrickson?
A. They had the same phone number in common.
Q. So the number provided in the Craigslist ad you

1 saw on May 3rd was the same number on the HireRush ad?
A. That's correct.
Q. And the HireRush ad linked that phone number to Mr. Henrickson?
A. That's correct, the HireRush ad listed Paul Henrickson with the phone number (425) 686-5270.
Q. Now, would you please turn to the exhibit marked KM-2.
A. I have that in front of me.
Q. Would you please identify this document.
A. This is the HireRush ad I found online while searching on May 3rd, that advertises for solid waste services.
Q. Is this a true and accurate copy of the HireRush advertisement that you saw on May 2019?
A. Yes, it is.

MR. ROBERSON: Judge Howard, staff move to admit KM-2.

JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any objection from Mr. Henrickson?

MR. HENRICKSON: I object.
JUDGE HOWARD: What would be the basis for your objection?

MR. HENRICKSON: That's just hearsay. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay.

Sorry, Mr. Roberson, what?
MR. ROBERSON: So BAP specifically allows you to admit hearsay that's RCW 34.05 point, I believe it's 452. The Commission's procedural rules, it's WAC 480.07, maybe 450, if you give me second.

495 allows you to admit any and all relevant evidence that does not exclude hearsay evidence. Regardless, these are Mr. Henrickson's own words. Under Evidence Rule 801(d)(2), they are not hearsay.

MR. HENRICKSON: How are they my own words? I object to whatever he's saying.

Where do you come up with that statement?
JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Henrickson, just a moment.

The hearsay objections, I am just going to let you know that the law does allow us to admit hearsay. I understand your concern that you are saying that these are not your statements.

So I will definitely allow you to cross examine Ms. McPherson, I'll allow you to testify on your behalf and give a closing statement, and those would be the appropriate ways for you to, I suggest for you to set that forth.

Do you have any other basis for your
objection to Exhibit KM-2?

MR. HENRICKSON: No.
JUDGE HOWARD: Okay, the objection on KM-2
is denied and I would deem that exhibit admitted.
You may proceed, Mr. Roberson.
(Exhibit No. KM-2 was admitted.)
BY MR. ROBERSON:
Q. Ms. McPherson, what service does the advertisement state that Mr. Henrickson offers?
A. It states that he offers moving and garbage removal.
Q. Does the HireRush advertisement identify the vehicle Mr. Henrickson would use to remove garbage?
A. Yes, it does. It states that he will be using an F250.
Q. And that's the same truck that was identified in the Craigslist ad, correct?
A. Yes, that's correct.

JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Henrickson, what was your objection?

MR. HENRICKSON: They're just continually testifying. F250, do they have any specialization in what an F 250 is? This is the same as a truck. Where are they going to go next?

MR. ROBERSON: I could lay some foundation if you like, your Honor.

JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Roberson, if you wouldn't mind either rephrasing or backing up a couple steps and asking a new question.

MR. HENRICKSON: He's testifying?
JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Henrickson, please direct any objections to me. But I am instructing Mr. Roberson to rephrase or to lay foundation for that particular line of questioning.

EXAMINATION (CONTINUED)
BY MR. ROBERSON:
Q. Ms. McPherson, are you familiar with motor vehicles?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you ever seen -- well, are you familiar with the Ford Motor Company?
A. Yes.
Q. Any what does the Ford Motor Company manufacture?
A. They manufacture cars and trucks. One of their lines of trucks is the $F$ series utility trucks, including the F250.
Q. So how would you describe an F250?
A. The 250 is a specific motor, not as large as the 350, for hauling purposes.
Q. Excellent.

Now, you testified that the HireRush advertisement states that the provider will use an F250?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you seen any other advertisements -- did you see any other advertisements on May 3rd by a provider that would claim he would use an F250?
A. Yes, on the Craigslist ad they did. Also on the May 3rd and on the HireRush ad, the verbiage reads haul, pick up, move, et cetera, F250.
Q. Now, other than a phone number, does the HireRush advertisement provide contact information for Mr. Henrickson?
A. Yes, it lists a phone number and it lists an address in Lake Stevens.
Q. And did you -MR. HENRICKSON: I object. JUDGE HOWARD: Let's -- Mr. Henrickson -Mr. Henrickson, go ahead with your objection. MR. HENRICKSON: What exhibit are you referring to where there's an address? JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Roberson, would you mind clarifying the exhibit you were referring to. Was that KM-2?

MR. ROBERSON: It is, your Honor.
JUDGE HOWARD: It's KM-2, Mr. Hendrickson.

MR. HENDRICKSON: There's an address in the ad. That's what they are testifying to, there's an address in the ad.

JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Henrickson, this is all available in the docket. I am looking at the exhibit. There's the address -- Mr. Henrickson, I am speaking. There does appear to be an address in the ad, so what is the basis for your objection? MR. HENRICKSON: Give me a second. Your Honor, I will get to this.

JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Mr. Roberson, you may proceed.

## EXAMINATION (CONTINUED)

BY MR. ROBERSON:
Q. Ms. McPherson, what did you learn from the HireRush ad?
A. With an address located on the HireRush ad, I was able to compose a technical assistance letter for my supervisor to review that $I$ could send to the company to provide technical assistance regarding solid waste rules.
Q. What does it ask you when you provide technical assistance?
A. I explained the solid waste rules on transportation and advertising of solid waste. I

1 explained there are penalties involved. And I requested all advertisements and services be terminated until such time that the company has applied for and received a certificate from the Commission.
Q. Did you eventually send that letter to Mr. Henrickson?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Did it reach him?
A. No, it did not. It was returned by mail on May 27th, 2018.
Q. So after the letter was returned, did you attempt to contact Mr. Henrickson by telephone?
A. Yes, I did. On several occasions in May, I attempted to call Mr. Henrickson to try to find a new address and discuss the investigation with him.
Q. Did you speak with him during any of those calls?
A. Yes, I did. I spoke with him on May $16 t h$ and on May 18th.
Q. Okay.

Did you eventually obtain another address for Mr. Henrickson?
A. Yes. Mr. Henrickson was unwilling to give me an address and I was able to locate an address using the internet. The address I located was 22720 Third

1 Avenue A, Lake Stevens, Washington.
Q. Did you attempt to send another technical assistance letter to that address?
A. I did send a second technical assistance letter to that address.
Q. Did that letter reach Mr. Henrickson, to your knowledge?
A. To the best of my knowledge, it did reach him.
Q. And how do you know that it reached him?
A. I spoke with Mr. Henrickson subsequent to that letter being sent.
Q. And when did that conversation take place?
A. Just pulling up my record.

I spoke with Mr. Henrickson on September 4, 2019 regarding the noncompliance letter that was sent a second time.
Q. And what was the outcome of your discussion with Mr. Henrickson?
A. When I spoke with Mr. Henrickson, he confirmed that he had received the compliance letter and stated he no longer owned Concrete and More. And I had stated that it was still showing in the Department of Health as an active business.

We discussed the rules regarding solid waste services and advertising on Craigslist for hauling

1 furniture. He stated that he could remove or change his ads, but he did not feel like he should have to.
Q. And did he eventually agree to remove his advertisements?
A. He did eventually agree to remove his advertisements.
Q. That was during that September 4th conversation?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.

Now, to make sure that Mr. Henrickson had taken down his advertisements?
A. I did. I researched advertisements that he was still currently listing on Craigslist, and I discovered that he was continuing to advertise for solid waste services at that time.
Q. And what day did you see if he was still advertising?

JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Roberson, hold on.
Mr. Henrickson, could you repeat yourself. MR. HENRICKSON: She said that I was making ads and -- there was none. She doesn't experience what I do.

JUDGE HOWARD: Is there any other basis for your objection?

MR. HENRICKSON: I was just objecting to her

1 statement saying that Mr. Henrickson was making ads, and
2 I wasn't, so...

JUDGE HOWARD: I will allow you to cross-examine her on that and provide your own testimony, but I'm going to deny the objection.

Mr. Roberson, you may proceed.
EXAMINATION (CONTINUED)
BY MR. ROBERSON:
Q. Ms. McPherson, how do you know that Mr. Henrickson was still advertising?
A. After I spoke I did research the ads subsequently again on September 4th and September 17th of 2019 finding current ads on Craigslist advertisement.
Q. Would you please turn to the exhibit marked KM-3.
A. Yes, I see that.
Q. And would you please identify that document.
A. This is another Craigslist ad stating that F250 hauling everything and demolition. Under the advertisement it says we will haul, pick up, move, et cetera in an F250 and that included garbage.
Q. And is that a true and accurate copy of the Craigslist ad that you saw on September 4th, I believe?
A. Yes.

MR. ROBERSON: Excuse me?

JUDGE HOWARD: We will wait just a moment here.

MR. ROBERSON: My apologies, your Honor, someone was ringing my doorbell.

JUDGE HOWARD: No problem. We are all
making due at this time.
You may continue.
MR. ROBERSON: So Judge Howard, I would like to enter KM-3.

JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any objections from
Mr. Henrickson?
MR. HENRICKSON: Hearsay.
JUDGE HOWARD: Just hearsay, is that what
you said?
MR. HENRICKSON: Yep.
JUDGE HOWARD: All right, I am going to deny the objection and this $\mathrm{KM}-3$ is admitted.
(Exhibit No. KM-3 was admitted.)
EXAMINATION (CONTINUED)
BY MR. ROBERSON:
Q. Ms. McPherson, you may have said this already, that Craigslist ad, does it provide a phone number?
A. Yes, it does, (425) 686-5270.
Q. Have you ever seen that phone number before?
A. Yes, it was a previous Craigslist ad, as well as

1 the HireRush ad.
Q. And based on your research, who did that phone number belong to?
A. Paul Henrickson.
Q. Did you attempt to book solid waste hauling after seeing Mr. Henrickson's September advertisements?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And how did you do that?
A. I replied to the Craigslist ad using a fictitious email address that $I$ used for investigations. I requested Mr . Henrickson to provide solid waste services.
Q. Would you please turn to the exhibit marked KM-4.
A. Yes, sir. I have that in front of me.
Q. Would you please identify that document?
A. That's the Gmail of -- sorry, the Gmail email that I sent to the Craigslist email link.
Q. And is that a true and accurate copy of your email exchange with Mr. Henrickson?
A. Yes, it is.

MR. ROBERSON: Judge Howard, I ask to admit KM-4.

JUDGE HOWARD: Are there any objections from Mr. Henrickson?

MR. HENRICKSON: No.
JUDGE HOWARD: Sorry, repeat that,
Mr. Henrickson. It's a little quiet here.
MR. HENRICKSON: No, I never seen the email, so -- I mean, I never received it.

JUDGE HOWARD: Okay, I will take that as not having an objection.

This exhibit is admitted. KM-4 is admitted.
You may proceed, Mr. Roberson.
(Exhibit No. KM-4 was admitted.)
BY MR. ROBERSON:
Q. Ms. McPherson, how did Mr. Henrickson respond to your email?
A. Mr. Henrickson requested a photo of the -JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Henrickson, can you repeat that.

MR. HENRICKSON: I think she already knows. They just made a statement that said how did Mr. Henrickson respond.

JUDGE HOWARD: So what is your objection?
MR. HENRICKSON: Speculating, leading, just testifying that $I$ responded. And he can rephrase it if you want.

JUDGE HOWARD: Would the court reporter mind reading back the question.
(Question and answer read back.)
JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to deny the objection.

Mr. Roberson, you may proceed.
BY MR. ROBERSON:
Q. Ms. McPherson, how did the person you sent that email respond?

JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Roberson, wait.
Mr. Henrickson, are you -- I did not catch that.

MR. HENRICKSON: Never mind.
JUDGE HOWARD: Okay, Mr. Roberson, you may proceed.

BY MR. ROBERSON:
Q. Ms. McPherson, how did the person to whom you sent that email respond?
A. The person responded that they would like a text with a photo of the waste that needed to be picked up.
Q. And did the person provide a number before you could text that picture to you?
A. Yes, they did. I am reviewing the email right now to give you the phone number that was requested to send.

It said question mark, can you email it to me or send a text (425) 686-5270.
Q. Ms. McPherson, in the course of your investigation, had you seen the phone number
(425) 686-5270 before?
A. Yes, this has been on the HireRush ads, as well as all the Craigslist ads that I have reviewed.
Q. Did you send a picture to that number?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Would you please turn to the exhibit marked KM-5.
A. I have that in front of me.
Q. Would you please identify this document?
A. This is a screenshot of the text message sent to (425) 686-5270 showing a photo of approximately eight garbage bags and other debris that I requested to be taken to the dump.
Q. Is that a true and accurate copy of the text string that you had with Mr. Henrickson, or with the person who had that phone number?
A. Yes, sir.

MR. ROBERSON: Judge Howard, at this point in time we submit Exhibit KM-5.

JUDGE HOWARD: Do you have any objections, Mr. Henrickson?

MR. HENRICKSON: Yes. I think they are confused. There was no texts.

JUDGE HOWARD: Okay, do you have any other basis for your objection?

MR. HENRICKSON: Yeah, and the exhibit, there shows no text. There's nothing about texting at all, from what $I$ recall. There's no texting. It's all emails from people.

JUDGE HOWARD: Well, do you have the KM-5 in front of you, Mr. Henrickson? I believe this would have been served on you by email and it's in the docket.

MR. HENRICKSON: It doesn't show a text.
JUDGE HOWARD: Well, I don't really want to speak to it, but it is available for you to review if you want to make an objection.

MR. HENRICKSON: This email conversation, there's nothing about texting, so I object to hearsay texts.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Well, again, Mr. Henrickson, I will definitely provide you opportunities to cross and provide your own testimony, but as far as this speaking objection, I am going to deny it.

So Mr. Roberson, KM-5 is admitted. You may continue.
(Exhibit No. KM-5 was admitted.)
BY MR. ROBERSON:
Q. Ms. McPherson, what did the person to whom you sent a text message respond with?
A. Where are you and can $I$ do it as soon as possible, to which I responded, how much will it cost, the garbage company wants to charge me extra and he responded $\$ 100$.
Q. I would like to move at this point to the subject of penalties.

Are you familiar with the Commission's policy statement on enforcement which it issued in Docket A120061?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. Are you familiar with the factors set out for determining the appropriate penalty in that document?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. Did you review the policy statement when considering what penalties to recommend to the Commission for imposition of this document?
A. Yes, I considered all the factors.
Q. And does that have a penalty recommendation for the Commission, if it finds Mr. Henrickson violated the policy service laws?
A. Yes, that recommendation is the maximum penalty of $\$ 2,000$. $\$ 1,000$ for advertising for solid waste services without a certificate, and an additional \$1,000

1 for offering services to provide solid waste services 2 without a certificate.

MR. ROBERSON: Judge Howard, at this point I have no further questions for Ms. McPherson.

JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Mr. Henrickson, would you like to ask any questions of Ms. McPherson?

MR. HENRICKSON: Sure.
Let's start off with this texting statement. I am looking at the exhibit and all I see is emails. Can somebody point out exactly what we are talking about when it shows texting? I have no idea what they are talking about.

JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Henrickson, I am going to -- Mr. Henrickson, I am going to let you know, since all these are admitted now, I am looking at $K M-5$, and this appears to be a screenshot of text messages.

So if you want to ask a question about $\mathrm{KM}-5$, that's great, feel free, but it is in the docket. So I wanted to clarify that issue, so feel free to ask questions of Ms. McPherson.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. HENRICKSON:
Q. In regards to this texting of -- they sent the phone number, you believe that $I$ knew exactly what you were referring to?
A. Yes, I included a photo as requested in the email of the garbage that needed to be picked up when I texted (425) 686-5270. I sent a picture of the garbage bags that needed to be picked up.
Q. Now, if I had received this email, would I know what you are talking about?
A. I would be unaware.
Q. Thank you.

Also in your photo, it looks like you showed junk in that email in your text, whatever it is. You have -- you are assuming that $I$ would know what's in the bag too, correct?
A. Yes, I had stated in the email that I had things that needed to be taken to the dump and I stated that as well in the text messages, that the things in the garbage needed to be taken to the dump.
Q. From your text?
A. Yes.
Q. I would take things to the dump, doesn't say anything about garbage. Can you make a statement on
this?
A. I would state that if taking things to the dump, that it would be considered solid waste.
Q. So you are saying it counts as solid waste?
A. That would be two different issues on definitions. In my email and in my text $I$ only specifically mentioned the garbage bags that were bagged garbage and stated that the garbage company was going to charge too much and I needed these taken to the dump.
Q. Now, wouldn't it be logical that if it were just garbage -- how much do you think the garbage company would charge you for five bags of garbage?
A. I am unsure what the tariff rates for the garbage company for Snohomish County would charge at this time.
Q. Are you aware that it's actually free?
A. To my knowledge, it is not free to have solid waste services in Snohomish County.
Q. Are you aware that somebody pays for service?
A. Yes.
Q. A service they get is picking up garbage, correct? That's why they pick up garbage, correct?
A. As a consumer protection specialist for several years with the Commission, there are tariff rates that the certified garbage companies have to collect.

One of those rates is for extra garbage beyond the part of the bins that you are allocated with your monthly service bill. Any additional garbage in this photo where you had several bags, there would be subsequent additional charges that are also listed in our tariff rates.
Q. And you are aware that junk was in those bags?
A. There could be many things in that bag.
Q. You are also aware that lay individuals such as myself confuse garbage and junk?
A. Yes, yes. I'm very specific when I email with people who may be of lay education regarding solid waste services, that is why $I$ use keywords like garbage and taking to dump.
Q. You didn't answer the question.
A. Could you rephrase the question more specifically for me.
Q. People do confuse the word garbage and junk, correct?
A. Some people would confuse those words, yes.
Q. A layperson?
A. Perhaps. And as I stated, that is exactly where I make very specific words, using words like garbage and dump.
Q. And a person who does garbage collection would

1 probably know this, right?
A. Know the difference between or what garbage is and what a dump is.
Q. How many Craigslist ads do you target in a day, a week, a month, a year, that contains verbiage from garbage to junk?
A. I would not have those specific records available to me. That is something that our staff keeps track of. I record all companies that $I$ work with on technical assistance in our compliance system.
Q. Okay.

There's a reason for this, right? That's why you are employed, right?
A. I am employed to ensure that companies are not transporting solid waste without a certificate to ensure safety of our public and to ensure the protection of our certificated companies.
Q. But the people that you are targeting do not really transport garbage until you correct their verbiage, isn't that what you do most of the time?
A. Moderately. I work with companies on a regular basis to assist them in removing advertisements that are in a violation of RCW 81.77.040. I provide them technical assistance so that their advertisement does not violate the state laws.

In addition to that, $I$ help them research and provide them with information on receiving common carrier permits in order to have junk removal services and a permit that allows them to do that.

In the junk removal services, they are given strict guidelines as to how to avoid violations of those RCWs, so that they are not subsequently in violation and potentially receiving without knowledge a fine.
Q. The majority of people aren't in the garbage business, correct?
A. The majority of the people do not understand the rules, and I assist them in working within their company to be able to be in compliance with the Commission and continuing to do business.
Q. Do you find people that do landscape advertising, they throw in the word garbage and you correct them, right?
A. Yes, sometimes they do do that, that has happened. I also follow up and make sure that they do not accept solid waste pickup and as far as our compliance procedures.
Q. Correct, but the majority of them do change their language, unless they are still in garbage; is that correct?
A. Yes, absolutely. The majority of companies do

1 comply with Washington State law.
Q. So you are aware that $I$ have actually been researching and seeing the Craigslist ads and seeing garbage changed to junk probably on a daily basis?
A. Solid waste services and junk removal services are two different services offered. Junk removal services offer incidental removal of the solid waste; they are being paid to provide other services. And we request that those companies receive a common carrier permit, because they are transporting commodities for compensation.

Solid waste business are when you are picking up curbside or providing a service that our solid waste companies can provide and you are in violation of providing those services without a certificate.
Q. So you correct them in their verbiage?
A. And in their ads.
Q. Are you aware that the ads that I saw were all changed and they were people that did junk removal, moving or landscape --
A. I would be unaware.
Q. -- on a regular basis? So you are actually doing this to many people on a daily basis?
A. I apologize for interrupting you.

I do not have access to what advertisements that

1 you have personally viewed, so I would not know what 2 their original advertisement was, what services they offered or what changes those companies have made.
Q. So your job is in the garbage collection, you are teaching people that they are not in the garbage collection business, correct?
A. Absolutely.
Q. And if they are collecting garbage, then they need to get a certificate?
A. You are absolutely correct, sir.
Q. So referring back to your vague message, and you say you are a specialist in garbage collection?
A. I am a solid waste investigator.
Q. So if you are to put five bags curbside, you wouldn't know what the garbage company might charge, rough estimate, if they charge or don't charge, if it's a free service, if it comes with the service?
A. That would be something you would want to research with our regulatory service company. Our regulatory service works with our contracted parent company to determine a rate.
Q. Are you aware that I am 54 years old?
A. I was not specifically aware of your exact age, no.
Q. Are you aware that I have garbage picked up at

1 my house?

MR. HENRICKSON: Well, I am -MR. ROBERSON: It's a free service. JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Roberson, I did want to give Mr. Henrickson leeway and opportunity here.

So yeah, Mr. Henrickson, as long as -- you know, I will definitely give you a few more minutes to have these for your questioning. I am going to give you some leeway here, so please continue if you have more questions.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION (CONTINUED)

BY MR. HENRICKSON:
Q. So somebody said it cost $\$ 100$ to pick up five bags of garbage, wouldn't that be logical that they are pretty much saying if you are worried about costs, here's a -- what's your break? $\$ 1,000, \$ 500, \$ 2$ or is that, could that be just, Hey, get away from me type? Do you know the intent of the response?
A. I only know that what was specifically mentioned in the text and in the email. I did not testify as to

1 the intent of the sender.

2
3
Q. So if it was a free service that went with your garbage company and the $\$ 100$ charge, which one would you take?
A. I don't think that is an answer $I$ can provide you under this circumstance.
Q. So you can sit there and say the intent of the person was to actually collect $\$ 100$ for picking up five bags of garbage?
A. Again, $I$ don't think that is a question $I$ can answer under this circumstance. I can only reflect on the communication that was provided between myself and the person sending me texts and emails.
Q. So you can't respond to, you can't respond to logic?
A. I don't have an answer for that question.
Q. You said in your supposed email to me that the garbage company was charging you much for five bags of garbage, and if somebody responded and said I will charge you $\$ 1,000$, where is your logic? What's the breaking point? Or is that just another way of kick rocks? I don't deal in garbage.
A. The only information $I$ had was the information that was provided to me by email and by text. And the responses provided to me were in violation of the RCW

1 regarding solid waste rules, so I subsequently proceeded 2 with a solid waste court case.

3 Q. So -- but there was no agreement of picking up

MR. HENRICKSON: No.

JUDGE HOWARD: We can do a few more minutes of questions, if you have them.

CROSS-EXAMINATION (CONTINUED)
BY MR. HENRICKSON:
Q. So when you contacted me, this was a new job to you?
A. Well, relatively new. I believe I have been in this position for five months, but I initially contacted you regarding advertisement.
Q. And you said you contacted me at an address?
A. I sent a technical assistance letter initially to you, and as we had stated, it was returned. I spoke with you by phone and then $I$ sent it to what you have listed on record as your current address.
Q. What did we speak to about on the phone?
A. I discussed the solid waste rules, the advertisements on Craigslist, the violations of the verbiage requesting or providing garbage services. I requested you to remove those advertisements. You had said to me that you didn't believe that you needed to change those advertisements. You had stated to me that you had the smallest truck at the dump, and that you did not feel that you were in violation of the rules.
Q. I mean, how many conversations have we had?
A. Multiple.
Q. Multiple.

How many people did you contact in regards to this case?
A. With some companies, again, multiple, depending on the varying needs of some companies require a lot more technical assistance than you were provided because they are trying to become in compliance with the Commission and assisted with applying for a solid waste permit or solid waste certificate.

Other companies are far less than you because they become compliant and removed their ads, either ceased doing their business and modified so they are in compliance with the Commission rules.
Q. How many people in-house are you talking to regards to those?
A. In-house, in the company's house or within the Commission house?
Q. All together.
A. Okay.

Overall, with companies that I work with, I normally have one main contact that $I$ work with. Occasionally there might be a second person who also owns the company and I will work with both of them.

Within the Commission typically, but not normally, exclusively, but typically, my only

1 communication regarding companies that may be in
2 violation is with my supervisor, because he is the person who signs the compliance letter that I send to assist the company with technical assistance.
Q. Are you aware of the documentation that's included with this case?
A. Yes.
Q. How much documentation do you think there is?
A. I could not be specific. It has been to hearing now four times, including today, so there is a lot of commission documentation that follows along with any hearing.
Q. Are you aware that $I$ have over one foot of paperwork on my desk in front of me right now?
A. I can imagine.
Q. Are you aware that you have emails in-house with 20 other individuals?

MR. ROBERSON: Objection.
Judge Howard, I am not sure what relevance this has.

MR. HENRICKSON: The relevant is she communicates with so many people in regards to this accusation of garbage that she is all over the place. There's almost a thousand emails. There's 30 other people that are cc'd on this on a daily basis. There

1 have been multiple attorneys and businesses, there's
2 been judges and it's just unfathomable.

MR. HENRICKSON: And I am leading to that, your Honor. We will get there. I don't have an hour of questions, trust me.

JUDGE HOWARD: Okay.
MR. HENRICKSON: I have a couple of points that I am leading to that will end then in a conclusion. JUDGE HOWARD: I just want to be mindful of our time, but I do want to give you your chance. So proceed.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION (CONTINUED)

BY MR. HENRICKSON:
Q. So all these conversations, don't you think that you can be confused about our conversations, when and

1 how they happened?
A. That's a very good question. That is why in our -- each time I speak with a company, as I speak with that company, I document in our investigation the details of those conversations and subsequent actions that need to be taken after those conversations for follow-up.
Q. Are you aware that you accidentally sent to me your documentation to have professionals clean it up with your 30 people roundabout cc's?
A. I don't understand that question.
Q. The 30 people that are cleaning your documents for your perfection, how would they have relevance to our conversations?

MR. ROBERSON: Objection. This is, in fact, not in evidence.

JUDGE HOWARD: I am going to grant the objection.

Mr. Henrickson, would you just, please, continue on and try to bring it to your point you would like to make about the -- really the single issue before me today.

> CROSS-EXAMINATION (CONTINUED)

BY MR. HENRICKSON:
Q. Approximately how many phone calls did you make

1 to me? you. allow --
A. Approximately ten over the course of two years.
Q. Did you have other people contact me?
A. I believe you requested my supervisor contact
Q. Are you aware that I received numerous crank phone calls from your office?

MR. ROBERSON: Objection. Argumentative and assumes facts not in evidence.

JUDGE HOWARD: I am going to allow -- I am going to briefly, very briefly -- I am going to allow a couple minutes of questioning here on this issue.

I am going to allow Mr. Henrickson some
leeway to show me why he thinks this is relevant. But, again, $I$ am going to remind him that I am charged with deciding a very narrow issue here and I have some broad authority to decide some other claims. So I will

MR. HENRICKSON: I will tell you my point. My point is that this is actually vindictive. I don't actually deal in garbage. This is some sort of an argument that led to harassment, led to police phone calls. It led to crank phone calls asking me if my refrigerator is running. There's hundreds of phone calls made to me by this party.

And there's -- I requested the documents from UTC. There's so many documents and clarified by an attorney that's all crossed up and phone calls that this is probably $\$ 100,000$ operation now. I mean, just a rough estimate.

But the harassment and the phone calls that continue, this was actually more vindictive. And we will get to the ads, but this is actually a vindictive argument that Kathryn and $I$ had when her initial phone call came from.

JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Henrickson, I am going to start talking.

So I am going to allow you to ask a few minutes of questioning on this topic. I want you to try to focus on what the issue is relevant here. I don't want to spend a lot of time on this. The Commission has other case before it, and I am -- you know, I am going to give you leeway here, so, please, if you have a few questions for Ms. McPherson, I will, I will allow it. You have a few more minutes on this. You can feel free to testify as well when it's your turn to testify.

MR. HENRICKSON: Again, that's where it's going to lead to, for me to testify.

CROSS-EXAMINATION (CONTINUED)
BY MR. HENRICKSON:
Q. Ms. McPherson, are you aware that HireRush advertises for people?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know how they make their money?
A. No.
Q. Are you aware that they go out and find jobs and then they alert people to, Hey, I found you this job, I want $20 \%$ ?
A. I am unaware of the procedures of HireRush as a business. I just --
Q. Have you ever done business with HireRush?
A. I just discovered the advertisement for HireRush with your information on it.
Q. So you are aware that I never conversed with HireRush and someone did the advertisement for me?
A. I couldn't answer that.
Q. Are you aware that people sit at home nowadays and try to find a way to -- what do they call that when they -- they try to pawn it off on the computer for other people, so they advertise for people and then they try to get the $20 \%$ off their logistics?
A. I have no knowledge of that.
Q. So it is a possibility that I did not do any of these advertisements?
A. I only used advertisements discovered with the

1 information that was provided in this advertisement to
2 determine if there was a violation of the RCW.
Q. Wasn't it when we first communicated, not about garbage, it was about the advertisement and I informed you that $I$ do not advertise, which led into an argument?
A. I do not have that in my notes specifically. I have in my notes that $I$ discussed with you the advertisement on Craigslist that the advertisement needed to be changed and you could not provide solid waste services or advertise solid waste services.
Q. You said in earlier, our conversation that we had for years, was all done at that first time we conversed?
A. Was all -- could you repeat that last part of the question; was all what?
Q. Didn't you condense our few years of conversation into one conversation that we initially had?
A. No, I have multiple notes on multiple conversations.
Q. Didn't $I$ end up hanging up on you?
A. I believe you did.
Q. And it was from an argument. I have no recollection of what you are talking about.
A. I don't remember those words, but I do remember

1 you getting very upset.
Q. And I told you that you are uneducated and not to contact me anymore, and that you were to mail me any information so that there was a paper trail?
A. I specifically do not remember you stating that because you refused to provide your address for me.
Q. And in turn you mailed an address from ten years ago, correct, because it was sent back to you?
A. As it was stated in previous testimony, I did email a previous address you had. However, the second compliance letter you had confirmed that you received was mailed to 22720 Third Avenue A, Lake Stevens, Washington, which subsequently today you did state is your current address.
Q. Wasn't this after probably five or six crank phone calls or calls that you kept on calling me and harassing me and I threatened to call the police?

MR. ROBERSON: Objection, argumentative. JUDGE HOWARD: I'll allow the question. THE WITNESS: For the record, I have not called you or anyone a crank phone call. Any phone calls that $I$ had with you were regarding the compliance of Washington State rules and to try to work with you to avoid leading into court where you would have possible penalties.

1 BY MR. HENRICKSON:
2 Q. So when I received the letter -- did I not phone 3 you back the day after I received the letter?

1 Would a person take down their advertisement if they 2 were advertising if they were subject to a fine?

Do you have two or three more questions at the most?

CROSS-EXAMINATION (CONTINUED)
BY MR. HENRICKSON:
Q. Didn't you contact me and tell me that I had won my case and this was over?
A. Absolutely incorrect.
Q. And you wanted my new address?
A. No. The only time I requested an address from you was the initial time when I requested the address and you refused. And then after a default order because

1 you did not show for your first hearing case, you had
2 contacted Judge Pearson and she had allowed you to have a new court date.

I called you per the request of Judge Pearson to find a current address to send dockets for a new date, at which time you also refused to provide me with a new address.
Q. Meanwhile, didn't you get a judgment against me through Judge Pearson telling that I was served properly?
A. Judge Pearson issued a default order when you did not appear in court. And as I stated in my previous statement to this, that after you contacted her was overturned and then we had a second date.
Q. Weren't you aware that you didn't serve me properly, you served the wrong address?

MR. ROBERSON: Objection, relevance.
JUDGE HOWARD: I think I am going to grant the objection. Mr. Henrickson, I am going to grant the objection.

I did -- I have allowed for additional
questions after I asked, so we need to conclude this. I will definitely give you time to testify and to give a closing statement.

Mr. Roberson, do you have any redirect for

1 the witness?

MR. ROBERSON: I have a limited amount of redirect, Judge Howard.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. ROBERSON:
Q. Ms. McPherson, at the start of your cross-examination there was a lot of discussion about garbage or junk. Which of those two words did the advertisements use?
A. The advertisements specifically say garbage.
Q. And when you texted the number, it was
(425) 686-5270, you -- did you ask the person that you texted that to to haul junk or garbage?
A. I said that I had a picture of stuff, which included garbage bags, and I needed it taken to the dump.
Q. My apologies. When you emailed Exhibit KM-4, did you ask whether the person hauled junk or garbage?
A. I was very specific about garbage.
Q. Did the Craigslist ads in September -- those are after you spoke with Mr. Henrickson on the phone, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And did those advertisements reflect any change

1 of verbiage? Did they use junk instead of garbage?
A. No, there was no mention of junk hauling or junk removal services in our first initial contact with Mr. Henrickson. Any advertisements that were in Craigslist were all verbiage of garbage removal services, leading up to the first court date.
Q. Now, you were generally asked about solid waste services in Snohomish County. To your knowledge, is curbside garbage and recycling performed by a certified carrier in Snohomish County?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. So is it fair to say that that service is free?
A. It is not free to have solid waste services within Snohomish County, to the best of my knowledge. If somebody is a renter, it possibly may be included in their rent. I am not knowledgeable to that.

I was very specific in my email and texts that I was going to be charged additional by the garbage company and that's why $I$ was seeking services. MR. ROBERSON: And I think that's actually all the questions I have, Judge Howard. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Mr. Henrickson, I will swear you in and then you will have an opportunity to testify in your behalf.

```
PAUL HENRICKSON,
    witness herein, having been
    first duly sworn on oath,
    was examined and testified
    as follows:
```

    JUDGE HOWARD: You may proceed to testify on
    your behalf.

MR. HENRICKSON: Now, I am just going to tell what happened, and should be short, sweet and simple.

I had a company a long time ago before I moved to Australia. I have a Master's degree. I have been national sales manager of a large company. I have a professional background. I do not haul garbage, garbage bags or anything like that.

I have lived in other countries. I like things short, sweet and simple. And I don't like to beat around the bush.

This case has beat around the bush and they have taken advantage of it with their employment, I wish I had a job like that. The attorneys doing thousands of emails, crossing stuff up. There might be frickin' thieves galore with this whole deal.

The UTC lady, one foot of paperwork on my desk, and I didn't even receive all of the information $I$

1 requested. I didn't get the administrative recording, 2 that they said they served me and got a judgment against 3 me, I never received that.

1 in her thing and said he didn't show.

I have no idea what anybody's talking about. You have to sit there and pay for HireRush so that they get their $20 \%$. I have no idea what anybody is talking about. I tried to sit there and contact them, close the account. They wouldn't let me close the account because they said $I$ am not even privy to the account.

So I wrote a thing on there saying I have no idea what this is in regards about. I believe Ms. McPherson even continued after that and wrote a bad response about me, but $I$ have never even done business with these people.

I have been harassed by Ms. McPherson since their initial phone call. There's been probably 300 phone calls from her, her staff, and the attorney. I would say about $10 \%$ of them have been crank phone calls such as is your fridge running, maybe you should go catch it. Stupid phone calls like that where I get from them. You won the lawsuit. Since I moved again, we need your new address so we can send you the winning judgment.

> Also when the judge did the original
judgment, $I$ received a phone call from Ms. McPherson saying that she was aware that they served the wrong address, that they didn't have my correct address, and

1 she wanted me to drive down to court the next day to 2 appear in front of the judge. I said are you kidding me. So we got in another argument. She went to court the next day, her and an attorney on the phone, she got a judgment against me when they didn't even serve me. These are the things that I have been dealing with these people, nothing but lies, deceit and misleading this whole thing.

I do not deal in garbage. I do not
advertise garbage. And when Kathryn McPherson contacted me, we initially got into an argument and I said, Hey, mail me whatever your problem is.

When she finally did mail me, I responded to her ASAP and I said I will do my due diligence to fix anything that you have a problem with.

This led into more arguments, and I said I have no control over what other people do. I will do my due diligence and try to -- and if you look up HireRush, it's me complaining about their system. I cannot even access my own name. I cannot do anything. So I do not have control over these people that are trying to make $20 \%$ off of me. I did my due diligence for everything.

And in addition, she has no logic. And now it's the thing I told her all the time, I said, you are not very logical in your stuff. I would change the ad

1 if I had the power to go change garbage to junk. It's
2 not -- that would not be hard. And I would not want a
3 ton of paperwork on my desk. I don't want crank phone 4 calls.

So the thing is that she said well, even an F350, that's for hauling, not an F250.

If somebody did email me something at junk and they are sitting there saying something stupid or something like that, yeah, my response would be an attempt to go away.

And if $I$ would have said something to make them respond back to something, there was no intent there of me doing any garbage job for her. It was basically if $I$ responded to somebody like that, why I received so many texts, that would be go away, get away from me. Because if there was logic in it and they got a free service for taking out five bags of trash, they are going to go for the service.

Might have been a kind way if she didn't text me. I have no idea. I don't remember any texts like that. If it was, it was in garbage to me. I had dismissed it. I don't deal in garbage.

But the thing is, they haven't heard from me ever since all of this extreme accusations and fines that they are giving me. And it says on the first thing, and RCW whatever says that, 34.05 .110 , that violations would be -- the first violation would just be a warning. I never even got a warning. I never got anything.

Just for frickin' A to $Z$ and it all stemmed from an angry individual, Kathryn McPherson, and he called her ignorant on her education. And I think I hit the nail on her head when she told me her education earlier on the phone.

MR. ROBERSON: Objection. Argumentative.
JUDGE HOWARD: I am going to give him --
Mr. Henrickson, I am speaking, I am talking.
Mr. Roberson made an objection.
Mr. Henrickson, I am talking.
Mr. Roberson, I see your objection, but I am going to give him leeway because he is pro se.

So Mr. Henrickson, you may continue, just please be careful about speaking over me.

MR. HENRICKSON: It's hard to tell who is speaking to be honest.

JUDGE HOWARD: I understand.
MR. HENRICKSON: So basically, you know, with all this stuff that's gone on, it hasn't been happening anymore.

So I hire Rush saying, oh, we did something, the account is canceled, or I texted them, I emailed them and I said who is this, what are you doing, advertising? They canceled it, Craigslist ads, whatever, I don't see any more of that stuff. And I

1 don't hear any more from Ms. McPherson.

So to me this whole thing is just done and has been done for quite some time. The only thing I got a problem with is the vindictiveness, the lies and the deceit and the crank phone calls. It was very unprofessional, and I am being 100\% honest about everything. And it's just been ridiculous.

This has been hair-changing-color type situation where $I$ have been harassed. And actually, I was actually considering suing UTC because I could prove it with all the phone calls and everything.

I didn't want to spend as many hours as they got into this. I have, what, three hours into this. They have got, what, 20,000, 30 other people, and this is the best case they can throw forward.

Oh, we served him properly. We mailed him. They mailed something before I lived in Australia. I have dual citizenship. This is just ridiculous. It's beyond out of control abuse. And then the attorney was aware of that they didn't serve me properly.

So, you know, these things are just out of control. And I have nothing further to say.

JUDGE HOWARD: All right, thank you, Mr. Henrickson.

Mr. Roberson, do you have any questions for MR. ROBERSON: I do have a couple. JUDGE HOWARD: You may proceed. CROSS-RE-EXAMINATION

BY MR. ROBERSON:
Q. Mr. Henrickson, you are calling in right now on the number (425) 686-5270, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. That's your phone number?
A. That's my phone number.
Q. Okay.

So when someone emails Craigslist or HireRush, the email gets forwarded on, correct, to someone else?
A. I would assume so.
Q. So when Ms. McPherson sent the request for a quote, in response to that Craigslist ad, she got a text message, or she got an email saying text this number, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And that number was your phone number, correct, (425) 686-5270?
A. Correct.
Q. And the offer and the exchange over the text message, that was outside of the purview of HireRush or Craigslist, right?
A. The what?
Q. It's just between those two people, right? It doesn't go to Craigslist or HireRush, right?
A. Yeah, it does, and I tell you how they do it. So they will contact the customers, did this person do business with you, or they will contact me, and there's probably, I would say ten different individuals in the last couple years that have done this logistics thing for me or towards me. Where I get phone calls all the time for logistics, logistics people sit at home nowadays making $20 \%$ off of what other people do.

I will get a phone call, Hey, can you do this, Hey, can you do that? Well, yeah, I am in construction, I do these things, you know, not garbage, but other things.

And so somebody might get a phone call for something stupid and they will call me, and I am like no, don't do that. Or it's illogical, or it's a waste of somebody's time and just like go away.

So you try to be kind because people come back with more stupid questions, they just waste your time. I don't like wasting time. I am A to Z.
Q. I don't suppose you have the names of any of these people who are posting your advertisements for you?
A. I did. I haven't had them in quite some time.
Q. Do you actually have the names, can you remember any of the names?
A. I usually don't remember the names. I have a phone number of people that still text me and they ask me to go pick up loads or something, and I don't deal with the people. But normally, no, there's not even hardly any names. It's just a phone call. Hey, can you do this, can you do that. Hey, can you do this, can you do that, and, can you go look at this bid, can you go look at this job. It's a concrete job, they want a sport court 30 by 60. Hey, can you do this, and it's just a lead. They are just actually finding leads for you.

It's a free lead generation. It's just like the website, it's the same thing. Do I remember your name, no, I don't even remember your name, Mr. Attorney. I talk to hundreds of people a day. Just like we are all sitting here saying about Ms. McPherson, how many people did you talk to? Do you give your paperwork and have them rewrite it for you so you can submit it?

Yeah, I am complaining about her education and then her calling up and wasting all my time and all the paperwork. Yeah, I am upset, I am really upset.

How many emails does -- how much time did it

1 take for that guy to dig up those records and still 2 didn't get me off.

MR. ROBERSON: Mr. Henrickson, I move to strike this as nonresponsive.

JUDGE HOWARD: I am going to -- that point is well taken. I am not going to grant striking the testimony yet. But Mr. Henrickson, we are going beyond the scope of what Mr. Roberson is asking you.

So after Mr. Roberson asks you his questions, $I$ will give you another brief opportunity to offer testimony on your behalf, if you want to respond to anything he asks you. So Mr. Roberson -- Ms. -Mr. Henrickson.

MR. HENRICKSON: Just beating that horse, same thing. Ask a few questions, going to be the same answers.

JUDGE HOWARD: I think we are all hoping to get through this hearing at this point.

So Mr. Roberson, finish your cross and then I will allow a brief opportunity for Mr. Henrickson to respond on his behalf.

MR. ROBERSON: You know, actually, I think I have no further questions. Thank you.

JUDGE HOWARD: Mr. Henrickson, would you like to just briefly state and give any testimony on

1 your behalf in response to what Mr. Roberson asked.

MR. HENRICKSON: Yeah, I just did my due diligence, and asked me to take care of something, did my due diligence. Anybody that contacted me in regards to that, they don't contact me anymore. What can I say, what can I do.

I didn't do business with any of these people. Most of them were fly by, sitting-at-home type of individuals. Like I said, they do their follow-up and then try to get their $20 \%$. They'll contact the tax department who does business with me. If you look it up on the internet, it's me complaining about these individuals. If you look up my name, I don't appreciate the harassment and I believe it still continues. And I believe Ms. McPherson also wrote a bad review about me when I have never done business with them. And I am going like, okay, never even heard of it, never even got a phone call once. The only time it has come up was with Ms. McPherson.

So we have been going at it for two years now, hard core, over the phone. This is vindictive, this is out of control and $I$ want it to stop. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Henrickson. Is that all you have?

MR. HENRICKSON: That's all I have. I

1 didn't do anything. I don't deal in garbage, what do
2 you want me to say.

JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Henrickson, and thank you, Ms. McPherson, both of you for your testimony today.

I will take this all under advisement and issue an order soon. Before we adjourn, I would like to ask the parties to waive their requirement to issue an order in ten days, because $I$ would like to have the transcript of this hearing available to me when I am writing my decision.

And we usually receive that within roughly
seven to ten days. And then $I$ would try to issue an order within five business days from the date I received the transcript at the latest.

Does either party have an objection to
waiving that ten-day requirement?
MR. ROBERSON: No objection.
JUDGE HOWARD: No objection from you, Mr. Henrickson?

MR. HENRICKSON: No.
JUDGE HOWARD: All right. In that case, we are adjourned. Thank you all.
(Hearing concluded at 11:16 a.m.) -o00-
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