

No. 62996-4-1

DIVISION I, COURT OF APPEALS  
OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

MICHAEL FARROW and LIDIA FARROW,  
husband and wife,

Appellants,

v.

LESLIE CONTROLS, INC., et al.,

Respondents.

FILED  
COURT OF APPEALS  
STATE OF WASH.  
2009 SEP - 8 PM 3:55

Consolidated Appeal from King County Superior Court  
(Hon. Dean S. Lum)  
Cause No. 08-2-0717-4 SEA

BRIEF OF RESPONDENT ANCHOR DARLING VALVE COMPANY.

Barry N. Mesher, WSBA No. 07845  
Brian D. Zeringer, WSBA No. 15566  
Jeffrey M. Odom, WSBA No. 36168  
LANE POWELL PC  
Attorneys for Respondent,  
Anchor Darling Valve Company

Lane Powell PC  
1420 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4100  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
Telephone: (206) 223-7000  
Facsimile: (206) 223-7107

ORIGINAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	ii
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. JOINDER IN RESPONDENTS' BRIEFS .....	3
III. ISSUES PERTAINING TO ASSIGNMENTS OF ERROR .....	4
IV. STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	5
A. Factual Background .....	5
B. Procedural Background.....	7
V. ARGUMENT .....	8
A. The Trial Court Correctly Dismissed All Claims against Anchor Darling That Are Based on Mr. Farrow's Alleged Exposure to Asbestos at PSNS .....	8
B. The Trial Court Correctly Dismissed All Claims against Anchor Darling That Are Based on Mr. Farrow's Alleged Exposure to Asbestos Outside of PSNS.....	9
VI. CONCLUSION.....	11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page</u>
<u>CASES</u>	
<u>Lockwood v. AC&amp;S, Inc.</u> , 109 Wn.2d 235, 744 P.2d 605 (1987).....	10
<u>STATUTES AND COURT RULES</u>	
RAP 10.1(g).....	3

## I. INTRODUCTION

In this action Plaintiffs/Appellants, Michael and Lidia Farrow, sued more than 50 defendants for damages relating to Michael Farrow's diagnosis of mesothelioma, which condition Appellants contend was caused by exposure to asbestos. In their Complaint, Appellants alleged that Mr. Farrow was exposed to asbestos at various places during the 1950's, 1960's, and through the late 1970's. Among the places where Mr. Farrow was allegedly exposed to asbestos was the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard ("PSNS"), where he worked as a pipefitter and engineering technician from 1953 to 1974. Notwithstanding their claims as to Mr. Farrow's overall asbestos exposure, Appellants expressly disclaimed "any cause of action or recovery for any injuries caused by any exposure to asbestos dust that occurred in a federal enclave, which expressly excludes U.S. Navy vessels."

IMO Industries, Inc. ("IMO") moved for summary judgment dismissal of all of the claims Appellants had asserted against it. IMO's motion was in part based on the disclaimer contained within Appellants' Complaint. Anchor Darling Valve Company ("Anchor Darling"), together with several other defendants, joined IMO's summary judgment motion to the extent it sought dismissal of the claims Appellants had asserted against it arising out of Mr. Farrow's employment at PSNS.

The trial court granted IMO's summary judgment motion, and it also granted Anchor Darling's motion for partial summary judgment thereby dismissing all claims asserted against Anchor Darling for the injuries Mr. Farrow had allegedly sustained as a result of asbestos exposure at PSNS. The trial court's ruling was based on its finding that PSNS was a federal enclave and that, by virtue of their disclaimer, Appellants had excluded from this action all claims based on exposure at PSNS. In granting summary judgment dismissal of Appellants' PSNS based claims, the trial court also rejected Appellants' efforts to limit the scope of their disclaimer to "land based" exposures and to reserve for themselves the ability to pursue in this action claims based on exposures aboard the Navy vessels that were drydocked or moored at PSNS during their construction or repair.

After the trial court dismissed the claims that were based on exposure at PSNS, Anchor Darling moved to dismiss Appellants' claims to the extent they were based on exposure to asbestos outside of PSNS. In its follow-up motion Anchor Darling showed that there was no evidence that Mr. Farrow had any exposure outside of PSNS to an asbestos-containing product for which Anchor Darling was responsible. Appellants did not oppose this motion and, accordingly, the trial court further ordered

the dismissal of all claims asserted against Anchor Darling that related to Mr. Farrow's alleged exposure to asbestos outside of PSNS.

Appellants apparently do not seek to reverse the trial court's dismissal of their claims against Anchor Darling relating to exposures outside of PSNS. Rather, it is the trial court's finding as to the federal enclave status of PSNS and its finding as to the scope of the disclaimer contained within Appellants' Complaint that form the crux of their appeal. This Court should affirm the trial court's findings as to both issues. The trial court's determination that PSNS is a federal enclave is supported by historical documentation evidencing the federal government's acquisition of ownership and jurisdiction over the property comprising PSNS, and is consistent with prior rulings by the U.S. Supreme Court, the Washington Supreme Court, and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, all of which also determined PSNS to be a federal enclave. This Court should also affirm the trial court's decision not to limit the scope of Appellants' disclaimer. Contrary to the Appellants' assertions, the language of their disclaimer is not ambiguous, and the limiting interpretation they ask this Court to accept is unsupported and unreasonable.

## II. JOINDER IN RESPONDENTS' BRIEFS

Pursuant to RAP 10.1(g), Anchor Darling joins in the Brief of Respondents Crane Co., Garlock Sealing Technologies, Inc., Fairbanks

Morse Pump Corporation, Coltec Industries, and McWane Inc. and in the Brief of Respondents Leslie Controls, Inc. and ITT Corporation (“Co-Respondents’ Briefs.”) Anchor Darling joins in and adopts by specific reference, but without limitation, the Statement of Issues Pertaining to Assignments of Error, the Statement of the Case, and the Argument sections of the Co-Respondents’ briefs and the authorities presented therein. In addition, Anchor Darling sets forth herein certain issues, facts, and arguments particularly pertinent to Appellants’ appeal of the orders dismissing their claims as to Anchor Darling.

### III. ISSUES PERTAINING TO ASSIGNMENTS OF ERROR

1. The trial court correctly determined that PSNS is a federal enclave based on historical documentation furnished by Respondents establishing the federal government’s acquisition of ownership and jurisdiction over the property comprising PSNS and based on prior case law determining it to be a federal enclave.

2. The trial court correctly determined that Appellants’ disclaimer of any cause of action relating to injuries caused by asbestos exposure occurring within a federal enclave was not ambiguous, and it correctly rejected Appellants’ efforts to limit the scope of their disclaimer to exclude asbestos exposures that occurred aboard U.S. Navy ships that

were moored alongside piers or drydocked within PSNS during their construction or repair.

3. Insofar as Appellants' Complaint disclaimed any cause of action relating to injuries sustained as a result of asbestos exposures Mr. Farrow may have sustained within a federal enclave, the trial court correctly dismissed on summary judgment Appellants' claims to the extent they were based on Mr. Farrow's asbestos exposure while he worked as a pipe fitter and engineering technician at PSNS.

4. The Court correctly dismissed on summary judgment Appellants' claims as to Anchor Darling that were based on asbestos exposures he may have sustained outside of PSNS as Appellants presented no evidence in opposition to Anchor Darling's summary judgment motion that Mr. Farrow was exposed outside of PSNS to asbestos for which Anchor Darling may be deemed responsible.

#### IV. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

##### A. Factual Background.

In their Complaint, Appellants sought damages from the defendants for the injuries they suffered relating to Michael Farrow's diagnosis of mesothelioma, which condition they allege was caused by

exposure to asbestos. (L-CP 5-10)<sup>1</sup> Appellants alleged in their Complaint that Mr. Farrow was exposed to asbestos at various places, including Bremerton, Washington; San Diego, California; Groton, Connecticut; Washington D.C., Pearl Harbor, Hawaii; and Maine during the 1950's, 1960's, and through the late 1970's. (*Id.*) In written responses to style discovery requests and to discovery requests specifically propounded by Anchor Darling, Appellants stated that the basis for their claims specifically as to Anchor Darling related to Mr. Farrow's work with Anchor Darling's products at PSNS. (A-CP 1036-39, 1050) At his deposition, Mr. Farrow discussed his work with Anchor Darling products, but only in the context of his work at PSNS. (A-CP 1068, 1072-74)

Although, Appellants alleged that Mr. Farrow was exposed to asbestos at several locations, they expressly disclaimed any cause of action that was based on Mr. Farrow's asbestos exposure within a federal enclave. Appellants' disclaimer was expressly set out in Paragraph 6 of their Complaint, the first sentence of which reads as follows:

Plaintiffs hereby disclaim any cause of action or recovery for any injuries caused by any exposure to asbestos dust that

---

<sup>1</sup> Appellants filed two appeals. Their first appeal in Farrow v. Leslie Controls, 62996-4-I was consolidated with their appeal in Farrow v. Alfa Laval, 63554-9-I. Consistent with the manner in which Appellants referred to the clerk's papers in the consolidated appeals, Anchor Darling refers to the clerk's papers designated in Leslie as L-CP and the clerk's papers designated in Alfa Laval as A-CP.

occurred in a federal enclave, which expressly excludes U.S. Navy vessels.

(L-CP 9)

B. Procedural Background.

Based in part on the disclaimer contained within the Complaint, IMO moved for summary judgment dismissal of Appellants' claims. (L-CP 51-73) Anchor Darling partially joined in IMO's motion contending that PSNS was a federal enclave and that insofar as Appellants had disclaimed all causes of action based on asbestos exposure that occurred within a federal enclave, their PSNS based claims should be dismissed. (A-CP 329-30) The trial court agreed, and on October 25, 2009 it granted Anchor Darling's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and ordered the dismissal of all claims asserted against Anchor Darling that were based on injuries Mr. Farrow sustained during his employment at PSNS. (A-CP 724-25)

Thereafter, Anchor Darling moved for the summary judgment dismissal of all remaining claims that Appellants had asserted against it. (A-CP 1249-58) In its follow-up motion for summary judgment, Anchor Darling showed that aside from Mr. Farrow's alleged work with or around Anchor Darling's products at PSNS, Appellants had no evidence that he had been exposed to asbestos from an Anchor Darling product at any other location. (A-CP 1250-53) Accordingly, Anchor Darling sought dismissal

of all claims relating to Mr. Farrow's alleged exposures outside of PSNS. Appellants filed a Notice of Non-Opposition to Anchor Darling's follow-up summary judgment motion (A-CP 1792-93), and they did not otherwise oppose the relief that Anchor Darling sought except to note their continuing opposition to the Court's prior determination (made in the context of IMO's summary judgment motion) as to the nature and scope of the Appellants' disclaimer. On December 5, 2008, the trial court granted Anchor Darling's follow-up motion for summary judgment and ordered that all of Appellants' claims against Anchor Darling based on Mr. Farrow's asbestos exposure outside of PSNS be dismissed with prejudice. (A-CP 2174-75)

## V. ARGUMENT

### A. The Trial Court Correctly Dismissed All Claims against Anchor Darling That Are Based on Mr. Farrow's Alleged Exposure to Asbestos at PSNS.

In an apparent effort to avoid the removal of their action to federal court, Appellants disclaimed any cause of action that was based on Mr. Farrow's exposure to asbestos within a federal enclave. Based on prior court rulings and historical documentation evidencing the acquisition of ownership and jurisdiction over the property comprising PSNS, the trial court determined that PSNS was a federal enclave. Accordingly, based on Appellants' disclaimer of all claims relating to exposure within a federal

enclave, the Court correctly ruled that Appellants' PSNS related claims were disclaimed by virtue of their Complaint.

The trial court also found that Appellants' efforts to limit the scope of their disclaimer such that it would not serve to disclaim actions based on exposure to the Navy ships that were being built or repaired at PSNS was an unsupported and unreasonable interpretation of their Complaint, which on its face was unambiguous. Thus, the trial court correctly ruled that Appellants' disclaimer also served to disclaim actions based on Mr. Farrow's asbestos exposure while working aboard Navy ships that were moored or drydocked at PSNS during their construction or repair.

A more thorough and detailed analysis of why the trial court's determination as to the scope of Appellants' disclaimer and its finding that PSNS is a federal enclave should be upheld, and why the dismissal from this action of all claims relating to Mr. Farrow's exposure to asbestos at PSNS should be affirmed is set forth within the Co-Respondents' Briefs, which Anchor Darling has joined and adopted.

B. The Trial Court Correctly Dismissed All Claims against Anchor Darling That Are Based on Mr. Farrow's Alleged Exposure to Asbestos Outside of PSNS.

Following the trial court's determination that Appellants had disclaimed all of their PSNS related claims, Anchor Darling moved to dismiss all other claims asserted by Appellants, specifically all claims

based on Mr. Farrow's alleged asbestos exposure outside of PSNS. According to Appellants, all of Mr. Farrow's work with Anchor Darling's products allegedly took place at PSNS. There was no evidence that he worked with any Anchor Darling product anywhere else.

In Washington, in order for there to be a triable issue of fact regarding causation in an asbestos case, a plaintiff must offer evidence supporting a reasonable inference that there was exposure to respirable asbestos fibers from a defendant's product. Lockwood v. AC&S, Inc., 109 Wn.2d 235, 245, 744 P.2d 605 (1987). As to Mr. Farrow's alleged exposure outside of PSNS to asbestos from an Anchor Darling product, Appellants could not meet their burden under Lockwood, and indeed they did not dispute Anchor Darling's contention that no evidence of such exposure had been provided. Although Appellants have generally appealed the trial court's order dismissing all claims against Anchor Darling based on exposures outside of PSNS, they have pointed to no evidence and have made no argument that the trial court was in error in dismissing such claims or that the trial court's dismissal should be reversed. Accordingly, this Court should affirm the trial court's December 5, 2008 order dismissing all of Appellants' claims against Anchor Darling to the extent they relate to Mr. Farrow's asbestos exposure outside of PSNS.

VI. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above and for the reasons set forth in Co-Respondents' Briefs, Anchor Darling respectfully requests that this Court affirm (1) the trial court's October 25, 2008 Order Granting Defendant Anchor Darling Valve Company's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, and (2) the trial court's December 5, 2008 Order Granting Defendant Anchor Darling Valve Company's Motion for Summary Judgment

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 8th day of September, 2009.

LANE POWELL PC

By Brian D. Zeringer  
Barry N. Mesher, WSBA No. 07845  
Brian D. Zeringer, WSBA No. 15566  
Jeffrey M. Odom, WSBA No. 36168  
Attorneys for Respondent Anchor Darling  
Valve Company

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Kree Arvanitas, declare under penalty of perjury as follows:

1. I am now and at all times herein mentioned, a citizen of the United States and resident of the State of Washington, over the age of eighteen years, not a party to the above-captioned action, and competent to testify as a witness.

2. I am employed with the law firm of Lane Powell PC, 1420 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4100, Seattle, Washington.

3. On September 8, 2009, I caused to be served a true and correct copy of the foregoing **BRIEF OF RESPONDENT ANCHOR DARLING VALVE CO.** on the following parties as indicated below:

**Attorney for Appellant:**  
William Rutzick  
Schroeter Goldmark & Bender  
810 Third Avenue, Suite 500  
Seattle, WA 98104

- Legal Messenger
- U.S. Mail
- Facsimile
- E-mail
- FedEx

**Attorneys for Alfa Laval, Inc.**  
Christine E. Dinsdale  
Catherine E. Jeannotte  
Soha & Lang, P.S.  
701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2400  
Seattle WA 98104  
[asbestos@sohalang.com](mailto:asbestos@sohalang.com)

- Legal Messenger
- U.S. Mail
- Facsimile
- E-mail
- FedEx

**Attorneys for BW/IP, Inc.:**  
Christine E. Dinsdale  
David J. Fisher  
Soha & Lang, P.S.  
701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2400  
Seattle WA 98104  
[asbestos@sohalang.com](mailto:asbestos@sohalang.com)

- Legal Messenger
- U.S. Mail
- Facsimile
- E-mail
- FedEx

**Attorneys for The William Powell  
Company:**  
Carl E. Forsberg  
Melissa K. Habeck  
Forsberg & Umlauf, P.S.  
901 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1700  
Seattle, WA 98164-1039  
[asbestos3@forsberg-umlau.com](mailto:asbestos3@forsberg-umlau.com)

- Legal Messenger
- U.S. Mail
- Facsimile
- E-mail
- FedEx

**Attorneys for Cleaver-Brooks, Inc.:**

Timothy K. Thorson  
Carney Badley Spellman, P.S.  
701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3600  
Seattle, WA 98104  
[berman@carneylaw.com](mailto:berman@carneylaw.com)

- Legal Messenger
- U.S. Mail
- Facsimile
- E-mail
- FedEx

**Attorneys for Coltec Industries, Inc.;  
Garlock Sealing Technologies, LLC;  
Fairbanks Morse Pump Corporation;  
McWane, Inc.:**

G. William Shaw  
Michael K. Ryan  
K&L Gates, LLP  
925 Fourth Avenue, Suite 2900  
Seattle, WA 98104-1158  
[asbestosdefense@klgates.com](mailto:asbestosdefense@klgates.com)

- Legal Messenger
- U.S. Mail
- Facsimile
- E-mail
- FedEx

**Attorneys for Crane Co.:**

Michael K. Ryan  
Paul J. Lawrence  
K&L Gates, LLP  
925 Fourth Avenue, Suite 2900  
Seattle, WA 98104-1158  
[asbestosdefense@klgates.com](mailto:asbestosdefense@klgates.com)

- Legal Messenger
- U.S. Mail
- Facsimile
- E-mail
- FedEx

**Attorneys for Crosby Valve, Inc.;  
J.T. Thorpe & Son, Inc.; Metalclad  
Insulation Corporation; FMC  
Corporation; Sterling Fluid Systems  
(USA), LLC:**

Katherine M. Steele  
Stafford Frey Cooper  
601 Union Street, Suite 3100  
Seattle, WA 98101  
[asbestos@staffordfrey.com](mailto:asbestos@staffordfrey.com)

- Legal Messenger
- U.S. Mail
- Facsimile
- E-mail
- FedEx

**Attorneys for Flowserve US, Inc.  
as Successor to Edward Valves:**

Randy J. Aliment  
Manish Borde  
Williams, Kastner & Gibbs, PLLC  
601 Union Street, Suite 4100  
P.O. Box 21926  
Seattle, WA 98111-3926  
[asbestos@wkg.com](mailto:asbestos@wkg.com)  
[raliment@williamskastner.com](mailto:raliment@williamskastner.com)

- Legal Messenger
- U.S. Mail
- Facsimile
- E-mail
- FedEx

**Attorneys for Foster Wheeler Energy  
Corporation:**

Dirk Bernhardt  
Murray, Dunham & Murray  
200 W. Thomas Street, Suite 350  
P.O. Box 9844  
Seattle, WA 98109  
[asbestos@murraydunham.com](mailto:asbestos@murraydunham.com)

- Legal Messenger
- U.S. Mail
- Facsimile
- E-mail
- FedEx

**Attorneys for IMO Industries, Inc.**

Michael E. Ricketts  
James E. Horne  
Gordon Thomas Honeywell Malanca  
Peterson & Daheim, LLP  
600 University, Suite 2100  
Seattle, WA 98101  
[IMOService@gth-law.com](mailto:IMOService@gth-law.com)

- Legal Messenger
- U.S. Mail
- Facsimile
- E-mail
- FedEx

**Attorneys for Invensys Systems, Inc:**

Randy J. Aliment  
Williams, Kastner & Gibbs, PLLC  
601 Union Street, Suite 4100  
P.O. Box 21926  
Seattle, WA 98111-3926  
[asbestos@wkg.com](mailto:asbestos@wkg.com)  
[raliment@williamskastner.com](mailto:raliment@williamskastner.com)

- Legal Messenger
- U.S. Mail
- Facsimile
- E-mail
- FedEx

**Attorneys for Leslie Controls, Inc.;**  
**ITT Industries, Inc.;**

Mark B. Tuvim  
Kevin J. Craig  
Gordon & Rees, LLP  
701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2130  
Seattle, WA 98104  
[mtuvim@gordonrees.com](mailto:mtuvim@gordonrees.com)  
[kcraig@gordonrees.com](mailto:kcraig@gordonrees.com)

- Legal Messenger
- U.S. Mail
- Facsimile
- E-mail
- FedEx

**Attorneys for Metropolitan Life**  
**Insurance Company:**

John D. Wilson, Jr.  
Richard G. Gawlowski  
Wilson, Smith, Cochran & Dickerson  
1215 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1700  
Seattle, WA 98161-1007  
[MetLifeAsbestos@wscd.com](mailto:MetLifeAsbestos@wscd.com)

- Legal Messenger
- U.S. Mail
- Facsimile
- E-mail
- FedEx

**Attorneys for Sepco Corporation:**

Thomas A. Heller  
Heller Wiegstein PLLC  
144 Railroad Avenue, Suite 210  
Edmonds, WA 98020  
[tomh@hellerwiegstein.com](mailto:tomh@hellerwiegstein.com)

- Legal Messenger
- U.S. Mail
- Facsimile
- E-mail
- FedEx

**Attorneys for Thomas Dee Engineering**  
**Company:**

Douglas K. Yoshida  
Ogden, Murphy & Wallace, PLLC  
1601 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2100  
Seattle, WA 98101  
[asbestos@omwlaw.com](mailto:asbestos@omwlaw.com)

- Legal Messenger
- U.S. Mail
- Facsimile
- E-mail
- FedEx

**Attorneys for Warren Pumps, LLC:**

J. Michael Mattingly  
Rizzo Mattingly Bosworth PC  
411 SW Second Avenue, Suite 200  
Portland, OR 98204  
[Washington.asbestos@rizzopc.com](mailto:Washington.asbestos@rizzopc.com)

- Legal Messenger
- U.S. Mail
- Facsimile
- E-mail
- FedEx

**Attorneys for Weir Valves & Controls  
USA, Inc.; Hoke, Inc.:**  
Dana C. Hoerschelmann  
Thorsrud Cane & Paulich  
1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1300  
Seattle, WA 98101  
[dhoerschelmann@tcplaw.com](mailto:dhoerschelmann@tcplaw.com)

- Legal Messenger
- U.S. Mail
- Facsimile
- E-mail
- FedEx

**Attorneys for Fryer-Knowles, Inc.,  
A Washington Corporation:**  
Stephanie Andersen  
T. Arlen Rumsey  
Gordon & Polscer  
1000 Second Avenue, Suite 1500  
Seattle, WA 98104  
[asbestos-seattle@gordon-polscer.com](mailto:asbestos-seattle@gordon-polscer.com)

- Legal Messenger
- U.S. Mail
- Facsimile
- E-mail
- FedEx

**Attorneys for Yarway Corporation;  
Tyco Flow Control, Inc.:**  
Ronald C. Gardner  
David D. Mordekhov  
Gardner Bond Trabolsi & St. Louis PLLC  
2200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 600  
Seattle, WA 98121  
[asbestos@gardnerbond.com](mailto:asbestos@gardnerbond.com)


- Legal Messenger
- U.S. Mail
- Facsimile
- E-mail
- FedEx

**Court of Appeals Div. 1**  
One Union Square  
600 University Street, Room 100  
Seattle, Washington 98101

- Hand Delivery
- U.S. Mail
- Facsimile
- E-mail
- FedEx

The foregoing statements are made under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington and are true and correct.

Signed at Seattle, Washington, this 8<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2009.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Kree Arvanitas