

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

A.B., by and through her next friend  
CASSIE CORDELL TRUEBLOOD, et  
al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

WASHINGTON STATE  
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND  
HEALTH SERVICES, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C14-1178 MJP

ORDER RE: GOOD CAUSE  
EXCEPTION

The Court issues this Order further to its Order Re: Good Cause Exception (Dkt. No. 1047) and after reviewing Dr. Thomas J. Kinlen’s most recent contempt fines declaration (Dkt. No. 1049).

In the Court’s Order Re: Good Cause Exception, the Court explained, in part, that “[b]ased on the record before it, the Court will only reduce the in-jail competency evaluation fines for the 161 extensions that were affirmatively granted by the ordering Court.” (Order at 7.)

1 The Court explained that to ensure the judgment accurately reflected this reduction, Defendants  
2 were required “to submit an accounting of the fines associated with the 161 extensions and to  
3 indicate how the Court should account for these fines.” (Id.)

4 Defendants have since submitted a declaration from Dr. Kinlen with the accounting.  
5 (Dkt. No. 1049). Dr. Kinlen states that “[c]ourts . . . affirmatively granted 161 good cause  
6 extensions stemming from 150 orders for evaluation” and that “the total fines for these 150  
7 orders for evaluation is \$52,500, which has previously been paid into the court registry.” (Kinlen  
8 Decl. ¶ 16.) Dr. Kinlen then states that “the court should take no further action on these 161  
9 extensions.” (Id.) The Court has entered judgment based on Dr. Kinlen’s declaration and did not  
10 reduce any of the fines. (Judgment (Dkt. No. 1052).)

11 The Court separately issues this Order to clarify that should Defendants wish to request a  
12 reduction in the fines associated with any affirmative good cause extension, they must present  
13 the Court with a copy of the underlying order granting the extension, in addition to an accounting  
14 of the fines similar to what Dr. Kinlen has recently provided. But because Defendants have not  
15 asked for a reduction related to the 161 extensions, the Court will take no further action and will  
16 not require the underlying court orders for the 161 extensions.

17 The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to all counsel.

18 Dated September 26, 2023.

19 

20 Marsha J. Pechman  
21 United States Senior District Judge  
22  
23  
24