

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

THE HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON**

H.N., by and through her parents and )  
guardians, John Doe and Jane Doe; and )  
JOHN DOE and JANE DOE, husband and )  
wife, on their own behalf, )

Case No.: 15-cv-1374 RAJ

Plaintiffs, )

**ORDER**

v. )

REGENCE BLUESHIELD, a Washington )  
Corporation; and MBA GROUP )  
INSURANCE TRUST HEALTH AND )  
WELFARE PLAN, )

Defendants. )


This matter comes before the Court on Defendant Regence Blueshield’s Motion for Entry of Satisfaction of Judgment. Dkt. # 100. Plaintiffs have not filed an opposition; rather, Plaintiff’s counsel has filed a “Declaration of T. Jeffrey Keane in Response” to Regence’s Motion. Dkt. # 102. Regence has filed a Reply. Dkt. # 103. For the reasons that follow, the Court **GRANTS** Regence’s Motion.

On August 28, 2019, the Court entered Judgment against Defendants and for Plaintiffs in the total amount of \$291,970.30, including costs and interest. Dkt. # 99. Defendants have submitted evidence in the form of declarations and exhibits showing

1 that this amount has been paid in full to Plaintiffs. Dkt. # 103. Federal Rule of Civil  
2 Procedure 60(b) provides that a “court may relieve a party or its legal representative  
3 form a final judgment, order, or proceeding” where “the judgment has been satisfied,  
4 released or discharged,” where “applying it prospectively is no longer equitable,” or  
5 for “any other reason that justifies relief.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(5)–(6). Although  
6 Plaintiff’s Counsel’s “Declaration” contends that “this case is not over” and takes issue  
7 with Regence’s internal calculation of Plaintiffs’ damages, they do not dispute that  
8 they have received the full monies provided for in the Court’s August 28, 2018  
9 Judgment. Dkt. # 102. Plaintiffs also do not appear to contest this Court’s Judgment,  
10 or the amounts contained therein, and have not filed any motion with the Court to  
11 address Regence’s behavior in executing this Judgment. Thus, as it pertains to this  
12 Court’s Judgment (Dkt. # 99), there appears to be no outstanding issue as to whether  
13 the money has been received.

14 Accordingly, the Court **GRANTS** Regence’s Motion for Satisfaction of  
15 Judgment. Dkt. # 100. The Clerk is directed to discharge the Court’s August 28, 2018  
16 Judgment (Dkt. # 99) as a matter of record.

17 Dated this 12<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2019.

18  
19 

20 HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES  
21 United States District Judge  
22  
23  
24  
25