

FILED
SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
4/8/2025 3:27 PM
BY SARAH R. PENDLETON
CLERK

SUPREME COURT
OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

C.C., an individual,

Respondent,

and

A.B., an individual; D.E.F., an
individual; M.R., an individual;
J.L., an individual; B.F., as
guardian for K.F., an individual;
C.B., an individual; A.M., an
individual,

Plaintiffs,

v.

KIWANIS INTERNATIONAL, a
non-profit entity; KIWANIS
PACIFIC NORTHWEST
DISTRICT, a non-profit entity;
KIWANIS OF TUMWATER, a
non-profit corporation;
KIWANIS OF CENTRALIA-
CHEHALIS, a non-profit entity;
KIWANIS OF UNIVERSITY
PLACE, a non-profit entity;
KIWANIS VOCATIONAL
HOME, a nonprofit entity;
LEWIS COUNTY YOUTH
ENTERPRISES, INC. d/b/a

No. 103894-1

REPLY ON
MOTION TO
MODIFY CLERK'S
RULING RE:
ANSWER TO
PETITION FOR
REVIEW

Kiwanis Vocational Homes for
Youth, a non-profit corporation,

Petitioners,

and

CHARLES McCARTHY, an
individual; EDWARD J.
HOPKINS, an individual;
UNITED WAY OF PIERCE
COUNTY, d/b/a CHILDREN'S
INDUSTRIAL HOME and/or
COFFEE CREEK CENTER;
COFFEE CREEK CENTER, a
non-profit entity; CHILDREN'S
INDUSTRIAL HOME d/b/a
COFFEE CREEK CENTER, a
non-profit entity; MENTOR
HOUSE, d/b/a CHILDREN'S
INDUSTRIAL HOME and/or
COFFEE CREEK CENTER, a
nonprofit entity; STATE OF
WASHINGTON; STATE OF
WASHINGTON,
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL
AND HEALTH SERVICES,
DEPARTMENT OF
CHILDREN, YOUTH AND
FAMILY SERVICES, CHILD
PROTECTIVE SERVICES,
governmental entities,

Defendants.

A. INTRODUCTION

C.C.'s answer to the Kiwanis petitioners' motion to modify the Clerk's ruling at issue here¹ fails to address the points made in the Kiwanis petitioners' opening motion. Rather, C.C. argues for an interpretation of RAP 13.4(d) that renders the rule superfluous and opens the door to a multiplicity of pleadings RAP 13.4 never contemplated. This Court should reject C.C.'s interpretation of RAP 13.4.

B. FACTS RELEVANT TO MOTION

C.C. at various times tries to argue that the Kiwanis entities are advocating a "race to the courthouse." Answer at 3 n.2, 10. That is simply untrue. The Kiwanis petitioners filed their February 25 petition for review two weeks after Division II decided on February 11 to finally publish its opinion. Either party

¹ At various places, C.C. refers to the Clerk's ruling as the March 14, 2025 "Ruling of the Washington Supreme Court." That is inaccurate. The ruling at issue is *the Clerk's* ruling, until this Court weighs in on the Kiwanis petitioners' motion to modify. *See* RAP 17.7.

could have filed a petition for review under RAP 13.4(a) and the other could have answered in due course. RAP 13.4(d).

The Kiwanis petitioners merely note that C.C. had *ample* time to **decide** on his course of action. C.C. filed a motion to publish Division II's unpublished opinion on September 19, 2024. Division II took considerable time to **decide** on publication, nearly five months (September 19, 2024 – February 11, 2025), affording C.C.'s counsel *months* of time to **decide** on seeking review by this Court, and preparing a petition for review if they wanted to do so.

At that, the Kiwanis petitioners initially filed their petition for review on February 25, 2025. Again, C.C. had *ample* time to act on an answer to that petition. Instead, he *waited* to file his petition for review until March 13, 2025, rather than filing an answer to the Kiwanis petition with its own “cross-review” issues, as RAP 13.4(d) contemplates.

C. ARGUMENT

In his answer, C.C. nowhere **denies** that this Court

interprets court rules like it interprets statutes, motion at 4-5, or that in interpreting a court rule, like a statute, the Court implements the Court's intent, interpreting the rule *as a whole*, effectuating all of its provisions. *State ex. rel. Schillberg v. Everett Dist. Justice Court, Snohomish County*, 90 Wn.2d 794, 797 585 P.2d 1177 (1978).

Not to be ignored, RAP 13.4 is designed to *limit* the number of pleadings parties submit to this Court on review. RAP 13.4(d) *limits* replies, for example. The issue for this Court is whether it wants to open the door to a whole new group of added pleadings on review.

The Clerk's interpretation of RAP 13.4(d) makes the process of answering a petition for review, and raising new issues, entirely superfluous. C.C. did not answer the obvious question posed in the Kiwanis petitioners' motion at 6: Why would any respondent raising new issues to this Court not file *both* an answer to the initial petition, *and* a separate petition for review, giving themselves extra pages in *three* pleadings —

answer/PFR/possible reply. Nor does C.C. have an answer to the fact that the process envisioned by the Clerk creates an avenue, not contemplated by RAP 13.4(d) to inundate the Court and its Commissioner with unnecessary added briefing on review.

C.C.'s answer does not address the intent of the 1994 amendments to RAP 13.4(d) that were designed to permit parties answering a petition for review to raise new issues in such an answer, rather than filing a separate petition. Elizabeth A. Turner. 3 *Wash. Practice Rules Practice* (9th ed.) at 227-29. Motion at 6.

Under RAP 13.4(d), once the Kiwanis petitioners filed their February 25, 2025 petition for review, C.C. had 30 days to file an answer. If C.C. wanted to raise new issues, and he did, RAP 13.4(d) required him to “raise those new issues in an answer.”² He could not file a separate petition for review, hoping

² C.C. acknowledges that the answer raising new issues is a “cross-petition” for review. Answer at 7-8. However, the cases he cites address a distinct issue from the procedures contemplated by RAP 13.4(a) and RAP 13.4(d). Rather, those

to give himself multiple bites at the apple and more pages beyond those allotted to him by RAP 13.4(f)/RAP 18.17, or an additional pleading – a possible reply on his March 13 petition – not permitted by RAP 13.4(a), (d).

C.C. complains that the present process is “unfair” in that he does not get to answer the Kiwanis petitioners’ petition for review as to RCW 23B.14.340. Answer at 9-10. That “unfairness” is of *his own making*. He could have answered the Kiwanis entities’ petition and raised his new issues in a single pleading. That he *chose* not to address the issues raised in the Kiwanis petitioners’ February 25 petition was *his choice*. But he is not entitled to file a pleading not contemplated by RAP 13.4(a), (d).

Finally, C.C. argues that RAP 1.2(a) requires a liberal construction of RAP 13.4 and that he is entitled to a waiver of the requirements of RAP 13.4(d), citing RAP 1.2(c). But C.C.

cases address whether an issue has actually been presented to this Court.

fails to reference RAP 18.8(b) that strongly supports the “desirability of finality” by denying extensions of time as to petitions for review. That policy should be no less stringent for raising “new issues” in a RAP 13.4(d) answer, a pleading that is, under the rule, a cross-petition for review.

D. CONCLUSION

This Court should modify the Clerk’s March 27 ruling and bar C.C. from filing an “answer” to the Kiwanis entities’ petition for review. His “petition for review” is that answer. RAP 13.4(d).

This document contains 946 words, excluding the parts of the document exempted from the word count by RAP 18.17.

DATED this 8th day of April, 2025.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Philip A. Talmadge

Philip A. Talmadge

WSBA #6973

Talmadge/Fitzpatrick

2775 Harbor Avenue SW

Third Floor, Suite C

Seattle, WA 98126

(206) 574-6661

Francis Floyd
WSBA #10642
Amber L. Pearce
WSBA #31626
Floyd, Pflueger, Kearns,
Nedderman & Gress P.S.
3101 Western Avenue, Suite 400
Seattle, WA 98121

Charles P.E. Leitch
WSBA #25443
Patterson Buchanan
Fobes & Leitch Inc. P.S.
1000 Second Avenue, 30th Floor
Seattle, WA 98104
(206) 462-6700

Attorneys for Kiwanis Petitioners

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

On said day below I electronically served via the appellate portal a true and accurate copy of the ***Reply on Motion to Modify Clerk Ruling*** in Supreme Court Cause No. 103894-1 to the following parties:

Darrell L. Cochran
Kevin M. Hastings
Selena L. Hoffman
Bridget T. Grotz
Patrick A. Brown
Pfau Cochran Vertetis Amala PLLC
909 A Street, Suite 700
Tacoma, WA 98402

Zachary D. Rutman
Paul A. Buckley
Mallory E. Lorber
Taylor | Anderson, LLP
3655 Nobel Drive, Suite 650
San Diego, CA 92112

Francis Floyd
Amber L. Pearce
Floyd, Pflueger, Kearns, Nedderman & Gress P.S.
3101 Western Avenue, Suite 400
Seattle, WA 98119-4269

Aaron M. Young
Office of the Attorney General
800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000
Seattle, WA 98104

Charles P.E. Leitch
Patterson Buchanan Fobes & Leitch Inc. P.S.
1000 Second Avenue, 30th Floor
Seattle, WA 98104

Original E-filed via appellate portal:
Supreme Court Clerk's Office

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington and the United States that the foregoing is true and correct.

DATED: April 8, 2025 at Seattle, Washington.

/s/ Matt J. Albers
Matt J. Albers, Paralegal
Talmadge/Fitzpatrick

TALMADGE/FITZPATRICK

April 08, 2025 - 3:27 PM

Transmittal Information

Filed with Court: Supreme Court
Appellate Court Case Number: 103,894-1
Appellate Court Case Title: C.C., A.B., J.L., et al. v. Kiwanis International, et al.
Superior Court Case Number: 20-2-07087-0

The following documents have been uploaded:

- 1038941_Answer_Reply_20250408152455SC893838_8516.pdf
This File Contains:
Answer/Reply - Reply to Answer to Motion
The Original File Name was Reply on Motion to Modify Clerk Ruling.pdf

A copy of the uploaded files will be sent to:

- APearce@NWTrialAttorneys.com
- DSolberg@NWTrialAttorneys.com
- TORTTAP@atg.wa.gov
- aaron.young1@atg.wa.gov
- bgrotz@pcvalaw.com
- brad@tal-fitzlaw.com
- cpl@pattersonbuchanan.com
- darrell@pcvalaw.com
- ecampbell@nwtrialattorneys.com
- ffloyd@NWTrialAttorneys.com
- jds@pattersonbuchanan.com
- kevin@pcvalaw.com
- khedger@pcvalaw.com
- matt@tal-fitzlaw.com
- mhetlage@pcvalaw.com
- pbrown@pcvalaw.com
- shoffman@pcvalaw.com
- sklotz@nwtrialattorneys.com
- tnedderman@NWTrialAttorneys.com

Comments:

Reply on Motion to Modify Clerk's Ruling Re: Answer to Petition for Review

Sender Name: Matt Albers - Email: matt@tal-fitzlaw.com

Filing on Behalf of: Philip Albert Talmadge - Email: phil@tal-fitzlaw.com (Alternate Email: matt@tal-fitzlaw.com)

Address:
2775 Harbor Avenue SW
Third Floor Ste C
Seattle, WA, 98126
Phone: (206) 574-6661

Note: The Filing Id is 20250408152455SC893838