

FILED
SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
1/3/2022 12:59 PM
BY ERIN L. LENNON
CLERK

NO. 100181-9

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Court of Appeals, Div. I, 81814-7-I

JOHN DOES 2-4,

Petitioners,

v.

KING COUNTY AND THE SEATTLE TIMES,

Respondents.

THE SEATTLE TIMES RESPONSE TO
AMICUS CURIAE MEMORANDUM OF
WASHINGTON COALITION FOR OPEN
GOVERNMENT

Katherine George, WSBA No. 36288
JOHNSTON GEORGE LLP
2101 Fourth Avenue, Suite 860
Seattle, WA 98121
Phone: 206 832-1820
kathy@johnstongeorge.com
Attorney for The Seattle Times

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. DISCUSSION.....	1
II. CONCLUSION	3

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Cornu-Labat v. Hosp. Dist. No. 2 Grant Co.,
177 Wn.2d 221, 298 P.3d 741 (2013) 2

Does 1-11 v. Bellevue School Dist. No. 405,
164 Wn.2d 199, 189 P.3d 139 (2008))..... 2

Lyft Inc. v. City of Seattle,
190 Wn.2d 769, 418 P.3d 102 (2018) 2

Statutes, Rules & Other Authorities

GR 14.1(a) 2

RCW 42.56.030 1, 3

RCW 42.56.080(2) 2

RCW 42.56.100 3

RCW 42.56.520(1) 2

I. DISCUSSION

The Washington Coalition for Open Government (WCOG) makes two primary points as to why the Court of Appeals opinion should not be reviewed. First, WCOG correctly argues that the opinion is based on well-settled principles of law, including narrow construction of disclosure exemptions as required by RCW 42.56.030. Mem. 7-11. Second, WCOG aptly argues that reviewing the injunction denial at this late stage – nineteen months after the John Does opposed prompt and ultimate determination by this Court, and twenty-one months after the Does obtained a temporary injunction pending appeal - would frustrate the Public Records Act's strong policy against undue delay of disclosure. Mem. pp. 4, 11-12.

The Seattle Times agrees with WCOG. As explained in the Answer to Petition for Review, the Court of Appeals did not break new ground or contradict precedents when denying an injunction against disclosure of the adult criminal records at

issue.¹ In fact, the decision is unpublished and cannot interfere with settled law. GR 14.1(a).

WCOG is also correct that, if third parties can stall disclosure of important records simply by dragging out appeals, the public's ability to hold government accountable is thwarted. WCOG appropriately warns against allowing those "seeking to hide their conduct to 'run out the clock' on the public's interest in the issue." Mem. p. 12.

WCOG's position is supported by the Public Records Act's emphasis on promptness. RCW 42.56.080(2) requires agencies to make public records "promptly available" upon request. RCW 42.56.520(1) commands: "Responses to requests

¹ See, e.g., Answer p. 8 (noting reliance on *Cornu-Labat v. Hosp. Dist. No. 2 Grant Co.*, 177 Wn.2d 221, 229, 298 P.3d 741 (2013) for the well-established rules that records must be disclosed unless an exemption applies and that disclosure exemptions must be narrowly construed); Answer p. 9 (noting reliance on the two-part injunction test in *Lyft v. City of Seattle*, 190 Wn.2d 769, 789-90, 418 P.3d 102 (2018)); Answer p. 10 (describing adherence to *Does 1-11 v. Bellevue School Dist.*, 164 Wn.2d 199, 189 P.3d 139 (2008) in upholding the release of records with redactions); and Answer pp. 11-14 (explaining a lack of conflicts with precedential opinions).

for public records shall be made promptly....” RCW 42.56.100 requires “the most timely possible action” on records requests. When construing these provisions, courts must be mindful that: “[t]he people insist on remaining informed so that they may maintain control over the instruments that they have created.” RCW 42.56.030. The people of Washington will not remain informed if third parties can prolong disclosure injunctions simply to facilitate needless review of unpublished decisions.

II. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, this Court should deny review.

Dated this 3rd day of January 2022.

I certify that this response contains 2,383 words except for content excluded by RAP 18.17.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

/s Katherine A. George
Katherine George, WSBA No. 36288
Attorney for The Seattle Times

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned declares under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that on January 3, 2022, I caused service of the foregoing Response to Amicus Memorandum on registered parties through the electronic filing system.


KATHERINE A. GEORGE

JOHNSTON GEORGE LLP

January 03, 2022 - 12:59 PM

Transmittal Information

Filed with Court: Supreme Court
Appellate Court Case Number: 100,181-9
Appellate Court Case Title: John Does 2-4 v. King County, et al.

The following documents have been uploaded:

- 1001819_Briefs_20220103125721SC187099_6494.pdf
This File Contains:
Briefs - Answer to Amicus Curiae
The Original File Name was Seattle Times Response to WCOG Amicus Brief 1 3 22.pdf

A copy of the uploaded files will be sent to:

- Natalie.brown@kingcounty.gov
- caesarkalinowski@dwt.com
- chris@cedarlawpllc.com
- christinekruger@dwt.com
- cisacke@mcnaul.com
- cmb@witherspoonkelley.com
- ericstahl@dwt.com
- john.gerberding@kingcounty.gov
- kaitlin@cedarlawpllc.com
- khambley@omwlaw.com
- kwalker@mcnaul.com
- lara@cedarlawpllc.com
- mari.isaacson@kingcounty.gov
- maryn@witherspoonkelley.com
- tdemonte@mcnaul.com
- tdo@mcnaul.com
- whitney@cedarlawpllc.com

Comments:

Sender Name: Katherine George - Email: kathy@johnstongeorge.com
Address:
2101 4TH AVE STE 860
SEATTLE, WA, 98121
Phone: 206-832-1820

Note: The Filing Id is 20220103125721SC187099