



In support of Schaeffer Cox #13 June 14, 2017.

As a Registered Nurse (for 36 years) I had a close working relationship with nurses I stood beside. It took little time to understand the content of their character.

We would fight together to save lives and sometimes weep when we failed that goal.

How hard it was to take an infant from a mother's arms who would beg us to save her child's life. We would try and too often fail. Not because of any fault of ours but rather the reality of the human condition.

Attorneys also have a similar working relationship. They also work with human life. Sometimes failing to bring Justice. Often, not a fault of their own. But sometimes, some attorneys, are driven by their own self interest. Winning, regardless of truth or Justice.

It is my belief Joseph W. Bottini and Steven E. Skrocki are two such attorneys. Both working for the DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Anchorage Alaska's office. Working side by side for 26 years.

According to Steven E. Skrocki, (previously posted resume) he has worked in the DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, in Alaska, since 1991. All those years in the Anchorage office.

One of the three DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE offices in Alaska.

Bottini too had worked in the Anchorage office since 1985.

Bottini and Skrocki worked on the Schaeffer Cox case together. I imagine they worked closely over their entire legal career. Both of which had been completely within the DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE Anchorage office.

Like all professionals, who work together, we know the processes others use in our work related field.

As a nurse, I was aware of the qualities and weaknesses of those nurses I worked with. Rarely, but sometimes, discussing with management concerns I had about patient care.

I worked at many hospitals over the years. I was in union leadership at one of those hospitals. I

am an advocate for nurses but never placed my nurse support over the patient care delivered.

Like the DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, I helped institute peer review in the disciplinary process for nurses. Sometimes nurses were blamed for a failure in the delivery of care. But in 1999 the healthcare industry started to change. It was recognized failures in the delivery of healthcare were related to process failures rather than nurse delivering the care. For to Err is Human.

I asked for a peer review when nurses were disciplined. If they had professional support, I would fight tooth and nail to demonstrate the process failure rather than the nurse involved.

I find it amazing that the DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE did not follow their own protocol in disciplining Joseph W. Bottini. His discipline was overturned because a peer review was not done. Management punished him against DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE policy. Could they be

that inept? Perhaps the DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE gave Bottini a way out of his financial loss. An escape clause, if you will, for his discipline.

Nevertheless it is clear Mr. Bottini is an evil doer in the DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE. The question is why? We don't need to answer that question in regards to Schaeffer Cox case. Only understand how things work in the DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE Anchorage office.

We can see the motivation of Steven E. Skrocki corrupt behavior in the Cox case. For he wants to become a Federal Judge in Alaska. Heaven forbid he accomplish his self-serving goal.

Could Steven E. Skrocki not have known Bottini's behavior in the Ted Stevens case? Not hardly. For they worked side by side for two decades prior to the Stevens case. Skrocki knew how Bottini operated in cases. So, in the the least, Skrocki fully understood Bottini lied and

cheated to win cases. In the worse, Steven E. Skrocki acted just like Bottini, lying and cheating to win his own cases. According to his request for a federal judgeship he used the Cox case for his advancement. It is clear in my mind, Bottini and Skrocki are two peas in a pod. Identical in behavior when it comes to Prosecutorial Misconduct.

Skrocki has demonstrated his own self-interest by using the corrupt conviction of my friend Schaeffer Cox for his own personal advancement.

I don't know what Bottini's motivation was in regards to the lies he perpetrated against Senator Ted Stevens and others. Perhaps, if his evil behavior was not exposed in the Ted Stevens case, he would also be applying for the vacant federal Judge position.

Next time: how to do to Steven E. Skrocki what he did to Schaefer Cox, economic hardship.

Signed Ray Southwell, Nikiski, Alaska

End – another post

This is promising. Michael Filipovic is representing Schaeffer in the upcoming appeal hearing in August.

Filipovic also represented an Alaskan legislator by the name of Kohring back in 2011.

According to the attached

"The U.S. Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit today unanimously vacated (PDF) the conviction of Victor Kohring, a former member of the Alaska House of Representatives. Federal prosecutors in Alaska shirked their obligation to turn over exculpatory and impeachment information to Kohring's lawyers, the court said."

It must be why Skrocki is front and center on Cox's appeal. Skrocki fears he will be exposed as an evil doer as is Bottini. (Remember how much exculpatory evidence was withheld in Senator Ted Stevens case.)

For Skrocki's friend and associate Bottini was responsible for withholding exculpatory evidence in Kohring's case.

I continue to prayerfully visualize the miracle of Schaeffer stepping out (from prison) in the sunlight. His eyes being sore from it. Then he catches the glimpse of motion to realize his kids are running up the steps towards him.

Please Visualize this prayer many times throughout the day.

<http://legaltimes.typepad.com/blt/2011/03/court-vacates-conviction-prosecutorial-violations.html>

March 11, 2011

Appeals Court Vacates Conviction in Alaska Public Corruption Case

Updated 2:49 p.m.

A former elected state official in Alaska today won a new trial on public corruption charges after a federal appeals court ruled that prosecutors suppressed information favorable to his defense, undermining confidence in the outcome of the trial.

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit today [unanimously vacated \(PDF\)](#) the conviction of Victor Kohring, a former member of the Alaska House of Representatives. Federal prosecutors in Alaska shirked their obligation to turn over exculpatory and impeachment information to Kohring's lawyers, the court said.

But the appeals court split over whether to dismiss the indictment itself. Two judges on the panel, Sidney Thomas and A. Wallace Tashima, said there was insufficient evidence to conclude federal prosecutors acted in bad faith. A third judge wrote in dissent, saying the case exemplified "flagrant" government misconduct.

Judge Betty Fletcher said prosecutors in the Kohring case acted with "reckless disregard" for their constitutional obligations, shielding thousands of pages of relevant documents from Kohring's lawyers until after his conviction in the U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska in November 2007.

"Despite these egregious violations of basic prosecutorial responsibilities, the prosecution insists that Kohring's trial was justly conducted and his conviction fairly obtained," Fletcher wrote. "The prosecution's refusal to accept responsibility for its misconduct is deeply troubling and indicates that a stronger remedy is necessary to impress upon it the reprehensible nature of its acts and omissions."

Fletcher said dismissal of the indictment would serve not only as a deterrent, "but to release Kohring from further anguish and uncertainty."

The Justice Department said it is reviewing the opinion and declined to immediately comment on it. A lawyer for Kohring, Michael Filipovic, an assistant federal public defender in Seattle, said he anticipated the circuit would side with Kohring.

"We're disappointed the majority did not dismiss all of the charges against Mr. Kohring," Filipovic said in an interview this afternoon. "There were many egregious and serious *Brady* and *Giglio* violations in this case. We felt the combination of how serious and how calculated these violations were that this was a case that called for dismissal."

Filipovic said he is hopeful the Justice Department will examine the prosecution closely and choose against a second trial for Kohring.

In November 2007, a jury found [Kohring guilty on charges](#) that included conspiracy to commit extortion and attempted extortion for allegedly taking cash and other benefits from an oil company executive in exchange for legislative acts to benefit the company. Kohring was a member of the Alaska Legislature from 1994 to 2007.

The prosecution of Kohring was part of the U.S. Justice Department's investigation of public corruption in Alaska, a probe that included the false-statements case against the late Alaska Sen. Ted Stevens in Washington. The Stevens case was [thrown out in April 2009](#) amid allegations of prosecutorial misconduct. A criminal contempt investigation of members of the prosecution team is ongoing.

The Kohring case was already on appeal in the 9th Circuit when Attorney General Eric Holder Jr. announced the government was abandoning the Stevens prosecution because prosecutors failed to turn over favorable information to Stevens' lawyers. After the charges against Stevens were dismissed, lawyers for Kohring asked the 9th Circuit to order DOJ to turn over all favorable information.

In a rare move, the government [asked the appeals court to remand](#) the Kohring case to the trial judge for further proceedings. Kohring was freed pending appeal.

On remand, Justice Department prosecutors disclosed several thousand pages of documents, including FBI reports of interviews of government witnesses Bill Allen and Rick Smith. Allen is the former chief executive of an oil field services company called VECO Corp., and Smith was a VECO executive. The government's case against Kohring was rooted primarily in recorded conversations between Kohring, Allen and Smith.

Kohring's lawyers argued the newly disclosed information cast doubt on Allen's memory and also revealed that Allen's payments to Kohring were made out of friendship and pity and not through a quid-pro-quo relationship. The documents also showed differing recollections as to how much money Allen and Smith actually paid to Kohring.

The trial judge, John Sedwick of federal district court in Alaska, determined the government suppressed favorable information, but he said the evidence was not material and did not affect Kohring's trial. Sedwick refused to dismiss the indictment.

The appeals court today disagreed on the materiality of the suppressed evidence and reversed Sedwick's ruling.

"We are cognizant of the prosecution's explanation that it disclosed the voluminous material out of an abundance of caution. And we recognize that the prosecution might not have had a duty to disclose all the information it did," Thomas wrote. "However, a substantial amount of the material is either admissible on its face, could have been used as impeachment material, or is likely inadmissible but memorializes exculpatory facts or impeachment information that should have been disclosed."

Posted by [Mike Scarcella](#) on March 11, 2011 at 11:21 AM in [Crime and Punishment](#), [Current Affairs](#), [D.C. Courts and Government](#), [Justice Department](#), [Legal Business](#), [Personal Finance](#), [Politics and Government](#), [Travel](#) | [Permalink](#)