

FILED
SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
9/9/2022 10:38 AM
BY ERIN L. LENNON
CLERK

NO. 101178-4

SUPREME COURT
OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

DOUGLAS VERDIER, a single man,

Plaintiff,

vs.

**GREGORY BOST AND LAURIE BOST, husband and wife and their
marital community,**

Defendants- Counterclaim Plaintiffs-Respondents.

vs.

TODD VERDIER, a single man,

Counterclaim Defendant-Appellant

RESPONDENTS' ANSWER TO PETITION FOR REVIEW

C. Robert Steringer, WSBA #41229
bob.steringer@harrang.com
Erica Tatoian, WSBA #58837
erica.tatoian@harrang.com
Harrang Long Gary Rudnick P.C.
1050 SW Sixth Avenue, Suite 1600
Portland, OR 97204
Telephone: 503-242-0000

Attorneys for Respondents Gregory and Laurie Bost

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	ISSUE PRESENTED.....	2
III.	STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	2
IV.	ARGUMENT	2
	A. The only issue on appeal is whether the trial court erred in enforcing the parties’ settlement agreement.	2
	B. All other issues raised by Todd Verdier’s Petition for Review are untimely and unpreserved.....	6
	C. The Court of Appeals’ decision is not in conflict with a decision of the Supreme Court.....	8
	D. The Court of Appeals’ decision in this case does not conflict with a published decision of the Court of Appeals.....	9
	E. This case does not involve a significant question of law under the Washington Constitution or the United States Constitution.....	10
	F. Todd Verdier’s Petition for Review does not involve an issue of substantial public interest that should be determined by this court.....	10
V.	CONCLUSION.....	11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Arkison v. Ethan Allen, Inc.</i> , 160 Wash.2d 535, 160 P.3d 13 (2007).....	5, 8
<i>City of Seattle v. Blume</i> , 134 Wash.2d 243, 947 P.2d 223 (1997).....	10
<i>Duc Tan v. Le</i> , 177 Wash.2d 649, 300 P.3d 356 (2013).....	9
<i>Morse v. Antonellis</i> , 149 Wash. 2d 572, 70 P.3d 125 (2003).....	3
<i>Seafirst Center Ltd. Partnership v. Erickson</i> , 127 Wash.2d 355, 898 P.2d 299 (1995).....	10
<i>Speckert v. Bunker Hill Arizona Min. Co.</i> , 6 Wash.2d 39, 106 P.2d 602 (1940).....	9
<i>State v. Kirkman</i> , 159 Wash.2d 918, 155 P.3d 125 (2007).....	3
<i>State v. Stevenson</i> , 128 Wash.App. 179, 114 P.3d 699 (Div. 2 2005).....	9
<i>State v. Taylor</i> , 150 Wash.2d 599, 80 P.3d 605 (2003).....	6
<i>State v. Truong</i> , 168 Wash.App. 529, 277 P.3d. 74 (Div. 1 2012), <i>rev. den.</i> , 175 Wash.2d 1020 (2012).....	9
<i>Zink v. City of Mesa</i> , 140 Wash.App. 328, 166 P.3d 738 (Div. 3 2007).....	9
Other Authorities	
RAP 2.5(a)	3

RAP 3.16

RAP 5.2(a)7

RAP 9.2(b)6

RAP 9.6(a)6

United States Constitution10

Washington Constitution10

I. INTRODUCTION

Only one issue is properly presented in this appeal: Did the trial court err in enforcing the parties' settlement agreement, which was read into the court's record in May 2019? In the trial court, Petitioner Todd Verdier¹ argued that the trial court could not enforce the settlement agreement because his attorney lacked authority to release certain purported claims that Todd Verdier believes he may have against Respondents Gregory and Laurie Bost ("the Bosts"). After an evidentiary hearing, the trial court found Todd Verdier not credible, and concluded that his attorney had authority to settle the dispute, including releasing all of Todd Verdier's purported claims against the Bosts. After briefing and oral argument, the Court of Appeals affirmed.

Todd Verdier's Petition for Review, like his Opening Brief in the Court of Appeals, raises numerous *other* issues that he contends this Court should address. But, as the Court of Appeals recognized in its decision, none of those other issues are properly before the Court.

For the reasons described in the Court of Appeals' decision and for the reasons below, the Bosts respectfully request that this Court deny Todd Verdier's Petition for Review.

¹ The Bosts refer to Petitioner Todd Verdier by his first name to distinguish him from his father, Douglas Verdier, who was the plaintiff in the underlying case but is not a party to this appeal.

II. ISSUE PRESENTED

Did the trial court err in enforcing the parties' settlement agreement that was read into the court's record on May 3, 2019?

III. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The Bosts incorporate by reference the Court of Appeals' recitation of the pertinent facts. Appx. 2-7.

IV. ARGUMENT

Todd Verdier's Petition for Review lists several issues that he claims are before this Court and warrant this Court's review of the Court of Appeals' decision. He is incorrect in so representing.

A. The only issue on appeal is whether the trial court erred in enforcing the parties' settlement agreement.

Todd Verdier timely appealed from the trial court's February 4, 2020, order enforcing the parties' settlement agreement. The only preserved issue with respect to that ruling, as the Court of Appeals recognized, "was the authority of [Todd Verdier's attorneys] to enter into a settlement agreement, releasing Todd's potential federal law claims against the Bosts." Appx. at 8.

The Court of Appeals affirmed the trial court's order enforcing the parties' settlement agreement, recognizing that the trial court's ruling that Todd Verdier's attorney had the requisite authority was based on a

credibility assessment. That is, the trial court found Todd Verdier's attorney's testimony credible and Todd Verdier's testimony not credible. Tr. Jan. 10, 2020, at 103:22 – 105:19. The Court of Appeals acknowledged that it “lack[ed] authority to revisit a trial court's credibility assessment on appeal.” Appx. at 8. Rightfully so: “Credibility determinations cannot be reviewed on appeal.” *Morse v. Antonellis*, 149 Wash. 2d 572, 574, 70 P.3d 125 (2003).

On appeal, Todd Verdier attempted to make different arguments concerning the validity of the parties' settlement agreement. The Court of Appeals refused to consider those arguments because they were raised for the first time on appeal. Appx. at 8-9. That conclusion is consistent with the “general rule that appellate courts will not consider issues raised for the first time on appeal.” *State v. Kirkman*, 159 Wash.2d 918, 926, 155 P.3d 125 (2007); RAP 2.5(a).

Todd Verdier now again tries to raise unpreserved arguments concerning the validity of the settlement. *See* Petition for Review at 13-15. This Court should not entertain arguments raised for the first time by Todd Verdier on appeal, particularly when he repeatedly represented to the trial court that the “only issue” he was asking the court to decide was whether his attorney had the authority to release his potential claims

against the Bosts. *See* Tr. Dec. 6, 2019, at 9:23-10:9; Tr. Jan. 10, 2020, at 6:21-7:11.

Indeed, not only did Todd Verdier fail to preserve in the trial court the arguments that he currently is making to this Court, but he is seeking to rescind an agreement after earlier benefitting from enforcing its exact terms against the Bosts:

- On May 3, 2019, the parties appeared before the trial court to notify the court that they had reached a settlement. Counsel for Todd Verdier's father read into the record the terms of the agreement which included "a mutual release of all claims between both Verdiers, Todd and Doug, and the Bosts past to present, not future." Tr. May 3, 2019, at 5:17-18.
- In June 2019, both Douglas and Todd Verdier moved to enforce the terms of the settlement agreement against the Bosts, and specifically the terms concerning the release of claims. CP 310, CP 311. Todd Verdier asked the trial court to "enforce the settlement agreement that was reached after many days of intense negotiations by parties represented by competent counsel" and confirmed that the

“terms read into the records on May 3, 2019, are clear and should be enforced as stated.” CP 311 at 2-4.

- By December 2019, Todd Verdier had apparently changed his mind about releasing his claims and only then began to argue that his attorney lacked authority to enter into a settlement agreement and release his purported claims against the Bosts. CP 342 at 255.

By earlier arguing that the parties’ settlement agreement as read into the record in May 2019 was binding *against the Bosts*, Todd Verdier cannot now argue that those *same terms* are not binding against him. Such gamesmanship is barred by principles of judicial estoppel. *Arkison v. Ethan Allen, Inc.*, 160 Wash.2d 535, 538, 160 P.3d 13 (2007) (recognizing that judicial estoppel “precludes a party from asserting one position in a court proceeding and later seeking an advantage by taking a clearly inconsistent opinion”).

B. All other issues raised by Todd Verdier’s Petition for Review are untimely and unpreserved.²

Todd Verdier’s Petition for Review is replete with unsupported statements concerning water rights, water systems, and the Department of Health’s authority. None of those issues were properly before the Court of Appeals, as they all relate, if at all, to a 2018 ruling that Todd Verdier (1) has no standing to challenge; and (2) even if he had the requisite standing, Todd Verdier failed to timely appeal.³

Todd Verdier lacks standing to challenge the trial court’s 2018 bench trial ruling because he is not an “aggrieved party.” Only an “aggrieved party may seek review by the appellate court.” RAP 3.1. An “aggrieved party” under RAP 3.1 is “one whose personal right or pecuniary interests have been affected * * * not one whose feelings have been hurt or one who is disappointed over a certain result.” *State v. Taylor*, 150 Wash.2d 599, 603, 80 P.3d 605 (2003). As the Court of

² Review of Todd Verdier’s complaints concerning the 2018 ruling is also impossible because Todd Verdier failed to properly designate a record to allow this Court to assess the merits of his complaints. Todd Verdier did not arrange for a transcription of any of the proceedings relating to the 2018 order. Nor did he designate any motions or pleadings made in connection with the 2018 order. Accordingly, he failed to provide this Court the requisite record to review the issues he now raises on appeal. *See* RAP 9.2(b) (requiring a party seeking review to “arrange for the transcription of all portions of the verbatim report of proceedings necessary to present the issues raised on review”); and RAP 9.6(a) (requiring a party seeking review to designate “those clerk’s papers and exhibits the party wants the trial court clerk to transmit to the appellate court”).

³ Nothing in the trial court’s February 2020 order enforcing the parties’ settlement agreement concerns the parties’ water rights. CP 365.

Appeals correctly recognized in its decision, Todd Verdier lacks standing to challenge the trial court's 2018 bench trial ruling concerning the parties' water rights: "The only claims litigated at the bench trial were Douglas's claims against the Bosts. Todd was not a party to these claims." Appx. at 12. Indeed, the only mention of Todd Verdier in the trial court's 2018 bench trial ruling is a finding of fact that a third party hired by the Bosts to build a fence "was confronted by the plaintiff's son Todd Verdier who opposed the building of a new fence." CP 178. The record is devoid of any evidence that Todd Verdier had a personal, property, or pecuniary right that was adversely affected by the court's 2018 bench trial ruling.

Even if Todd Verdier could establish that he had a personal, property, or pecuniary right that was adversely affected by the trial court's 2018 bench trial ruling, any challenge to that ruling is grossly untimely. A party seeking to challenge a trial court's ruling must file a notice of appeal within 30 days. RAP 5.2(a). The trial court entered its bench trial ruling on September 24, 2018. Yet Todd Verdier filed his notice of appeal on March 4, 2020, 527 days after the trial court entered its order. The Court of Appeals' decision recognizes that Todd Verdier's challenge to the 2018 ruling is untimely. Appx. at 11 n. 4.

C. The Court of Appeals' decision is not in conflict with a decision of the Supreme Court.

Having narrowed the multitude of issues raised by Todd Verdier in his Petition for Review to the only issue properly before this Court, there is no basis to conclude that the Court of Appeals' decision conflicts with a decision of this Court. Indeed, the Court of Appeals' decision is consistent with decisions of this Court. Accordingly, review in this case is not warranted.

The Court of Appeals concluded that the trial court's ruling concerning the authority of Todd Verdier's authority was based on a credibility determination and that appellate courts could not second-guess credibility determinations. Appx. at 8. The trial court found that Todd Verdier's attorney, who testified that Todd had given him authority to enter into a settlement agreement that released all of his potential claims against the Bosts, was credible and that his testimony "consistent with the documents that were admitted." Jan. 10, 2020, at 103:22-24. On the other hand, the trial court found Todd Verdier's testimony that "he was withholding these federal – potential causes of action" to not be credible. *Id.* at 104:16-21.

The Court of Appeals' refusal to question the trial court's credibility determination is in line with case law established by this Court.

See, e.g., Speckert v. Bunker Hill Arizona Min. Co., 6 Wash.2d 39, 41, 106 P.2d 602 (1940) (“The credibility of the witnesses and the weight to be given to their testimony were for the trial court, not this court.”); *Duc Tan v. Le*, 177 Wash.2d 649, 671-72, 300 P.3d 356 (2013) (recognizing that an appellate court “must strongly defer” to a factfinder’s determinations of credibility). This factor does not warrant granting Todd Verdier’s Petition for Review.

D. The Court of Appeals’ decision in this case does not conflict with a published decision of the Court of Appeals.

As has this Court, each division of the Washington Court of Appeals has recognized that it is the role of the factfinder to measure a witness’s credibility, and not the appellate court’s. *See State v. Truong*, 168 Wash.App. 529, 534, 277 P.3d. 74 (Div. 1 2012), *rev. den.*, 175 Wash.2d 1020 (2012); *State v. Stevenson*, 128 Wash.App. 179, 192 n. 11, 114 P.3d 699 (Div. 2 2005); *Zink v. City of Mesa*, 140 Wash.App. 328, 336, 166 P.3d 738 (Div. 3 2007). Because the Court of Appeals’ decision is in line with the precedent of its sibling courts, this factor does not warrant granting review of Todd Verdier’s Petition for Review.

E. This case does not involve a significant question of law under the Washington Constitution or the United States Constitution.

Todd Verdier's Petition for Review does not raise a significant question of law under either the Washington Constitution or the United States Constitution. Consequently, this factor does not warrant granting review of Todd Verdier's Petition for Review.

F. Todd Verdier's Petition for Review does not involve an issue of substantial public interest that should be determined by this court.

There is no basis to conclude that Todd Verdier's Petition for Review involves an issue of substantial public interest. Again, the only issue properly before this Court is whether the trial court erred in enforcing the parties' settlement agreement based on its finding that Todd Verdier's attorney had the requisite authority to do so. That issue is not one of interest to the public, let alone a substantial public interest.

To the contrary, the public has an interest in having this matter resolved with finality. "[T]he express public policy of this state * * * encourages settlement." *City of Seattle v. Blume*, 134 Wash.2d 243, 258, 947 P.2d 223 (1997); *Seafirst Center Ltd. Partnership v. Erickson*, 127 Wash.2d 355, 366, 898 P.2d 299 (1995) (recognizing "Washington's strong public policy of encouraging settlements).

The parties settled their dispute in May 2019. In June 2019, Todd Verdier expressed that the parties had not only settled their dispute, but that the terms read into the record in May 2019 – including the terms concerning the release of claims – were binding on the parties. CP 310; CP 311. Yet Todd Verdier has since taken the position that he is not bound by the settlement agreement, prolonging this litigation for three more years.

There is no basis to conclude that there is a substantial public interest presented in this case.

V. CONCLUSION

For the forgoing reasons, the Bosts respectfully request that this Court deny Todd Verdier's Petition for Review.

DATED: September 9, 2022.

Respectfully submitted,

By: s/ Erica Tatoian
C. Robert Steringer, WSBA #41229
bob.steringer@harrang.com
Erica Tatoian, WSBA #58837
erica.tatoian@harrang.com
Of Attorneys for Respondents Gregory
and Laurie Bost, husband and wife and
their marital community

APPENDIX

Unpublished Opinion of the Court of Appeals of the State of Washington, Division Three, *Douglas Verdier v. Gregory Bost and Laurie Bost v. Todd Verdier*, Case No. 38543-4-III.....Appx.1-13

FILED
JULY 19, 2022
In the Office of the Clerk of Court
WA State Court of Appeals Division III

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
DIVISION THREE

DOUGLAS VERDIER, a single man,)	No. 38543-4-III
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	
)	
GREGORY BOST and LAURI BOST,)	UNPUBLISHED OPINION
husband and wife and their marital)	
community,)	
)	
Respondents,)	
)	
TODD VERDIER, a single man,)	
)	
Appellant.)	

PENNELL, J. — Todd Verdier appeals a superior court order granting a motion to enforce a CR 2A settlement agreement. He also claims the right to appeal a 2018 bench trial ruling resolving a boundary line and water dispute between his father, Douglas Verdier, and Gregory and Lauri Bost. We affirm.

No. 38543-4-III
Verdier v. Bost

FACTS

Douglas Verdier owned property in Clark County, Washington, adjacent to property owned by Gregory and Lauri Bost. Douglas,¹ who resided there with his son Todd, had a well on his property that supplied both the Verdier and Bost households with water. As a result of dispute between the neighbors concerning the property line and the Bosts' use of the well, Douglas filed suit in early 2013 to quiet title and for other damages and declaratory relief. The Bosts' answered Douglas's complaint and asserted counterclaims against Douglas and Todd. The counterclaims included allegations of both negligent and intentional infliction of emotional distress. In September 2014, the Bosts were successful in obtaining an injunction against Todd and Douglas to prevent them from interfering with the Bosts use of the well.

A bench trial on Douglas's claims was held in September 2018. While the court ruled in Douglas's favor on the boundary line dispute, it ruled in favor of the Bosts on the water dispute, explaining that "[e]ach of the parties has the right to an uninterrupted supply of water from the well located on [Douglas]'s property." Clerk's Papers (CP) at 73. The court's ruling identifies Douglas as the plaintiff, the Bosts as defendants and

¹ For clarity and readability, we refer to the Verdiers by their first names.

No. 38543-4-III
Verdier v. Bost

counterclaim plaintiffs, and Todd as a counterclaim defendant. The ruling did not resolve the Bosts' counterclaims.

On May 2, 2019, Douglas's attorney, Lowell McKelvey, sent an e-mail proposing a settlement of the Bosts' counterclaims. One term of the settlement was the "[m]utual [r]elease of all claims between both Verdiers and Bosts, past to present." Ex. D1-4.

Todd's attorney, Levi Bendele, e-mailed the proposed terms to Todd, indicating: "Looks like everyone is ready to settle. It requires a mutual release of all parties past to present.

. . . You in or out?" Ex. D2-105. Later that evening, Mr. Bendele e-mailed Todd again:

Thank you for getting back to me. Confirming that you accept the settlement terms below. And confirming the release will be mutual and for all potential claims accrued past to today's date. We'll try to get the case settled now with your authority.

Id. Todd e-mailed back:

Ok . . . Levi[.]
 Per our conversation. I give my release for past up to the present . . . mutually. In the Verdier v[.] Bost matter filed in 2013. If this settles for the 110k plus whatever C. Doug Verdier's other conditions are.

Id.

On May 3, the parties appeared before the trial court to notify the court they had reached a settlement. Attorney John Barton² appeared on Todd's behalf as Mr. Bendele

² Mr. Barton was co-counsel with Mr. Bendele.

No. 38543-4-III
Verdier v. Bost

was out of town. Mr. McKelvey read the terms of the agreed settlement to the court, including “There will be a mutual release of all claims between both Verdiers, Todd and Doug, and the Bosts past to present, not future.” Report of Proceedings (RP) (May 3, 2019) at 5. Mr. Barton informed the court that Todd agreed to the terms of the settlement. The settlement terms had not yet been reduced to a formal written agreement at the time of the hearing.

In June, Douglas filed a motion to enforce the terms of the settlement read into the record on May 3. After the Bosts responded to the motion, Todd also filed a response, stating he had “concerns regarding the Bosts[’] attempts to change and add terms that were never mentioned in the settlement agreement read into the court record on May 3, 2019.” CP at 114. Todd argued that “[t]he terms read into the records on May 3, 2019 are clear and should be enforced as stated.” *Id.* at 117. Todd’s response specifically listed the mutual release of all claims between the Verdiers and the Bosts as a term read into the record. The trial court granted the motion.

By September, the settlement agreement had still yet to be reduced to writing. Consequently, the Bosts filed their own motion to enforce the settlement, arguing the Verdiers had unreasonably delayed the formalization of a written agreement. Todd opposed this motion, asserting that he had not authorized his attorneys to enter into a

No. 38543-4-III
Verdier v. Bost

settlement with the Bosts wherein he would give up the right to assert claims against them in the future.

At a hearing in November, Mr. Bendele requested to withdraw from representing Todd due to a conflict. Todd also personally asked for a continuance to resolve issues surrounding his legal representation. Later in the hearing, Mr. McKelvey discussed Douglas's response to the Bosts' motion to enforce the settlement. Mr. McKelvey explained he drafted and attached to Douglas's response a written version of the draft settlement agreement read into the record on May 3, which Douglas had signed as a demonstration of his willingness to settle. Mr. McKelvey described this draft as follows:

[I]t's a settlement agreement where I took the May 3rd email that formed the settlement basis for this settlement—that was poorly worded—but the May 3rd email that is the basis for the settlement agreement which I then read almost verbatim—in retrospect I wish I had read it verbatim—into the record before Your Honor.

RP (Nov. 15, 2019) at 13. The court granted Todd a continuance and scheduled another hearing on the Bosts' motion for December 6.

At the December hearing, Todd argued the trial court needed to hold an evidentiary hearing to resolve issues of fact concerning whether he had authorized his counsel to release his potential claims against the Bosts. The court concurred and scheduled a hearing to receive evidence on the issue.

No. 38543-4-III
Verdier v. Bost

The evidentiary hearing was held on January 10, 2020. At the outset of the hearing, Todd conceded that there was “no dispute” that he had “agreed to a mutual release of claims.” RP (Jan 10, 2020) at 6. Todd explained the only thing to be decided by the court was the “very narrow issue” of whether Mr. Bendele had the authority to settle Todd’s federal law claims³ against the Bosts. *Id.* 6-7.

During the hearing, Todd produced a letter of engagement from Mr. Bendele and Mr. Barton which stated they were retained only to defend claims made against Todd, and were not authorized to represent him in making claims of his own. Mr. Bendele explained the Bosts requested a release of all potential claims against them as a condition of settlement of their claims against Todd. In support of this contention, he produced the e-mails between himself, Mr. McKelvey, the Bosts’ attorney, and Todd. Mr. Bendele also claimed he repeatedly discussed with Todd the necessity of releasing all claims Todd had against the Bosts to settle the Bosts’ claims against Todd. Mr. Bendele testified Todd released all his claims of any kind against the Bosts. Mr. Bendele denied that Todd instructed him to reserve potential federal law claims against the Bosts.

³ Todd was considering suing the Bosts under the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. §1365, and the Trafficking Victims Protection Act, 18 U.S.C. §1595.

No. 38543-4-III
Verdier v. Bost

Todd testified at the hearing that he had given Mr. Bendele permission to release “the Verdier v[.] Bost matter state [law] claims that they filed against me in 2013.” *Id.* at 73. He denied providing Mr. Bendele permission to settle his federal law claims.

The trial court found Mr. Bendele’s testimony to be persuasive and consistent with the documents admitted. The court found Mr. Bendele to have been very clear with Todd about the nature of the claims he was releasing. Conversely, the court found Todd’s testimony about withholding his federal law claims to not be credible. The court concluded Mr. Bendele did not exceed his authority by entering into the settlement agreement.

On February 4, 2020, the trial court granted the Bosts’ motion to enforce the settlement. The court’s order specified that the draft of the written settlement agreement proposed by Douglas in his response to the motion constituted the written agreement among the parties.

Todd now appeals both the September 2018 bench trial ruling and the order enforcing the settlement agreement. A Division Three panel considered Todd’s appeal with oral argument after receipt of an administrative transfer of the case from Division Two.

No. 38543-4-III
Verdier v. Bost

ANALYSIS

Todd challenges the trial court's order enforcing the settlement agreement. He also challenges the trial court's bench trial ruling regarding the right to well water. We address each issue in turn.

Enforcement of settlement agreement

During the trial court proceedings, the only issue before the court was the authority of Mr. Barton and Mr. Bendele to enter into a settlement agreement, releasing Todd's potential federal law claims against the Bosts. Todd did not raise any legal arguments regarding the validity of the CR 2A settlement. After hearing the testimony and considering the matter, the trial court ruled Todd's attorneys had authority to enter into the settlement agreement. This ruling was based on a credibility assessment. The trial court credited Mr. Bendele's testimony that Todd had agreed to settle all claims in any shape or form. The court did not credit Todd's testimony to the contrary. We lack authority to revisit a trial court's credibility assessment on appeal. *State v. N.B.*, 7 Wn. App. 2d 831, 837, 436 P.3d 358 (2019). Todd therefore fails to show the trial court erred in its decision to uphold the settlement agreement.

For the first time on appeal, Todd makes several legal arguments regarding the propriety of the CR 2A settlement agreement. As pointed out by the Bosts, arguments

No. 38543-4-III
Verdier v. Bost

raised for the first time on appeal are generally deemed waived. *See* RAP 2.5(a). While we have discretion to address unpreserved issues under RAP 2.5(a), we decline to exercise that discretion in this case.

Subject matter jurisdiction

Todd argues he has made a subject matter jurisdiction claim that is reviewable for the first time on appeal. Under RAP 2.5(a), a litigant is entitled to raise a claim of lack of subject matter jurisdiction at any time, regardless of whether the claim was preserved at trial. We therefore assess whether Todd has a viable subject matter jurisdiction argument.

“Subject matter jurisdiction refers to a court’s ability to entertain a type of case, not to its authority to enter an order in a particular case.” *In re Marriage of Buecking*, 179 Wn.2d 438, 448, 316 P.3d 999 (2013). Superior courts have jurisdiction “in all cases . . . in which jurisdiction shall not have been by law vested exclusively in some other court. . . .” WASH. CONST. art. IV, § 6. “As courts of general jurisdiction, superior courts have long had the ‘power to hear and determine all matters, legal and equitable . . . except in so far as these powers have been expressly denied.’” *In re Marriage of Major*, 71 Wn. App. 531, 533, 859 P.2d 1262 (1993) (quoting *State ex rel. Martin v. Superior Court*, 101 Wash. 81, 94, 172 P. 257 (1918)).

No. 38543-4-III
Verdier v. Bost

In general, “state courts may assume subject-matter jurisdiction over a federal cause of action absent provision by [the United States] Congress to the contrary or disabling incompatibility between the federal claim and state-court adjudication.” *Gulf Offshore Co. v. Mobil Oil Corp.*, 453 U.S. 473, 477-78, 101 S. Ct. 2870, 69 L. Ed. 2d 784 (1981). Congress has provided that citizen suits under the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1365, be filed in United States District Court. Likewise, private suits under the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA), 18 U.S.C. § 1595, must also be filed in federal district court.

While the trial court lacked the subject matter jurisdiction to hear a claim under the Clean Water Act or the TVPA, the court never entertained such a claim. Instead, the court merely issued an order enforcing a settlement agreement that waived Todd’s claims against the Bosts. As a court of general jurisdiction, the trial court had the subject matter jurisdiction to enforce the settlement agreement. Todd cites no law to the contrary or any law that states Washington superior courts lack the jurisdiction to enforce agreements waiving federal law claims. We therefore affirm the trial court’s order enforcing the CR 2A settlement agreement.

No. 38543-4-III
Verdier v. Bost

Water ruling

Todd challenges the trial court’s September 2018 bench trial ruling, arguing it created an illegal public water system. The Bosts answer that Todd lacks the standing to appeal this ruling, as Todd lacks a legal interest in any of the property at issue in the water ruling. We agree with the Bosts.⁴

“Only an aggrieved party may seek review by the appellate court.” RAP 3.1. For a party to be aggrieved, the decision in question must adversely affect that party’s property or pecuniary rights, or a personal right, or impose on the party a burden or obligation. *Sheets v. Benevolent & Protective Order of Keglers*, 34 Wn.2d 851, 855, 210 P.2d 690 (1949). “[U]nder some narrow circumstances, persons who were not formal parties to trial court proceedings, but who are aggrieved by orders entered in the course of those proceedings, may appeal as ‘aggrieved parties.’” *State v. G.A.H.*, 133 Wn. App. 567, 574, 137 P.3d 66 (2006). For example, a mother was allowed to appeal a filiation order following proceedings brought in the name of the State, as she had a direct pecuniary interest that was adversely affected by the order. *State v. Casey*, 7 Wn. App. 923, 927, 503 P.2d 1123 (1972).

⁴ As the Bosts also note, Todd’s appeal of the water ruling is not timely.

No. 38543-4-III
Verdier v. Bost

Todd was not an aggrieved party for purposes of the 2018 bench trial ruling. The only claims litigated at the bench trial were Douglas's claims against the Bosts. Todd was not a party to these claims. Furthermore, he did not have a property, personal, or pecuniary right that was adversely affected by the court's ruling. Todd did not own his father's property at the time of the bench trial. He had no property or pecuniary right to the well, and the order directing Douglas to allow the Bosts to have an uninterrupted supply of water imposed no burden or obligation upon Todd. Therefore, Todd was not an aggrieved party who has the ability to appeal the court's bench trial ruling. We will not review this claim of error.

Motion to supplement record

On March 7, 2022, Todd filed a motion to supplement the record with a declaration from an attorney for the Bosts named Jennie Bricker. The motion references numerous exhibits documenting settlement negotiations between the Bosts and the Verdiers. Todd's motion includes a copy of Ms. Bricker's declaration. However, the motion does not include the vast majority of the exhibits purportedly appended to the declaration. Todd filed his motion three days before oral argument in this case. The Bosts argue the motion to supplement the record should be denied as untimely.

No. 38543-4-III
Verdier v. Bost

We agree with the Bosts that the motion to supplement the record is untimely and is therefore denied. It is not apparent how Ms. Bricker's declaration is relevant to the credibility assessment that was at issue during the evidentiary hearing on whether to enforce the parties' settlement agreement. Supplementing the record at this point would be unfair to the Bosts as it would delay the proceedings and require additional briefing. The ends of justice would not be served by supplementing the record.

CONCLUSION


The superior court is affirmed. The motion to supplement the record is denied.

A majority of the panel has determined this opinion will not be printed in the Washington Appellate Reports, but it will be filed for public record pursuant to RCW 2.06.040.




 Pennell, J.

WE CONCUR:



 Siddoway, C.J.



 Lawrence-Berrey, J.

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

This brief complies with the applicable Court approved word-count limitation under RAP 18.7, because it contains 2,269 words, exclusive of words contained in the appendices, the title sheet, the table of contents, the table of authorities, the certificate of compliance, the certificate of service, signature blocks, and pictorial images (e.g., photographs, maps, diagrams, and exhibits).

HARRANG LONG GARY RUDNICK P.C.

By: s/ Erica Tatoian
C. Robert Steringer, WSBA #41229
bob.steringer@harrang.com
Erica Tatoian, WSBA #58837
erica.tatoian@harrang.com
Of Attorneys for Respondents Gregory
and Laurie Bost, husband and wife and
their marital community

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on September 9, 2022, I caused to be served a true and correct copy of the foregoing document, **RESPONDENTS'**

ANSWER TO PETITION FOR REVIEW, to be served as follows:

- Via E-Filing
- Via First Class Mail, Postage Prepaid
- Via Facsimile
- Via Personal Delivery

Todd Verdier
36105 NE Washougal River Road
Washougal, WA 98671

HARRANG LONG GARY RUDNICK P.C.

By: s/ Erica Tatoian
C. Robert Steringer, WSBA #41229
bob.steringer@harrang.com
Erica Tatoian, WSBA #58837
erica.tatoian@harrang.com
Of Attorneys for Respondents Gregory
and Laurie Bost, husband and wife and
their marital community

HARRANG LONG GARY RUDNICK PC

September 09, 2022 - 10:38 AM

Transmittal Information

Filed with Court: Supreme Court
Appellate Court Case Number: 101,178-4
Appellate Court Case Title: Gregory Bost, et al. v. Todd Verdier
Superior Court Case Number: 13-2-00382-5

The following documents have been uploaded:

- 1011784_Answer_Reply_20220909103344SC356874_7270.pdf
This File Contains:
Answer/Reply - Answer to Petition for Review
The Original File Name was Respondents Answer to Petition for Review.PDF

A copy of the uploaded files will be sent to:

- deborah.boersma@harrang.com
- erica.tatoian@harrang.com
- mverdi2003@yahoo.com

Comments:

Sender Name: Tessa Landis - Email: tessa.landis@harrang.com

Filing on Behalf of: C Robert Steringer - Email: bob.steringer@harrang.com (Alternate Email: lindsey.darnell@harrang.com)

Address:
497 Oakway Road, Suite 380
Eugene, OR, 97401
Phone: (541) 485-0220

Note: The Filing Id is 20220909103344SC356874