Page 1 of 3

```
1
                                                                Hon. Judge Zilly
2
    Floyd E. Ivey
    Liebler, Ivey, Connor, Berry & St. Hilaire
1141 N. Edison, Suite C
    P.O. Box 6125
    Kennewick, WA 99336
Telephone (509) 735-3581
4
    Fax (509) 735-3585
5
    Attorneys for Defendant
6
    DOUGLAS E. MCKINLEY, JR.
    Attorney At Law
P.O. Box 202 Richland, Washington 99352
509-628-0809
 8
    Fax (509) 628-2307
Attorney for Plaintiff
 9
10
    ROBERT J. SIEGEL
     1325 4th Ave Ste 940
     Seattle, WA
11
     98101-2509
12
13
                        IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                   FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
14
15
     OMNI INNOVATIONS LLC et al
                                                                NO. CV-06-01284-TSZ
16
                                                                DECLARATION OF FLOYD
                           Plaintiffs
                                                                E. IVEY IN SUPPORT OF
17
                                                                PETITION FOR STAY
     ASCENTIVE, LLC
18
     a Delaware Limited Liability Company;
     ADAM SCHRAN, individually and as part of his marital community; JOHN DOES, I-X
19
                           Defendants
20
21
            Floyd E. Ivey now declares that I have appeared for Defendant Ascentive,
22
     LLC in the matter of Omni LLC v. Ascentive LLC on October 20, 2006. The
23
     damage to Defendants Ascentive LLC and Mr. Schran, by disqualification of
24
     counsel Ivey is not limited to the present case of Omni LLC v. Ascentive LLC. I
25
     have been the lead counsel representing Ascentive LLC and Mr. Schran in the
26
     Eastern District since approximately August 2005. In that matter I have brought a
27
28
                                                                LIEBLER, IVEY, CONNOR, BERRY & ST. HILAIRE
     DeclarationIvey Motion Opposing Plaintiff's Motion to Disqualify -
                                                                             Attorneys at Law
                                                                              P.O. Box 6125
     Z:\IPClient\Ascentive LLC v. Gordon\Ascentive v. Omni Innovations\Motions\MotionDisqualify\Motion.Stay.Mandamus.061209\Motion forMANDAMUS.STAY.DECIVEY.061212.wpd
                                                                      Kennewick, Washington 99336-0125
(509) 735-3581
```

Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Jurisdiction with the matter to be further considered at trial. I have pursued discovery issues in opposing discovery and in seeking responses to discovery from Plaintiff. I have interacted with Ascentive and Mr. Schran on numerous occasions.

Additionally, I am a lead counsel in the Eastern District case of Gordon v. Impulse Marketing Group, Inc, CV-04-5125-FVS and have personally drafted and filed the majority of pleadings in that case through approximately March 2006 and Court Rec. 255 in Gordon v. Impulse. Since approximately August 2005 I have been the sole counsel for Defendants Gordon v Ascentive LLC, Eastern District of Washington, CV-05-5079-FVS; since approximately the fall of 2005 I was the sole counsel representing Defendants in Gordon v. Efinancials LLC, Benton County Superior Court, until such time that on my Motion for Change of Venue the case was moved to King County.

As Counsel for Defendant in these several cases, in opposition to Mr. Gordon, I have filed dozens of pleadings, have moved to dismiss, have pursued motions to compel and presently have pending, in Gordon v. Ascentive LLC, in the Eastern District, a Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff Gordon's First Amended Complaint.

Disqualification in the Western District matter of Omni LLC v. Ascentive has the specific potential to affect Defendant's choice of counsel in the other cases of Gordon v. Impulse and Gordon v. Ascentive in the Eastern District.

Specifically, should the disqualification be effected in the Western District what will be the effect of Defendants, other than Ascentive, in their continuing reliance on co-counsel who have labored with counsel Ivey in the matter of Gordon v. Impulse in the Eastern District?

It is reasonably considered that another attorney may not gain the same quality of attorney-client relationship and rapport that I have with petitioner

Defendants. Except for compelling reasons, such as necessary bar admissions, 1 clients should be permitted to have the counsel of their choice. A lost choice of 2 counsel at trial cannot be remedied on direct appeal. 3 DATED this 12th day of December, 2006 4 LIEBLER, IVEY, CONNOR BERRY & ST. HILAIRE 5 6 7 ounsel før Defendant 8 1141 N. Edison, Suite C Kennewick, WA 99336 9 10 I hereby certify that on December 12, 2006, I electronically filed **Declaration of Floyd E. Ivey Supporting Petition for Stay** with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF System which will send notification of such filing to Plaintiffs' counsel Robert J. Siegel and Douglas McKinley.

S/FLOYD E. IVEY

FLOYD E. IVEY 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28