

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

8  
9 ALLSTATE INSURANCE CO., *et al.*,

10 Plaintiffs,

11 v.

12 LIGHTHOUSE LAW P.S., INC., *et al.*,

13 Defendants.

Case No. C15-1976RSL

ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS'  
MOTIONS TO DISMISS  
PLAINTIFFS' AMENDED  
COMPLAINT

14  
15 This matter comes before the Court on “Defendant Lighthouse Law P.S., Inc. and  
16 Thammalaiviroj’s Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs’ Amended Complaint.” Dkt. # 56.<sup>1</sup> Plaintiffs  
17 Allstate Insurance Co., Allstate Indemnity Co., Allstate Fire & Casualty Insurance Co., and  
18 Allstate Property and Casualty Insurance Co. (together, “Allstate”) allege that defendants Patty  
19 Thammalaiviroj, an attorney licensed in California, and Chong “Joseph” Kim, a non-lawyer  
20 residing in Washington State, created and operated a sham law firm, defendant Lighthouse Law  
21 P.S., Inc. (“Lighthouse”), for the purpose of profiting from fraudulent insurance claims.

22 After this Court dismissed Allstate’s original complaint with leave to amend, Dkt. # 47,  
23 Allstate filed an amended complaint, Dkt. # 52, naming additional defendants and elaborating on  
24

25  
26 <sup>1</sup> Defendants Chong “Joseph” Kim and Jane Doe Kim also moved to dismiss Allstate’s amended  
27 complaint, Dkt. # 59, but on December 20, 2016, the parties stipulated to dismissal of all claims against  
28 the Kims with prejudice, Dkt. # 92. Accordingly, the Kims’ motion to dismiss is DENIED as moot.

ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS’ MOTIONS  
TO DISMISS PLAINTIFFS’ AMENDED COMPLAINT - 1

1 the factual allegations underlying its claims. Defendants Lighthouse and Thammalaiviroj  
2 (“Defendants”) again move to dismiss, arguing that Allstate’s amended complaint still fails to  
3 state a claim. Having reviewed the memoranda, declarations, and exhibits submitted by the  
4 parties, the Court finds as follows.

5 **I. Failure to State a Claim**

6 Federal pleading rules require a complaint to include “a short and plain statement of the  
7 claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). This requirement  
8 serves to “give the defendant fair notice of what the claim is and the grounds upon which it  
9 rests.” Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 545 (2007) (internal marks and citation  
10 omitted). Although the complaint’s factual allegations need not be detailed, they must  
11 sufficiently state a “plausible” ground for relief. Id. at 544. “A claim has facial plausibility  
12 when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference  
13 that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678  
14 (2009). The plausibility standard is met when a complaint alleges “more than a sheer possibility  
15 that a defendant has acted unlawfully.” Id. “Dismissal is proper only where there is no  
16 cognizable legal theory or an absence of sufficient facts alleged to support a cognizable legal  
17 theory.” Taylor v. Yee, 780 F.3d 928, 935 (9th Cir. 2015). Dismissal without leave to amend is  
18 proper “only if it is absolutely clear that the deficiencies of the complaint could not be cured by  
19 amendment.” Grogan v. Health Officer of Cty. of Riverside, 221 F.3d 1348 (9th Cir. 2000)  
20 (quotation marks and citation omitted).

21 When deciding a Rule 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss, the Court may not consider any  
22 materials other than the pleadings, Lee v. City of Los Angeles, 250 F.3d 668, 688 (9th Cir.  
23 2001), and may disregard any materials improperly submitted, see Swedberg v. Marotzke, 339  
24 F.3d 1139 (9th Cir. 2003). All well-pleaded allegations of material fact are accepted as true and  
25 are construed in the light most favorable to the non-moving party. Manzarek v. St. Paul Fire &  
26 Marine Ins. Co., 519 F.3d 1025, 1031 (9th Cir. 2008).

1           **A.     Washington Consumer Protection Act**

2           Allstate alleges that Defendants violated Washington’s Consumer Protection Act  
3 (“CPA”), RCW 19.86 *et seq.*, by engaging in deceptive trade practices for financial gain.  
4 Specifically, Allstate claims that Defendants violated the CPA by “trafficking in insurance  
5 claims” and by presenting material misrepresentations in insurance settlement demands. Dkt.  
6 # 52, ¶¶ 78, 94. Defendants move to dismiss this claim on the grounds that Allstate’s amended  
7 complaint fails to allege a causal link between Defendants’ alleged wrongdoing and Allstate’s  
8 monetary loss, and that in any event Allstate lacks standing to bring a CPA claim. Dkt. # 56 at  
9 11-13.

10           Washington law empowers private plaintiffs to bring CPA claims where a defendant’s  
11 bad acts cause injuries to the plaintiff and risk injury to the public. See Indoor  
12 Billboard/Washington, Inc. v. Integra Telecom of Washington, Inc., 162 Wn.2d 59, 73 (2007).  
13 A private CPA action may be brought by a party who is not in a consumer relationship with the  
14 defendant, Panag v. Farmers Ins. Co. of Wash., 166 Wn.2d 27, 43–44 (2009), so long as the  
15 plaintiff successfully pleads five elements: (1) an unfair or deceptive act or practice; (2) that  
16 occurred in trade or commerce; (3) a public interest was implicated; (4) the plaintiff’s business  
17 or property was injured; and (5) the unfair or deceptive act caused the injury suffered, Indoor  
18 Billboard, 162 Wn.2d at 73. The causation prong requires the defendant’s act to be the  
19 proximate cause of the plaintiff’s injury, “mean[ing] a cause which in a direct sequence  
20 unbroken by any superseding cause, produces the injury event complained of and without which  
21 such injury event would not have happened.” Schnall v. AT&T Wireless Servs., Inc., 171  
22 Wn.2d 260, 278 (2011) (internal marks omitted) (quoting 6 Washington Practice: Washington  
23 Pattern Jury Instructions: Civil 15.01, at 181 (5th ed. 2005)). An insurance company has  
24 standing to bring a CPA claim against a party that submits false information in connection with  
25 an insurance claim. State Farm Fire & Cas. Co. v. Hyunh, 92 Wn. App. 454, 458–62 (1998).

26           Allstate has successfully pled the elements of its CPA claim. The amended complaint

1 alleges that Defendants operated a sham law firm in order to profit from insurance proceeds,  
2 which Allstate paid as a result of Defendants’ illegal solicitation of insurance claimants and  
3 Defendants’ knowing material misrepresentations (including misrepresenting a sham law firm as  
4 a legitimate one) in its settlement demands. Dkt. # 52, ¶¶ 5, 31, 32, 33, 45–75, 77, 88, 89, 91,  
5 92, 94. Defendants contest only the causation element, which Allstate has sufficiently pled:  
6 Allstate’s monetary loss would not have occurred absent Defendants’ alleged trafficking and  
7 misrepresentations, as Allstate would not have agreed to settle the insurance claims had it known  
8 that the claimants were represented by a sham law firm. See Panag, 166 Wn.2d at 64.  
9 Moreover, the facts as alleged do not suggest that Allstate’s monetary loss is attributable to any  
10 superseding cause. See Schnall, 171 Wn.2d at 278. And Washington law provides that Allstate  
11 has standing to bring this CPA claim. See Hyunh, 92 Wn. App. at 458–62. Defendants’ motion  
12 to dismiss Allstate’s CPA claim is denied.

### 13 **B. Common Law Fraud**

14 Allstate alleges that Defendants committed fraud by misrepresenting material facts during  
15 the submission of settlement demands, including misrepresenting Thammalaiviroj and Kim as  
16 Washington-licensed attorneys and Lighthouse as a legitimate law firm. Dkt. # 52, ¶¶ 96–115.  
17 Allstate also specifically alleges that Lighthouse knowingly incorporated a chiropractor’s false  
18 billing statements into its settlement demands. Dkt. # 52, ¶ 100. Defendants move to dismiss  
19 this claim on the grounds that Allstate’s amended complaint fails to state this fraud claim against  
20 each defendant with sufficient particularity. Dkt. # 56 at 13–17.

21 The federal rules require parties to “state with particularity the circumstances constituting  
22 fraud or mistake.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 9(b). To satisfy that standard, a plaintiff “must set forth more  
23 than the neutral facts necessary to identify the transaction. The plaintiff must set forth what is  
24 false or misleading about a statement, and why it is false.” In re GlenFed, Inc. Sec. Litig., 42  
25 F.3d 1541, 1548 (9th Cir. 1994). A fraud complaint may not “lump multiple defendants  
26 together”; rather, a plaintiff must “differentiate [its] allegations when suing more than one

1 defendant.” Destfino v. Rieswig, 630 F.3d 952, 958 (9th Cir. 2011). Under Washington law, a  
2 fraud claim must include: (1) representation of an existing fact; (2) materiality; (3) falsity; (4) the  
3 speaker’s knowledge of its falsity; (5) intent of the speaker that it should be acted upon by the  
4 plaintiff; (6) plaintiff’s ignorance of its falsity; (7) plaintiff’s reliance on the truth of the  
5 representation; (8) plaintiff’s right to rely upon it; and (9) damages suffered by the plaintiff.  
6 Stiley v. Block, 130 Wn.2d 486, 505 (1996).

7 Allstate’s amended complaint meets the heightened Rule 9(b) pleading standard. Where  
8 several defendants are sued in connection with an alleged fraudulent scheme, “there is no  
9 absolute requirement that . . . the complaint must identify *false statements* made by each and  
10 every defendant,” as each conspirator may be performing different tasks to bring about the  
11 desired result. Swartz v. KPMG LLP, 476 F.3d 756, 764 (9th Cir. 2007) (quoting Beltz Travel  
12 Serv., Inc., v. Int’l Air Transp. Ass’n, 620 F.2d 1360, 1367 (9th Cir. 1980)). Rather, a plaintiff  
13 must, at a minimum, “identify the role of each defendant in the alleged fraudulent scheme.”  
14 Swartz, 476 F.3d at 765 (quoting Moore v. Kayport Package Express, Inc., 885 F.2d 531, 541  
15 (9th Cir. 1989)). Allstate attributes specific misconduct to each of the named defendants, and  
16 accordingly meets the particularity requirement of Rule 9(b).

17 As to Defendant Thammalaiviroj, the complaint alleges that Defendant Thammalaiviroj is  
18 not licensed to practice law in Washington state, but that, together with a non-lawyer, she  
19 formed a California law firm that held itself out to be a Washington professional corporation  
20 doing business in King County, Washington. Dkt. # 52, ¶¶ 3, 4, 17, 47, 48, 49. Allstate further  
21 alleges that it believed this law firm’s legal services were provided by Washington-licensed  
22 attorneys bound by the Washington Rules of Professional Conduct, and that it relied on this  
23 misrepresentation in making payments to the firm. Dkt. # 52, ¶¶ 97–115. The complaint also  
24 alleges that Defendant Thammalaiviroj received over \$12,500 in profits from the law firm’s  
25 business between 2012 and 2015. Dkt. # 52, ¶ 39, 40, 41.

26 As to Defendant Lighthouse, the complaint repeatedly alleges that the law firm operated

1 illegally and profited from insurance settlements that Allstate paid in reliance on the firm’s  
2 misrepresentations regarding its ownership. Dkt. # 52, ¶¶ 32, 33, 36, 43, 52, 72, 97–100.

3 The above allegations are “specific enough to give defendants notice of the particular  
4 misconduct which is alleged.” Bly-Magee v. California, 236 F.3d 1014, 1019 (9th Cir. 2001)  
5 (quotation marks and citation omitted). Accordingly, the amended complaint states a fraud  
6 claim against Defendants with sufficient particularity, and Defendants’ motion to dismiss this  
7 claim is denied.

### 8 C. Washington Criminal Profiteering Act

9 Allstate alleges that Defendants violated portions of Washington’s Criminal Profiteering  
10 Act under RCW 9A.82.060 by trafficking in insurance claims and by engaging in the unlawful  
11 practice of law, and under RCW 9A.82.080 by investing illegal profits back into the illegal  
12 enterprise. Dkt. # 52, ¶¶ 118–135. The Criminal Profiteering Act combats organized crime by  
13 prohibiting the intentional organizing of three or more people “with the intent to engage in a  
14 pattern of criminal profiteering activity.” RCW 9A.82.060. The statute defines such a pattern as  
15 the commission of at least three predicate offenses within a five-year period. RCW  
16 9A.82.010(12). Listed predicate offenses include trafficking in insurance claims, as defined in  
17 RCW 48.30A.015, and the unlawful practice of law, as defined in RCW 2.48.180. RCW  
18 9A.82.010(4)(ee), -(ff). The statute also makes it illegal for a person to invest any proceeds from  
19 a pattern of criminal activity in real property or in the “operation of any enterprise.” RCW  
20 9A.82.080(1)(a). The Criminal Profiteering Act includes a private right of action for a party  
21 who sustains injury to its business or property by violations of RCW 9A.82.060 or RCW  
22 9A.82.080. RCW 9A.82.100(1)(a). Defendants move to dismiss these claims on the grounds  
23 that the amended complaint fails to allege sufficient facts demonstrating either trafficking or the  
24 unlawful practice of law. Dkt. # 56 at 17–20.<sup>2</sup>

---

25  
26 <sup>2</sup> Defendants also argue that Allstate has failed to plead any facts supporting an inference of  
27 intent. Dkt. # 56 at 18. But Allstate has specifically alleged intentional misrepresentation and

1 Allstate’s amended complaint sufficiently alleges that a pattern of criminal profiteering  
2 activity occurred. The complaint, taken as true, alleges that Defendants started an illegal law  
3 firm, procured clients in an illegitimate manner, and, posing as a legitimate firm, submitted over  
4 two hundred false claims and then profited from them. Dkt. # 52, ¶¶ 3, 5, 31–33, 37–133.<sup>3</sup> As  
5 described below, the amended complaint plausibly alleges the predicate offenses underlying this  
6 pattern of criminal profiteering in violation of RCW 9A.82.060.

7 **1. Insurance Trafficking**

8 The first predicate in this case, Washington’s insurance trafficking statute, prohibits  
9 service providers from knowingly accepting or making payments related to the referral of an  
10 insurance claimant. RCW 48.30A.015. Service providers include, among other things, persons  
11 who are involved in preparing, processing, presenting, or negotiating insurance claims. RCW  
12 48.30A.010. Allstate’s amended complaint specifically alleges that Defendants paid individuals,  
13 some now named as defendants, to refer insurance claimants to Lighthouse, a service provider.  
14 Dkt. # 52, ¶¶ 53–57, 63–67, 69, 88, 118, 122–24. The amended complaint sufficiently alleges  
15 trafficking in insurance claims.

16 **2. Unlawful Practice of Law**

17 The second alleged predicate, Washington’s statute governing the unlawful practice of  
18 law, prohibits persons not licensed to practice law in Washington (“non-lawyers”) from  
19 engaging in certain activities. RCW 2.48.180. These activities preclude a non-lawyer from  
20 holding herself out as entitled to practice law, holding an investment or ownership interest in a  
21 business that practices law, or sharing legal fees with a Washington-licensed attorney. Id.

22 Allstate’s amended complaint states a plausible claim regarding the unlawful practice of  
23

---

24 trafficking by Defendants, Dkt. # 52, ¶¶ 118, 122, 126, and the facts alleged, taken as true, give rise to a  
25 reasonable inference of intentional conduct. See Iqbal, 556 U.S. at 678.

26 <sup>3</sup> Moreover, unlike Allstate’s original complaint, the amended complaint successfully alleges that  
27 more than three individuals took part in Defendants’ alleged scheme.

1 law. Allstate alleges that Defendant Thammalaiviroj and Mr. Kim owned Lighthouse despite  
2 lacking Washington bar licenses. Dkt. # 52, ¶¶ 2–4, 17–19, 31, 52. Allstate also alleges that  
3 Ms. Kim, a non-lawyer, maintained an ownership interest in Lighthouse. Dkt. # 52, ¶¶ 60, 61,  
4 71. Those facts, taken as true, allow for a “reasonable inference” that the Defendants are liable  
5 as alleged. Iqbal, 556 U.S. at 678. Allstate has sufficiently alleged the unlawful practice of law.

### 6 **3. RCW 9A.82.080**

7 Allstate claims that Defendants violated RCW 9A.82.080 by receiving profits from the  
8 alleged pattern of criminal racketeering and then investing those profits back into the illegal  
9 operation. Dkt. # 52, ¶ 132. Defendants argue that Allstate’s claim is too vague, Dkt. # 56 at 17,  
10 and, absent any concrete allegations underlying this conclusory claim, the Court agrees. Still,  
11 Allstate’s successful allegations of insurance trafficking and unlawful practice of law  
12 sufficiently state a claim under 9A.82.060.

13 Defendants’ motion to dismiss Allstate’s Criminal Profiteering Act claim is denied.

### 14 **D. Unjust Enrichment**

15 Allstate’s amended complaint alleges that Defendants were unjustly enriched when  
16 Defendants received payment from Allstate for fraudulent insurance claims. Dkt. # 52,  
17 ¶¶ 137–44. The parties agree on the basic showing required to make an unjust enrichment claim  
18 in Washington: (1) a benefit was conferred by the plaintiff to the defendant; (2) the benefit was  
19 received at the plaintiff’s expense; and (3) it would be unjust for the defendant to keep the  
20 benefit under the circumstances. Young v. Young, 164 Wn.2d 477, 484 (2008). An action for  
21 unjust enrichment is “the method of recovery for the value of [a] benefit retained absent any  
22 contractual relationship because notions of fairness and justice require it.” Id. Defendants claim  
23 that the amended complaint fails to show a causal link between Defendants’ alleged misconduct  
24 and Allstate’s monetary loss. Dkt. # 59 at 17.<sup>4</sup> As explained above, see supra Part I.A

---

25  
26 <sup>4</sup> Defendants also argue that the amended complaint fails to allege that Defendant  
27 Thammalaiviroj received any of the proceeds in her personal capacity, Dkt. # 56 at 21, but the amended



1 (evaluating Allstate's claim under the Washington Consumer Protection Act), Allstate's  
2 amended complaint sufficiently alleges facts suggesting that Allstate would not have paid out  
3 over \$600,000 in insurance settlements absent Defendants' material misrepresentations.  
4 Accordingly, Defendants' motion to dismiss this claim is denied.

5  
6 For the foregoing reasons, Defendants' motions to dismiss for failure to state a claim,  
7 Dkt. ## 56, 59, are DENIED.

8  
9 DATED this 24th day of January, 2017.

10  
11 

12 Robert S. Lasnik  
13 United States District Judge  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 \_\_\_\_\_  
26 complaint specifically alleges that Defendant Thammalaiviroj personally received \$12,500 in profits,  
27 Dkt. # 52, ¶¶ 39-41.