1	Copies sent via: Honorable Jim Rogers	
2	e-mail Poted: 10/21/16 at 10:00 am With Oral argument	
3	US mail	
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON IN AND FOR KING COUNTY	
	TRACY S. MCNAMARA, an individual,	
10) Plaintiff,) No. 16-2-16400-5 SEA	
11 12 13 14 15	v. PROPOSED ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS'	
17	This matter came before the Court on Defendants' Motion for Dismissal Under CR	
18	12(c). Having reviewed the pleadings and files in this matter, heard argument of counsel,	
19	and issued an oral opinion, the Court rules as follows:	note
20	Defendants' Motion to Dismiss under CR 12(c) is hereby GRANTED, and the	
21	Complaint is hereby dismissed with prejudice.	
22		
23	//	
	ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR DISMISSAL UNDER CR 12(c) - 1 DWT 30328954v1 0107086-000001 Davis Wright Tremaine LLP LAW OFFICES Suite 22000 + 1201 Third Avenue Scattle. Washington 98101-3045 (206) 622-3150 · Fax: (206) 757-7700	

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

<u>ORDER</u>

The plaintiff's Complaint is dismissed with prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

ENTERED this 18 Nowley 2016

The Honorable Jim Rogers SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE

PRESENTED BY:

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP Attorneys for Defendants

By s/ Bruce E. H. Johnson

Bruce E. H. Johnson, WSBA #7667 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 2200

Seattle, WA 98101-3045 Telephone: (206) 757-8069

Fax: (206) 757-7069

E-mail: brucejohnson@dwt.com

ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR DISMISSAL UNDER CR 12(c) - 2 DWT 30328954v1 0107086-000001

Preliminarily, this motion contains a great deal of evidence, and therefore the Court converts the Motion into one for summary judgment under CR 56. All submitted evidence is admitted and was considered. All inferences are against the nonmoving party.

The Stritmatter firm posted certain statements about Ms. McNamara/Nessl ("McNamara") on its firm's web site. These statements are based upon a lawsuit it filed in Grant County. The Strittmater complaint is for wrongful death and undue influence. Ralston et al v. Nessl, 15-2-01064-2, Sup. Ct. Grant County. The factual allegations in the compliant are incendiary: incest, undue influence in financial matters, deliberate isolation from family members, and murder in a foreign country. Of course, Ms. McNamara hotly disputes these allegations. The parties agree that the fair reporting privilege could apply if the web site accurately reported the facts of the complaint. The issue is whether these statements made on the Strittmater web site are fair reports of the complaint.

The firm posted (for a time, until it was complained of) that Ms. McNamara had an "Interpol warrant" for her arrest. In fact, she did not have an Interpol warrant. Interpol had posted a "red notice," and the Belize police had issued a warrant for her. It appears that a warrant in Belize does not have the same legal meaning as it does in the United States and resembles a summons in effect, and can be issued by the police. While the use of the term "Interpol warrant" claim was inaccurate, strictly speaking, it was true that there was a legal document called a warrant, issued by the Belize police, and it was true that there was an

Interpol posting. (Defense points out that after Ms. McNamara's counsel pointed out the inaccuracy about the warrant, that part of the posting was changed, though the rest remained).

The Stritmatter firm also listed this case under a web page noting successful verdicts and cases. However, the firm made no claim of recovery about the case itself on that page, and for certain other cases. In fact, the featured case on the page is the "Ride the Ducks" case which, it is clear from the site, is far from settled, as one victim is asking for donations and there is no mention of a verdict or settlement. Another case on the page is pending before this Court, and no claim there is made that the case is settled. The rest of the discrepancies, in light of the actual allegations made in the complaint, do not stray far from the complaint.

The Court concludes that based upon the undisputed evidence, that the statements are privileged under the fair reporting privilege. *Cox Broadcasting Corp v. Cohn.*

The defense also claims that the statements are absolutely privileged under *Demopolis* and *Jeckle v. Crotty*. That is a closer question because the statements in question are arguably for advertising and not for the administration of justice. This Court does not decide the case under that privilege.

The CPA claim is dismissed. Under *Short v. Demopolis*, the claim does not relate to the "entrepreneurial aspects" of the Strittmater practice, and therefore not under the trade or commerce section of RCW 19.86. The relationship between this Plaintiff and the defendant is one of adversary, not customer.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

November 17,2016

Mon. James E. Rogers King County Superior Court

> Hon. Jim Rogers King County Superior Court Dept. 45 516 3rd Avenue KCC-SC-0203 Seattle, Washington 98104