

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT SEATTLE

10 ALEX JONES, et al.,

11 Plaintiffs,

12 v.

13 ST. PAUL FIRE & MARINE
INSURANCE COMPANY,

14 Defendant.
15

CASE NO. C15-531 MJP

ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR
SUMMARY JUDGMENT

16 THIS MATTER comes before the Court on Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment.
17 (Dkt. No. 38.) Having considered the Parties' briefing and the related record, the Court
18 GRANTS the motion.

19 The Court has now twice considered the question of whether or not attorney Douglas
20 Anderson was an appointed official of Grant County under the insurance contract issued by
21 Defendant St. Paul Fire & Marine Insurance Company. (Dkt. Nos. 27 at 3-5, 42 at 2-3.) Each
22 time, the Court found that Mr. Anderson was an independent contractor and was not an
23 appointed official, and concluded that Mr. Anderson was not covered under the insurance policy
24

1 at issue in this case. (Id.) In the interest of judicial economy, the Court incorporates those
2 discussions here.

3 Defendant now moves for summary judgment on all of Plaintiffs' claims, arguing that
4 because Mr. Anderson was not an insured under the contract, Plaintiffs' claims fail as a matter of
5 law. (Dkt. No. 38.) Plaintiffs "object to the Court's prior rulings regarding coverage," but
6 concede that "all of [Plaintiffs'] claims against [Defendant] hinge upon coverage under the
7 applicable insurance policy." (Dkt. No. 44 at 1.) Plaintiffs also concede that the Court's prior
8 rulings, "if adhered to, would require [Defendant's] motion for summary judgment to be
9 granted." (Id. at 1-2.)

10 The Court again finds that Mr. Anderson was not covered as an appointed official under
11 the insurance policy at issue. The Parties agree that this ruling controls the resolution of all of
12 Plaintiffs' claims in this matter. (See Dkt. Nos. 38, 44, 46.) Accordingly, the Court GRANTS
13 Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment on all of Plaintiffs' claims. (Dkt. No. 38.) The
14 Court finds that Rule 11 sanctions are not warranted here because Plaintiffs may wish to appeal
15 the Court's previous order(s), and therefore were under no obligation to dismiss the action;
16 Defendant's request for sanctions is DENIED. Defendant's Motion for a Protective Order is
17 DENIED as moot. (Dkt. No. 48.) The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to all
18 counsel.

19
20 Dated this 9th day of October, 2015.

21
22 

23 Marsha J. Pechman
24 Chief United States District Judge