

No. 80472-9

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON  
(Court of Appeals 35247-8-II)

---

CHARLES SALES and  
PATRICIA SALES, a married couple,

*Respondents*

v.

WEYERHAEUSER COMPANY,  
a Washington Corporation,

*Petitioner.*

---

**BRIEF OF THE COALITION FOR LITIGATION JUSTICE, INC.,  
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES OF  
AMERICA, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MUTUAL  
INSURANCE COMPANIES, PROPERTY CASUALTY INSURERS  
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, AMERICAN INSURANCE  
ASSOCIATION, AND AMERICAN CHEMISTRY COUNCIL AS  
*AMICI CURIAE* IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER**

---

Mark A. Behrens  
Cary Silverman  
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.  
600 14th Street, NW, Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 783-8400

James O. Neet, Jr. (WA #5916)\*  
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.  
2555 Grand Boulevard  
Kansas City, MO 64108  
(816) 474-6550  
Attorneys for *Amici Curiae*  
\* Counsel of Record

*Of Counsel*

(Additional *Of Counsel* Listed on Next Page)

X

FILED  
AUG 29 2007

CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
STATE OF WASHINGTON

---

*Of Counsel*

Paul W. Kalish  
CROWELL & MORING LLP  
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20004  
(202) 624-2500  
Counsel for the Coalition for  
Litigation Justice

Robin S. Conrad  
Amar D. Sarwal  
NATIONAL CHAMBER LITIGATION  
CENTER, INC.  
1615 H Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20062  
(202) 463-5337

Lynda S. Mounts  
Kenneth A. Stoller  
AMERICAN INSURANCE  
ASSOCIATION  
1130 Connecticut Ave, NW  
Suite 1000  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 828-7100

Donald D. Evans  
AMERICAN CHEMISTRY COUNCIL  
1300 Wilson Boulevard  
Arlington, VA 22209  
(703) 741-5000

Ann W. Spragens  
Robert J. Hurns  
PROPERTY CASUALTY INSURERS  
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA  
2600 South River Road  
Des Plaines, IL 60018-3286  
(847) 553-3826

Gregg Dykstra  
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF  
MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANIES  
3601 Vincennes Road  
Indianapolis, IN 46268  
(317) 875-5250

INDEX

|  | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....   | i           |
| STATEMENT OF INTEREST.....   | 1           |
| STATEMENT OF FACTS .....   | 1           |
| INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT .....   | 1           |
| ARGUMENT .....   | 1           |
| I.    The Appellate Court’s Decision Conflicts<br>With Past Precedent .....  | 1           |
| II.   Conditioning <i>Forum Non Conveniens</i> Dismissal on a<br>Defendant Waiving its Right to Removal Raises a<br>Significant Question of Law Under the United States<br>Constitution..... | 6           |
| III.  The Appellate Court’s Decision Raises an Issue of<br>Substantial Public Importance that Should be<br>Determined by this Court .....  | 9           |
| CONCLUSION.....  | 10          |
| PROOF OF SERVICE   |             |

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

| <b><u>CASES</u></b>  | <b><u>Page</u></b> |
|--|--------------------|
| <i>17th Street Assocs., LLP v. Markel Int'l Ins. Co.</i> ,<br>373 F. Supp. 2d (E.D. Va. 2005) .....                                    | 9                  |
| <i>Amchem Prods., Inc. v. Windsor</i> , 521 U.S. 591, 117 S. Ct. 2231,<br>138 L. Ed.2d 689 (1997) .....                                | 3                  |
| <i>Barron v. Burnside</i> , 121 U.S. 186, 7 S. Ct. 931,<br>30 L. Ed. 915 (1887) .....  | 8                  |
| <i>Frost v. Railroad Comm'n</i> , 271 U.S. 583, 46 S. Ct. 605,<br>70 L. Ed. 1101 (1926) .....  | 9                  |
| <i>Garrity v. New Jersey</i> , 385 U.S. 493, 87 S. Ct. 616,<br>17 L. Ed.2d 562 (1967) .....  | 8                  |
| <i>Goldey v. Morning News</i> , 156 U.S. 518, 15 S. Ct. 559,<br>39 L. Ed. 517 (1895) .....   | 7                  |
| <i>Harrison v. St. Louis &amp; San Francisco R.R.</i> , 232 U.S. 318,<br>34 S. Ct. 333, 58 L. Ed. 621 (1914) .....                     | 7-8                |
| <i>Hill v. Jawanda Transport Ltd.</i> , 96 Wn. App. 537,<br>983 P.2d 666 (1999) .....  | 3                  |
| <i>Home Ins. v. Morse</i> , 87 U.S. 445, 22 L. Ed. 365,<br>20 Wall. 445 (1874) .....   | 6, 8               |
| <i>In re Asbestos Prods. Liab. Litig.</i> , 1996 WL 539589<br>(E.D. Pa. Sept. 16, 1996) .....  | 4                  |
| <i>In re Maine Asbestos Cases</i> , 44 F. Supp. 2d 368 (D. Me. 1999) .....   | 4-5                |
| <i>In re Patenaude</i> , 210 F.3d 135 (3d Cir.), <i>cert. denied</i> ,<br>531 U.S. 1011, 121 S. Ct. 565, 148 L. Ed.2d 484 (2000) ..... | 4-5                |
| <i>Int'l Ins. Co. v. Duryee</i> , 96 F.3d 837 (6th Cir. 1996) .....  | 9                  |
| <i>Kansas Pub. Employees Ret. Sys. v. Reimer &amp; Koger Assocs.</i> ,<br>4 F.3d 614 (8th Cir. 1993) .....                             | 8                  |

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <i>Kewanee Oil Co. v. Bicron Corp.</i> , 416 U.S. 470, 94 S. Ct. 1879,<br>40 L. Ed.2d 315 (1974) .....   | 7    |
| <i>Klotz v. Dehkhoda</i> , 134 Wn. App. 261, 141 P.3d 67 (2006),<br>review denied, 160 Wn. 2d 1014, 161 P.3d (2007).....   | 3    |
| <i>Madden v. Able Supply Co.</i> , 205 F. Supp. 2d 695 (S.D. Tex. 2002) .....  | 4-5  |
| <i>Myers v. Boeing Co.</i> , 115 Wn. 2d 123, 794 P.2d 1272 (1990) .....  | 2, 3 |
| <i>Piper Aircraft Co. v. Reyno</i> , 454 U.S. 235, 102 S. Ct. 252,<br>70 L. Ed.2d 419 (1981), reh'g denied, 455 U.S. 928,<br>102 S. Ct. 1296, 71 L. Ed.2d 474 (1982) ..... |      |
| <i>Sales v. Weyerhaeuser Co.</i> , 138 Wn. App. 222,<br>156 P.3d 303 (2007).....   | 2    |
| <i>Sofie v. Fibreboard Corp.</i> , 112 Wn. 2d 636, 771 P.2d 711,<br>amended, 780 P.2d 260 (Wash. 1989) .....   | 2    |
| <i>Terral v. Burke Const. Co.</i> , 257 U.S. 529, 42 S. Ct. 188,<br>66 L. Ed. 352 (1922) .....   | 8    |
| <i>White v. Wellington</i> , 627 F.2d 582 (8th Cir. 1980).....   | 6    |
| <i>Wilson v. Republic Iron &amp; Steel Co.</i> , 257 U.S. 92,<br>42 S. Ct. 35, 66 L. Ed. 144 (1921) .....  | 8    |
| <i>Wolf v. Boeing Co.</i> , 61 Wn. App. 316, 810 P.2d 943,<br>review denied, 117 Wn. 2d 1020, 818 P.2d 1098 (1991).....  | 3    |

**CONSTITUTION AND STATUTES**

|                                 |      |
|---------------------------------|------|
| U.S. Const. art. III, § 2.....  | 6    |
| U.S. Const. art. VI, cl. 2..... | 7    |
| 28 U.S.C. § 1332.....           | 6, 7 |

**OTHER AUTHORITIES**

Mark A. Behrens, *Some Proposals for Courts Interested in Helping Sick Claimants and Solving Serious Problems in Asbestos Litigation*, 54 Baylor L. Rev. 331 (2002) ..... 3-4

Mark A. Behrens & Phil Goldberg, *The Asbestos Litigation Crisis: The Tide Appears To Be Turning*, 12 Conn. Ins. L.J. 477 (2006).....10

Griffin B. Bell, *Asbestos Litigation and Judicial Leadership: The Courts' Duty to Help Solve the Asbestos Litigation Crisis*, 6:6 Briefly (Nat'l Legal Center for the Pub. Interest June 2002), at <http://www.nlcpi.org> .....3

Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litig., *Statistical Analysis of Multidistrict Litigation 2006*, at 11, available at <http://www.jpml.uscourts.gov/Statistics/statistics.html> .....4

Paul F. Rothstein, *What Courts Can Do in the Face of the Never-Ending Asbestos Crisis*, 71 Miss. L.J. 1 (2001) .....4

## **STATEMENT OF INTEREST**

As organizations that represent Washington companies and their insurers, *amici* have an interest in ensuring that Washington's *forum non conveniens* law is fair, consistent with past precedent, complies with the United States Constitution, and reflects sound public policy. As described below, the appellate court's decision below violates these principles.

## **STATEMENT OF FACTS**

*Amici* adopt Petitioner's Statement of Facts.

## **INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT**

The appellate court's opinion is inconsistent with past precedent from this Court and the Court of Appeals. Furthermore, the appellate court's decision to condition *forum non conveniens* dismissal on a defendant waiving its right to removal pursuant to federal law raises a significant question of law under the United States Constitution. The decision also raises an issue of substantial public importance that should be determined by this Court. For all these reasons, this case should be reviewed by this Court and the appellate court's decision overturned.

## **ARGUMENT**

### **I. THE APPELLATE COURT'S DECISION CONFLICTS WITH PAST PRECEDENT**

This Court has set a high bar for trial court *forum non conveniens* decisions to be overturned – an “abuse of discretion” standard of review

applies. *Myers v. Boeing Co.*, 115 Wn. 2d 123, 128, 794 P.2d 1272, 1275 (1990). A dismissal “may *only* be reversed if it is *manifestly* unfair, unreasonable, or untenable.” *Id.* (emphasis added) (internal citation omitted).<sup>1</sup>

The appellate court’s opinion is out of step with that standard. The trial court heard two oral arguments on Petitioner’s *forum non conveniens* motion, carefully reviewed the parties’ briefs and the applicable law, and wrote a thorough decision granting Petitioner’s request.<sup>2</sup> The trial court “did not conclude that a single factor favored a Washington trial.” *Sales v. Weyerhaeuser Co.*, 138 Wn. App. 222, 230, 156 P.3d 303, 307 (2007). The appellate court might have disagreed with the trial court’s decision, but could not reasonably conclude the trial court abused its discretion.

The appellate court also altered the test for when *forum non conveniens* dismissal may be granted, adding an unprecedented new element: whether the defendant may assert its right to remove to federal court in the alternate forum state. We are not aware of any reported decisions in Washington or elsewhere that have conditioned dismissal on

---

<sup>1</sup> See also *Sofie v. Fibreboard Corp.*, 112 Wn. 2d 636, 667, 771 P.2d 711, 727 (“no reasonable judge would have reached the same conclusion”), *amended*, 780 P.2d 260 (Wash. 1989).

<sup>2</sup> See CP at 161 (trial court “review[ed] the cases cited by counsel”); RP at 14:10–12 (Tr. from Hr’g on Pls.’ Mot. to Recons., 7/28/06) (trial court “exhaustively” reviewed case law in its written opinion).

this basis. In fact, Washington courts have traditionally granted dismissal when the plaintiff merely had *some* remedy elsewhere.<sup>3</sup> It is “the rare case” where the remedy provided by the alternate forum is “so clearly inadequate or unsatisfactory that there is no remedy at all.” *Klotz v. Dehkhoda*, 134 Wn. App. 261, 265, 141 P.3d 67, 68 (2006), *review denied*, 160 Wn. 2d 1014, 161 P.3d 1027 (2007).

The appellate court justified its holding by concluding that the federal asbestos Multi-District Litigation (MDL) system would prevent Plaintiffs from trying this case in a timely manner. In effect, the appellate court held that the federal MDL is inadequate as a matter of law.

The federal MDL, however, has done a remarkable job responding to what the U.S. Supreme Court has described as “an asbestos-litigation crisis.” *Amchem Prods., Inc. v. Windsor*, 521 U.S. 591, 598, 117 S. Ct. 2231, 2237, 138 L. Ed.2d 689 (1997).<sup>4</sup> When the MDL was created in

---

<sup>3</sup> See *Myers*, 115 Wn. 2d at 139, 794 P.2d at 1281 (dismissing Japanese plane crash victims’ action where it was argued that Japan’s “legal system is cumbersome”); *Hill v. Jawanda Transport Ltd.*, 96 Wn. App. 537, 543, 983 P.2d 666, 670 (1999) (British Columbia provided adequate remedy even though it does not allow recovery for pain and suffering or for lost and future earnings); *Wolf v. Boeing Co.*, 61 Wn. App. 316, 324-25, 810 P.2d 943, 949 (dismissing action by Mexican plane crash victims even though Mexico dramatically limited recoverable damages), *review denied*, 117 Wn. 2d 1020, 818 P.2d 1098 (1991); see also *Piper Aircraft Co. v. Reyno*, 454 U.S. 235, 102 S. Ct. 252, 70 L. Ed.2d 419 (1981), *reh’g denied*, 455 U.S. 928, 102 S. Ct. 1296, 71 L. Ed.2d 474 (1982) (dismissing Scottish nationals’ action).

<sup>4</sup> See also Griffin B. Bell, *Asbestos Litigation and Judicial Leadership: The Courts’ Duty to Help Solve the Asbestos Litigation Crisis*, 6:6 Briefly 4 (Nat’l Legal Center for the Pub. Interest June 2002), at <http://www.nlcpi.org>; Mark A. Behrens, *Some* (Footnote continued on next page)

1991, nearly two new asbestos cases were being filed in federal court for each action that was terminated. Shortly after taking control of the MDL, the late Judge Charles Weiner instituted procedures to gain control of the docket. *See In re Asbestos Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 1996 WL 539589, at \*1 (E.D. Pa. Sept. 16, 1996). Cases were prioritized so that those involving malignancies and other serious diseases were addressed first. *See id.*

As a result of Judge Weiner's leadership, the tide began to turn. In 1996, the number of cases resolved exceeded the number of new cases filed. *See id.* at \*2. In 1997 and 1998, Judge Weiner was closing 10,000 cases a year. *See In re Patenaude*, 210 F.3d 135, 140 (3d Cir.), *cert. denied*, 531 U.S. 1011, 121 S. Ct. 565, 148 L. Ed.2d 484 (2000). By September 2006, nearly 75,000 of the 110,000 cases in the MDL were resolved. *See* Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litig., *Statistical Analysis of Multidistrict Litigation 2006*, at 11, available at <http://www.jpml.uscourts.gov/Statistics/statistics.html>. Few of the remaining cases involve malignancies.

Despite this track record, the appellate court cited *In re Maine Asbestos Cases*, 44 F. Supp. 2d 368 (D. Me. 1999), and *Madden v. Able*

---

*Proposals for Courts Interested in Helping Sick Claimants and Solving Serious Problems in Asbestos Litigation*, 54 Baylor L. Rev. 331 (2002); Paul F. Rothstein, *What Courts Can Do in the Face of the Never-Ending Asbestos Crisis*, 71 Miss. L.J. 1 (2001).

*Supply Co.*, 205 F. Supp. 2d 695 (S.D. Tex. 2002), as allegedly proving that the federal MDL is inadequate. The *Maine Asbestos* opinion, however, makes its comments only in passing, in a footnote. See *Maine Asbestos*, 44 F. Supp. 2d at 374 n.2. Neither the *Maine Asbestos* nor the *Madden* court cited any statistics or authority for their conclusions.

In *Patenaude, supra*, multiple asbestos plaintiffs implicitly asserted that the federal MDL was an inadequate forum. After failing to convince the MDL court and the JPML Panel to remand their claims to their original courts for trial, they filed a petition for writ of mandamus. The Third Circuit rejected the petition largely because the MDL court was appropriately handling its cases consistent with its legislative mandate. See 210 F.3d at 142. The Third Circuit highlighted the MDL court's explicit favoritism toward malignancy cases: "the sick and dying, their widows and survivors should have their claims addressed first." *Id.* at 139; see also *id.* at 140 ("cases of mesothelioma and lung cancer with asbestosis will be 'address[ed] ... on a priority basis.'") (citations omitted).

In sum, the published cases and available statistics demonstrate that the federal asbestos MDL is a fair and balanced forum, especially for malignancy cases. This Court should thus have no hesitation to allow the federal system to handle this case if that is indeed what would happen.

**II.    CONDITIONING *FORUM NON CONVENIENS* DISMISSAL  
ON A DEFENDANT WAIVING ITS RIGHT TO REMOVAL  
RAISES A SIGNIFICANT QUESTION OF LAW UNDER  
THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION**

The trial court found that well-settled principles of *forum non conveniens* warranted dismissal of this case. The appellate court, however, conditioned dismissal on Petitioner's stipulation to try the case in Arkansas state court, effectively requiring Petitioner to waive its right to remove the case to federal court. This presents a significant constitutional issue for resolution by this Court.

Federal diversity-of-citizenship jurisdiction has its foundation in Article III, § 2 of the U.S. Constitution: "The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising . . . between citizens of different states. . . ." Congress has codified the criteria for removing a case from state to federal court in diversity actions. 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a) provides defendants with an "absolute right" to remove a case that complies with the terms of the statute. *Home Ins. v. Morse*, 87 U.S. 445, 458, 22 L. Ed. 365, 20 Wall. 445 (1874). A party's motivation for seeking removal, including the potential for delay, "is beside the point as the right to removal is statutory, jurisdictional, and absolute, regardless of motivation, when it is found to exist." *White v. Wellington*, 627 F.2d 582, 586 (8th Cir. 1980).

The Supremacy Clause is the source of constitutional protection for a defendant's right to remove a qualifying case from state to federal court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332. The Supremacy Clause provides that the Constitution and the laws of the United States may not be trumped by state law. *See* U.S. Const. art. VI, cl. 2. As the U.S. Supreme Court has explained: “[W]hen state law touches upon the area of federal statutes enacted pursuant to constitutional authority, it is familiar doctrine that the federal policy may not be set at naught, or its benefits denied by the state law.” *Kewanee Oil Co. v. Bicron Corp.*, 416 U.S. 470, 479-80, 94 S. Ct. 1879, 1885, 40 L. Ed.2d 315 (1974) (internal citations and quotations omitted).

“[T]he judiciary of a State can neither defeat the right given by a constitutional act of Congress to remove a case from a court of the State into the Circuit Court of the United States, nor limit the effect of such removal.” *Goldey v. Morning News*, 156 U.S. 518, 523, 15 S. Ct. 559, 561, 39 L. Ed. 517 (1895). The Supreme Court has stated:

It may not be doubted that the judicial power of the United States as created by the Constitution and provided for by Congress pursuant to its constitutional authority is a power wholly independent of state action, and which therefore the several states may not by any exertion of authority in any form, directly or indirectly, destroy, abridge, limit, or render inefficacious. The doctrine is so elementary as to require no citation of authority to sustain it.

*Harrison v. St. Louis & San Francisco R.R.*, 232 U.S. 318, 327, 34 S. Ct. 333, 335, 58 L. Ed. 621 (1914).

Here, the appellate court's conditional dismissal is contrary to well-established Supreme Court precedent holding that a state may not condition its grant of a privilege on a party's surrender of a federal right. For example, in *Terral v. Burke Const. Co.*, 257 U.S. 529, 532-33, 42 S. Ct. 188, 188-89, 66 L. Ed. 352 (1922), the Court found that Arkansas could not revoke a foreign company's authority to do business in Arkansas if the company removed a case to federal court. *See also Barron v. Burnside*, 121 U.S. 186, 199-200, 7 S. Ct. 931, 936, 30 L. Ed. 915 (1887); *Morse*, 87 U.S. at 454-55. The Supreme Court has also intervened to invalidate procedural rulings by state courts that deprive the federal courts of their congressionally granted jurisdiction. *See, e.g., Wilson v. Republic Iron & Steel Co.*, 257 U.S. 92, 97-98, 42 S. Ct. 35, 37-38, 66 L. Ed. 144 (1921). The right of removal is to be "unchecked or unburdened by state authority." *Harrison*, 232 U.S. at 329, 34 S. Ct. at 336.

The Supreme Court continues to recognize the continuing validity of these cases. *See Garrity v. New Jersey*, 385 U.S. 493, 500, 87 S. Ct. 616, 620, 17 L. Ed.2d 562 (1967). Federal appellate courts have also held

that a state may not interfere with federal jurisdiction.<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, courts have found that the Constitution imparts a duty to safeguard and preserve the balance between state sovereignty and federal supremacy, including the right to remove where the requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 1332 are satisfied. *See 17th Street Assocs., LLP v. Markel Int'l Ins. Co.*, 373 F. Supp. 2d 584, 593-95 (E.D. Va. 2005).

Thus, this case presents the important constitutional issue of whether a state court may effectively nullify 28 U.S.C. § 1332 under the guise of a balancing of factors in a *forum non conveniens* analysis. Constitutional precedent strongly suggests that a state court may not condition dismissal on a defendant's waiver of its federal right of removal.

**III. THE APPELLATE COURT'S DECISION RAISES AN ISSUE OF SUBSTANTIAL PUBLIC IMPORTANCE THAT SHOULD BE DETERMINED BY THIS COURT**

Washington residents will bear an unfair burden if this Court lets the *possibility* of removal in the alternate forum become the paramount factor in the *forum non conveniens* calculus. Washington will experience

---

<sup>5</sup> *See, e.g., Int'l Ins. Co. v. Duryee*, 96 F.3d 837, 840 (6th Cir. 1996) (invalidating Ohio statute affecting removal right of out-of-state insurers); *Kansas Pub. Employees Ret. Sys. v. Reimer & Koger Assocs.*, 4 F.3d 614, 619 (8th Cir. 1993) ("states cannot indirectly prevent, defeat, or limit the free exercise of the right to remove"); *Frost v. Railroad Comm'n*, 271 U.S. 583, 593, 46 S. Ct. 605, 607, 70 L. Ed. 1101 (1926) (state may not strip a citizen of the right to remove "under the guise of a surrender of a right in exchange for a valuable privilege which the state threatens to otherwise withhold").


more nonresident filings in asbestos and other cases subject to a federal MDL - particularly as claimants seek to avoid states such as Mississippi, Texas, and Ohio, that have recently acted to curb forum-shopping and improve the overall asbestos litigation environment. *See* Mark A. Behrens & Phil Goldberg, *The Asbestos Litigation Crisis: The Tide Appears To Be Turning*, 12 Conn. Ins. L.J. 477 (2006).

It is unfair to expect Washington residents to serve as jurors, or to pay the taxes to fund the work of the courts, in cases having little or nothing to do with their local communities. Washington plaintiffs will see justice delayed if they must wait behind earlier-filing nonresidents to have their day in court. These issues are of substantial importance to Washington residents and merit this Court's consideration of this appeal.

### CONCLUSION

For these reasons, *amici curiae* ask this Court to review this case and overturn the appellate court's decision.

Respectfully submitted,

  
James O. Neet, Jr. (WA #9916)\*  
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.  
2555 Grand Boulevard  
Kansas City, MO 64108  
(816) 474-6550  
Attorneys for *Amici Curiae*  
\* Counsel of Record

Mark A. Behrens  
Cary Silverman  
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.  
600 14th Street, NW, Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 783-8400  
Counsel for the Coalition for Litigation Justice, Inc.

Paul W. Kalish  
CROWELL & MORING LLP  
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20004  
(202) 624-2500  
Counsel for the Coalition for Litigation Justice, Inc.

Robin S. Conrad  
Amar D. Sarwal  
NATIONAL CHAMBER LITIGATION CENTER, INC.  
1615 H Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20062  
(202) 463-5337

Ann W. Spragens  
Robert J. Hurns  
PROPERTY CASUALTY INSURERS  
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA  
2600 South River Road  
Des Plaines, IL 60018-3286  
(847) 553-3826

Gregg Dykstra  
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF  
MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANIES  
3601 Vincennes Road  
Indianapolis, IN 46268  
(317) 875-5250

Lynda S. Mounts  
Kenneth A. Stoller  
AMERICAN INSURANCE ASSOCIATION  
1130 Connecticut Ave, NW  
Suite 1000  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 828-7100

Donald D. Evans  
AMERICAN CHEMISTRY COUNCIL  
1300 Wilson Boulevard  
Arlington, VA 22209  
(703) 741-5000

*Of Counsel*

Dated: August 21, 2007

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

I certify that on August 21, 2007, an original and one copy of the foregoing Motion and Brief were sent by overnight mail to:


Ronald Carpenter, Clerk  
Supreme Court of Washington  
415 Twelfth Avenue SW  
Olympia, WA 98504-0929  
(360) 357-2077

I further certify that a copy of the foregoing Motion and Brief were sent via the United States Postal Service in a first-class postage-prepaid envelope addressed to the following:

Matthew Bergman  
BERGMAN & FROCHT  
614 First Avenue, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Seattle, WA 98104

John Phillips  
Phillips Law Group  
315 Fifth Avenue S.  
Seattle, WA 98104

Diane Kero  
GORDON, THOMAS, HONEYWELL,  
MALANCA, PETERSON &  
DAHEM, L.L.P.  
One Union Square  
600 University, Suite 2100  
Seattle, WA 98101

  
James C. Neet, Jr. (WA #5916)\*  
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.  
2555 Grand Boulevard  
Kansas City, MO 64108  
(816) 474-6550