1 The Honorable Thomas S. Zilly 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 10 AT SEATTLE 11 IDS PROPERTY AND CASUALTY Case No. 2:15-cv-02031-TSZ INSURANCE COMPANY, an admitted 12 JOINT PRETRIAL ORDER insurer, 13 Plaintiff, LCR 16 14 VS. 15 CHARLES H. FELLOWS; 16 Defendant. 17 **JURISDICTION** 18 19 This Court has jurisdiction in this case under 28 U.S.C. §1441 under diversity jurisdiction. The parties are of diverse citizen ship and the matter in controversy exceeds \$75,000. 20 CLAIMS AND DEFENSES 21 A. PLAINTIFF IDS PROPERTY AND CASUALTY INS. CO. 22 Plaintiff IDS Property and Casualty Insurance Company (hereinafter "IDS") asserts the 23 Court should declare no coverage exists for Defendant Charles H. Fellows' (hereinafter "Fellows") 24 25 insurance claims because (A) the intentional act exclusion to coverage applies because, as IDS asserts, the domestic violence exception to the exclusion does not apply to this matter; and (B) the 26 JOINT PRETRIAL ORDER - (Case No. 2:15-cv-2031) - PAGE 1 601357 THENELL LAW GROUP 12909 SW 68th Pkwy., Suite 320 Portland, Oregon 97223 Telephone: (503) 372-6450

Facsimile: (503) 372-6496

applicable policy specifically does not provide coverage for theft of personal property by another insured.

As defenses to Fellows' counterclaims for alleged breach of contract, alleged insurance bad faith, and alleged violations of the Washington Insurance Fair Conduct Act (hereinafter "IFCA") and the Consumer Protection Act (hereinafter "CPA"), IDS asserts its investigation and actions in connection with the subject insurance claim were reasonable, as was its ultimate coverage determination and denial of the insurance claim. IDS asserts it did not violate the regulations and statutes of the IFCA or the CPA and that Fellows' claims fail. Further, IDS asserts Fellows has not demonstrated a covered loss occurred to trigger coverage for personal property and that Fellows is barred from coverage because of the intentional act exclusion.

# B. DEFENDANT CHARLES H. FELLOWS

Fellows will pursue the following affirmative defenses:

- 1. IDS is estopped and/or precluded from collaterally challenging the determination of the King County Superior Court that Osborne violated the court order to preserve the house by willfully and purposefully destroying the family home.
- 2. The Court should enter a declaratory judgment that there is coverage for the loss to the dwelling and Fellows' personal property.

Defendant will pursue the following claims:

- 1. IDS committed the tort of insurance bad faith by failing to perform a full and fair investigation of Fellows's insurance claim and by elevating its interests above those of Fellows's.
- 2. IDS committed the tort of negligence by failing to perform a full and fair investigation of Fellows's insurance claim and by elevating its interests above those of Fellows's.
- 3. IDS committed the tort of constructive fraud by failing to perform a full and fair investigation of Fellows's insurance claim and by elevating its interests above those of Fellows's.
- 4. IDS committed breach of contract by failing to pay insurance benefits owed pursuant to the contract.

- 5. IDS violated the Consumer Protection Act both by committing an unfair or deceptive act or practice in trade or commerce causing injury to Fellows's property and by violating WAC 284-30-330(1); WAC 284-30-330(2); WAC 284-30-330(40; WAC 284-30-330(5); WAC 284-30-330(13); WAC 284-30-350(1); WAC 284-30-360(1); WAC 284-30-360(3); WAC 284-30-370; WAC 284-30-380(3).
- 6. IDS violated the Insurance Fair Conduct Act by unreasonably denying Fellows's insurance claim and by unreasonably denying payment of benefits and IDS is liable for punitive damages based on this and its violation of WAC 284-30-330(1); WAC 284-30-330(2); WAC 284-30-330(40; WAC 284-30-330(5); WAC 284-30-330(13); WAC 284-30-350(1); WAC 284-30-360(3); WAC 284-30-370; WAC 284-30-380(3).

#### ADMITTED FACTS

The following facts are admitted or otherwise undisputed between the parties:

- 1. Fellows and Michaela Osborne (hereinafter "Osborne") were married.
- 2. Osborne petitioned the King County Superior Court for dissolution of the marriage.
- 3. As part of the dissolution proceedings, the King County Superior Court issued a no-contact Protection Order which restricted any and all contact by Fellows with Osborne or her children. The Protection Order removed Fellows from the family residence in October 2013.
- 4. Also as part of the dissolution proceedings, an appraisal report was prepared on or about April 14, 2015.
  - 5. The appraisal report noted the residence was in "good condition" as of April 2015.
- 6. The underlying dissolution proceeding resolved on or about July 8, 2015, and awarded Fellows the residence. Further, the decree ordered Osborne to vacate the residence within 60 days from June 30, 2015.
- 7. The dissolution decree also ordered Osborne to maintain the home "in the condition it is; the house needs to be in a livable condition; she needs to leave the home intact. Do not damage it in any away, shape, or form."

4

6 7

5

8

10

11

12 13

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

2122

2324

25

- 8. Also on July 8, 2015, a the King County Superior Court issued a permanent nocontact Protection Order restricting Fellows from contacting Osborne or her children.
  - 9. Fellows attempted to re-enter the family residence on or about August 31, 2015.
- 10. Fellows discovered substantial damage to the home including graffiti, holes in the walls, missing appliances, and other vandalism.
- 11. Fellows reported the damages to the Renton Police Department who began an investigation of the damages and prepared a report.
- 12. As part of its investigation, Renton Police spoke with Osborne who admitted the damages occurred and also reported some of the damages were caused by her children whom she allowed to damage the home.
  - 13. Fellows reported the loss to IDS on or about September 1, 2015.
- 14. The residence was insured through a policy issued by IDS with effective dates of May 10, 2015, through May 10, 2016.
- 15. IDS assigned a claim under the subject insurance policy to Fellows' reported damages.
- 16. IDS inspected the home, with Fellows and his attorneys present, on or about September 23, 2015.
- 17. IDS requested examinations under oath of Fellows and Osborne as of September 28, 2015.
  - 18. Fellows submitted to an examination under oath on November 5, 2015.
  - 19. Osborne submitted to an examination under oath on December 18, 2015.
  - 20. IDS filed the instant action for declaratory relief on December 30, 2015.
- 21. Fellows has incurred approximately \$75,000 in repairing and replacing the dwelling. Fellows also paid approximately \$9,000 to his brother for additional repair to the dwelling for a total of approximately \$84,000.00 in actual expenditures to date.
- 22. IDS denied coverage for Fellows claim on December 6, 2016, based on the JOINT PRETRIAL ORDER (Case No. 2:15-cv-2031) PAGE 4

intentional act exclusion, the theft by an insured exclusion, and a failure to substantiate a covered loss occurred to the personal property.

#### DEFENDANT'S PROPOSED ADDITIONAL ADMITTED FACTS

Defendant proposes the following facts also be admitted. IDS objects to these as admitted facts.

- 23. Eric Lamb is an independent, licensed home appraiser.
- 24. Mr. Lamb completed an appraisal of the home on April 14, 2015.
- 25. The purpose of the appraisal was to assist in valuing the home for purposes of the Fellows and Osborne divorce.
- 26. Both Fellows and Osborne sought the home in the divorce.
- 27. Mr. Lamb's appraisal showed that on April 14, 2015, the home was in very good condition.
- 28. There was no significant damage to the home at the time of the appraisal on April 14, 2015.
- 29. IDS issued a renewal policy insuring the home effective May 10, 2015, for the period May 10, 2015 through May 10, 2016.
- 30. The King County Superior Court awarded the home to Fellows. *In re Marriage of Fellows*, 196 Wn. App. 1073, 2016 WL 6948771 at \*1 (Nov. 28, 2016).
- 31. At the conclusion of the divorce trial on June 30, 2015, and in a hearing on July 8, 2015, the King County Superior Court ordered Osborne to keep the home free from damage, ruling: "The house needs to be maintained in the condition it is"; "the house needs to be in a livable condition"; "she needs to leave the home intact. Do not damage it in any way, shape, or form." *Ibid*.

- 32. At the conclusion of the divorce trial on June 30, 2015, the home was in good condition without any significant damage.
- 33. The King County Superior Court ordered Fellows to pay Osborne \$52,413 for her interest in the house. Fellows paid this to Osborne in cash.
- 34. Fellows filed a police report relating to damage to the home with the Renton Police on August 31, 2015.
- 35. Fellows cooperated with the Renton Police investigation relating to the damage.
- 36. The Renton Police opened an investigation into the suspected crime of Malicious Mischief in the First Degree, Domestic Violence.
- 37. The Renton Police identified Osborne as the suspect.
- 38. Osborne telephoned IDS the next morning, September 1, 2015, and retroactively canceled the insurance coverage.
- 39. IDS allowed the policy to be canceled without any notice to Fellows.
- 40. IDS made a mistake when it allowed Osborne to cancel the insurance policy without giving proper, statutory notice to Fellows.
- 41. IDS learned later that day that it had made a mistake by allowing the policy to be canceled when Fellows telephoned to file a claim for the damage.
- 42. IDS did not tell Fellows that it had been a mistake to allow the policy to be canceled.
- 43. IDS did not tell Fellows that he was covered as an insured on the policy.
- 44. The King County Superior Court concluded that Osborne violated the court order to preserve the house by willfully and purposefully destroying the family home. *In re Fellows*, 2016 WL 6948771 at \*2.
- 45. This ruling was affirmed on appeal and is final.

26

46	. By willfully	and purposefully	destroying the	family home,	Osborne	committed
	contempt of	court in violation	of Washington	n law. <i>Id</i> . at *3	i.	

- 47. Robert Null and Eric Michalak were assigned by IDS to assist Mr. Fellows with his insurance claim.
- 48. Claudia Lemon, Scott Wilson, or Robert Null were responsible for deciding whether IDS will cover Mr. Fellows' insurance claim.
- 49. Fellows did not cooperate in or contribute to the creation of the loss.
- 50. Fellows cooperated in the investigation relating to the loss.
- 51. IDS's lawyer, Dan Thenell, assisted in IDS's investigation of the claim.
- 52. On September 18, 2015, Mr. Thenell wrote to Fellows' former lawyer that all communications regarding Fellows' insurance claim were to go through Mr. Thenell's office.
- 53. An examination under oath is a process under which an insurance company can require a person who has made a claim to testify under oath about the claim.
- 54. An examination under oath can be used only as a reasonable part of the insurer's investigation.
- 55. IDS's lawyer Dan Thenell took the examinations under oath of Fellows and Osborne.
- 56. Mr. Thenell's office also gathered documents for use in IDS's investigation.
- 57. In October and November 2015, Fellows' former lawyer wrote to IDS's counsel Mr.

  Thenell on more than one occasion requesting clarification as to whether Fellows was an insured under the policy.
- 58. Mr. Thenell and IDS knew that Fellows was insured.

59	. Neither Mr.	Thenell	nor IDS	informed	Fellows	nor I	Fellows'	s former	lawyer t	hat he
	was insured									

- 60. Fellows obtained three independent bids for the repair of the damage.
- 61. Mike Storino of Tersuli Construction estimated the repair cost to be \$174,388.05.
- 62. Richard Tietjen of Tubro Construction estimated the repair cost to be \$134,217.44.
- 63. Tim Burnson of Maxcare of Washington estimated the repair cost to be \$162,689.24.
- 64. IDS informed Fellows that after completing Osborne's examination under oath in December 2015, it would promptly make a decision on Fellows' insurance claim.
- 65. IDS filed this lawsuit on December 30, 2015, without making a decision on Fellows' claim.
- 66. IDS filed this lawsuit before completing its investigation.
- 67. Mr. Thenell advised in January 2016, after suing Fellows, that IDS considered its investigation to be continuing.
- 68. On November 21, 2016, the Court ordered IDS to make a coverage decision on Fellows' insurance claim.
- 69. On December 6, 2016, Mr. Thenell wrote a letter to Fellows' lawyers stating that IDS was denying Fellows's insurance claim. Mr. Thenell is the only person who signed the letter.
- 70. When IDS filed this lawsuit, it did not claim that Osborne's children did any damage nor that any loss was excluded for this reason.
- 71. The insurance policy covers any property damage that Osborne did that was either "domestic abuse" or "domestic violence."

- 72. Intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly causing damage to property so as to intimidate or attempt to control the behavior of another family or household member is domestic abuse. RCW 48.18.550(5)(d).
- 73. Former spouses are family or household members for purposes of domestic abuse or domestic violence. RCW 10.99.020(3) & RCW 26.50.010(6).
- 74. Malicious mischief property damage is domestic violence. RCW 10.99.020(5)(1)-(n).
- 75. A person commits malicious mischief property damage if the person: knowingly and maliciously causes physical damage to the property of another in an amount exceeding five thousand dollars; knowingly and maliciously causes physical damage to the property of another in an amount exceeding seven hundred fifty dollars; knowingly and maliciously causes physical damage to the property of another; or writes, paints, or draws any inscription, figure, or mark of any type on any public or private building or other structure or any real or personal property owned by any other person unless the person has obtained the express permission of the owner or operator of the property. RCW 9A.48.070–.090.

#### ISSUES OF LAW

The following are the issues of law to be determined by the Court:

- 1) Whether the intentional act exclusion bars coverage to Fellows and, further, whether the innocent spouse exception for domestic violence does or does not apply to Fellows' claim.
- 2) Whether Osborne's damage caused by Osborne children, if any, is covered under the subject policy; and
  - 3) Whether Fellows is entitled to coverage for personal property.

In addition to IDS's issues, Fellows raises the following issues as counterclaims:

1	1) Whether IDS breached the insurance contract;
2	2) Whether IDS committed insurance bad faith;
3	3) Whether IDS violated the Washington Consumer Protection Act;
4	4) Whether IDS violated the Washington Insurance Fair Conduct Act; and
5	5) Whether IDS committed the torts of constructive fraud and/or negligence.
6	EXPERT WITNESSES
7	A. IDS's Expert Witnesses
8	IDS intends to introduce the following expert witnesses to testify at trial in this matter:
9 10	1) Matt Lawless WILL TESTIFY Construction Systems Management, Inc. 811 First Avenue, Suite 466
11	Seattle, WA 98104
12	Mr. Lawless is expected to testify consistently with his report regarding his opinion as
13	to what the damages related to this loss are, what the cost to repair and/or replace the damages is,
14	and what methods of repair and replacement would meet industry standards.
14	
15 16	2) David Mandt WILL TESTIFY Professional Claim and Loss Consulting PO Box 854 Montesano, WA 98563
15 16	Professional Claim and Loss Consulting PO Box 854
15 16 17	Professional Claim and Loss Consulting PO Box 854 Montesano, WA 98563
15 16 17 18	Professional Claim and Loss Consulting PO Box 854 Montesano, WA 98563  Mr. Mandt is expected to testify consistently with his rebuttal report as to his opinion
15	Professional Claim and Loss Consulting PO Box 854 Montesano, WA 98563 Mr. Mandt is expected to testify consistently with his rebuttal report as to his opinion of the reasonableness of IDS's claims handling, investigation, and ultimate coverage
15 16 17 18 19	Professional Claim and Loss Consulting PO Box 854 Montesano, WA 98563  Mr. Mandt is expected to testify consistently with his rebuttal report as to his opinion of the reasonableness of IDS's claims handling, investigation, and ultimate coverage determination. Mr. Mandt will rebut Fellows' expert witness regarding these same topics.
15 16 17 18	Professional Claim and Loss Consulting PO Box 854 Montesano, WA 98563  Mr. Mandt is expected to testify consistently with his rebuttal report as to his opinion of the reasonableness of IDS's claims handling, investigation, and ultimate coverage determination. Mr. Mandt will rebut Fellows' expert witness regarding these same topics.  B. Fellows' Expert Witnesses  1) Roger Howson CDR  WILL TESTIFY CDR
115 116 117 118 119 220 221	Professional Claim and Loss Consulting PO Box 854 Montesano, WA 98563  Mr. Mandt is expected to testify consistently with his rebuttal report as to his opinion of the reasonableness of IDS's claims handling, investigation, and ultimate coverage determination. Mr. Mandt will rebut Fellows' expert witness regarding these same topics.  B. Fellows' Expert Witnesses  1) Roger Howson  WILL TESTIFY
115 116 117 118 119 220 221 222	Professional Claim and Loss Consulting PO Box 854 Montesano, WA 98563  Mr. Mandt is expected to testify consistently with his rebuttal report as to his opinion of the reasonableness of IDS's claims handling, investigation, and ultimate coverage determination. Mr. Mandt will rebut Fellows' expert witness regarding these same topics.  B. Fellows' Expert Witnesses  1) Roger Howson CDR 1100 Dexter Avenue North, Suite 100 Seattle, WA 98109
115 116 117 118 119 220 21 222 223	Professional Claim and Loss Consulting PO Box 854 Montesano, WA 98563  Mr. Mandt is expected to testify consistently with his rebuttal report as to his opinion of the reasonableness of IDS's claims handling, investigation, and ultimate coverage determination. Mr. Mandt will rebut Fellows' expert witness regarding these same topics.  B. Fellows' Expert Witnesses  1) Roger Howson CDR 1100 Dexter Avenue North, Suite 100 Seattle, WA 98109 Phone: 206-676-3851
115 116 117 118 119 220 221 222 223 224	Professional Claim and Loss Consulting PO Box 854 Montesano, WA 98563  Mr. Mandt is expected to testify consistently with his rebuttal report as to his opinion of the reasonableness of IDS's claims handling, investigation, and ultimate coverage determination. Mr. Mandt will rebut Fellows' expert witness regarding these same topics.  B. Fellows' Expert Witnesses  1) Roger Howson CDR 1100 Dexter Avenue North, Suite 100 Seattle, WA 98109 Phone: 206-676-3851  Mr. Howson has knowledge and opinions concerning the damage to Mr. Fellows' home

1	the steps ta	aken in the investigation of the claim and persons	interviewed.
2	3)		WILL TESTIFY
3		IDS Property and Casualty Insurance Company c/o Thenell Law Group, PC	
4		12909 SW 68 <sup>th</sup> Parkway, Suite 320 Portland, OR 97223	
5		Ms. Helf is expected to testify consistently with	her deposition as to IDS's practices
6	and proced	dures associated with claims handling. Ms. Helf	
7	documents	s, best practices and state specific practices.	
8	1)	Scott Wilson	WILL TESTIFY
9	4)	IDS Property and Casualty Insurance Company c/o Thenell Law Group, PC	WILL IESIIF I
10		12909 SW 68 <sup>th</sup> Parkway, Suite 320 Portland, OR 97223	
11		Tottalia, OK 7/225	
12		Mr. Wilson is expected to testify via contempora	aneous video conference consistently
13	with his de	eposition as to IDS's practices and procedures in cla	aims handling, as well as his personal
14	involvemen	nt in Fellows' claim.	
15	5)		WILL TESTIFY
16		IDS Property and Casualty Insurance Company c/o Thenell Law Group, PC	
17		12909 SW 68 <sup>th</sup> Parkway, Suite 320 Portland, OR 97223	
18		Mr. Giessen will testify as to his limited involvem	nent with the subject insurance policy
9	and determ	nining whether Fellows was an insured and other p	policy research.
20	6)	Clair Harrison	WILL TESTIFY
21	<b>_</b>	IDS Property and Casualty Insurance Company c/o Thenell Law Group, PC	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
22		12909 SW 68 <sup>th</sup> Parkway, Suite 320 Portland, OR 97223	
23		1 ordana, ore 7 1225	
24	Ms.	. Harrison is expected to testify as to her limited in	volvement with the subject insurance
25	policy and	determining whether Fellows was an insured and	other policy research.
26	////		
	JOINT PR	ETRIAL ORDER - (Case No. 2:15-cv-2031) - PAGE	12 601357

### WILL TESTIFY

Ms. Osborne is expected to testify consistently with her examination under oath and her deposition. Ms. Osborne is expected to testify as to her involvement in causing the damages or directing the damages to the residence to be done. Ms. Osborne is further expected to testify as to her history with Fellows, including her history of domestic violence and/or abuse by Fellows, as well as recent violations of the permanent no-contact order by Fellows.

Mason L. Hill, age 10-11 c/o Michelle Osborne 5224 Wilson Ave S, Suite 103 Scattle, WA 98118

POSSIBLE WITNESS

Mason is expected to testify as to her personal knowledge and experience with Fellows and any of the damages she may have caused or participated in to the residence.

Madison M. Hill, age 10-11 POSSIBLE WITNESS c/o Michelle Osborne 5224 Wilson Ave S, Suite 103 Seattle, WA 98118

Madison is expected to testify as to her personal knowledge and experience with Fellows and any of the damages she may have caused or participated in to the residence.

10) Officer C. Jacobs/1953 Renton Police Department 1055 S Grady Way Renton, WA 98057

**WILL TESTIFY** 

Officer Jacobs is expected to testify consistently with the report he prepared in connection with investigating the damages claimed by Fellows on or about August 31, 2015.

11) Detective Edwards Renton Police Department 1055 S Grady Way Renton, WA 98057

WILL TESTIFY

////

25 ////

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

26 1111

JOINT PRETRIAL ORDER - (Case No. 2:15-cv-2031) - PAGE 13

60I357

2

WILL TESTIFY

Mr. Webster is expected to testify consistently with his deposition as to his personal observations of the residence in April 2015, including the lack of men's suits and apparel in the

connection with the damages claimed by Fellows on or about August 31, 2015, as well as the

Detective Edwards is expected to testify as to his actions and investigation in

# WILL TESTIFY

Ms. Kershner is expected to testify consistently with her deposition as to when Fellows lived with her, what Fellows disclosed to her regarding this loss and the damages, Fellows relationship with Osborne, and Ms. Kershner's observations of the effect of the damages on

#### POSSIBLE WITNESS

Mr. Dickerson is expected to testify consistently with his deposition as to his personal observations and personal knowledge of the relationship between Osborne and Fellows, his observations (if any) of the damages to the residence, and his personal knowledge of domestic

#### POSSIBLE WITNESS

Ms. Phillips is expected to testify as to her personal observations and personal observations and personal knowledge of the relationship between Osborne and Fellows, her observations (if any) of the damages to the residence, and her personal knowledge of domestic

60I357

Telephone: (503) 372-6450 Facsimile: (503) 372-6496

1	of rebuttal		
2	В.	Fellows' Witnesses	
3	1)	Charles H. Fellows	WILL TESTIFY
4		c/o Keller Rohrback LLP 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 3200	(A)
5		Seattle, WA 98101 Phone: (206) 623-1900	
6	Mr	Fellows is the defendant in this action and has	knowledge surrounding the substance
7	of events,	the timeline of events, and intimate knowledge so	urrounding damage to his property.
8	2)	Chad Giesen IDS property Casualty Insurance Company c/o Thenell Law Group, PC	WILL TESTIFY
10		12909 SW 68 <sup>th</sup> Parkway, Suite 320 Portland, OR 97223	
11	Mr	Phone: (503) 372-6450  Ciesen is an employee of IDS who has handled	and worked on the Mr. Fellows' file
12		has knowledge about the defendant's claim.	and worked on the IVII. I chows The.
13		Robert Null	WILL TESTIFY
14		IDS property Casualty Insurance Company c/o Thenell Law Group, PC	WILL ILSTII'I
15 16	5	12909 SW 68 <sup>th</sup> Parkway, Suite 320 Portland, OR 97223 Phone: (503) 372-6450	97
17	Mr	. Null is an employee of IDS who has handled a	and worked on the Mr. Fellows's file.
18	Mr. Null h	as knowledge about the defendant's claim.	
19	4)	Eric Michalak IDS property Casualty Insurance Company	WILL TESTIFY
20		c/o Thenell Law Group, PC 12909 SW 68 <sup>th</sup> Parkway, Suite 320	
21		Portland, OR 97223 Phone: (503) 372-6450	
22	Mr	. Michalak is an employee of IDS who has handle	ed and worked on the Mr. Fellows' file.
23	Mr. Micha	lak has knowledge about the defendant's claim.	
25	5)	Claudia Lemon IDS property Casualty Insurance Company c/o Thenell Law Group, PC	WILL TESTIFY
26	IOD IT DO	12909 SW 68 <sup>th</sup> Parkway, Suite 320	2.15
	JOINT PR	ETRIAL ORDER - (Case No. 2:15-cv-2031) - PAGE	E 17 601357  THENELL LAW GROUP 12909 SW 68th Pkwy., Suite 320 Portland, Oregon 97223 Telephone: (503) 372-6450 Facsimile: (503) 372-6496

1	Phone: (503) 372-6450
2	Ms. Lemon is an employee of IDS who has handled and worked on the Mr. Fellows' file.
3	Ms. Lemon has knowledge about the defendant's claim.
4	6) Jodi Helf WILL TESTIFY
5	IDS property Casualty Insurance Company c/o Thenell Law Group, PC
6	12909 SW 68 <sup>th</sup> Parkway, Suite 320 Portland, OR 97223 Phone: (503) 372-6450
7	Ms. Helf is an employee of IDS who has handled and worked on the Mr. Fellows' file. Ms.
8	Helf has knowledge about the defendant's claim.
9	The man man mage about the determine to the man
10	7) Scott Wilson WILL TESTIFY IDS property Casualty Insurance Company
11	c/o Thenell Law Group, PC 12909 SW 68 <sup>th</sup> Parkway, Suite 320
12	Portland, OR 97223 Phone: (503) 372-6450
13	Mr. Wilson is an employee of IDS who has handled and worked on the Mr. Fellows' file.
14	Mr. Wilson has knowledge about the defendant's claim.
15	8) Daniel E. Thenell POSSIBLE WITNESS
16	Thenell Law Group, PC 12909 SW 68 <sup>th</sup> Parkway, Suite 320
17	Phone: (503) 372-6450
18	·Mr. Thenell is a representative of IDS who has handled and worked on the Mr. Fellows'
19	file. Mr. Thenell has knowledge about defendant's claim.
20	9) Eric Webster WILL TESTIFY Lamb Hanson Lamb Appraisal Associates, Inc.
21	4025 Delridge Way SW, Suite 140 Seattle, WA 98106
22	Phone: (206) 838-1215
23	Mr. Webster appraised the subject property on April 14, 2015. Mr. Webster has knowledge
24	of the state the property was in on that date.
25	10) Michael Elvidge WILL TESTIFY
1	10025 SE 192 <sup>nd</sup> Place Renton, WA 98055
26	JOINT PRETRIAL ORDER - (Case No. 2:15-cv-2031) - PAGE 18 601357

Portland, OR 97223

JOINT PRETRIAL ORDER - (Case No. 2:15-cv-2031) - PAGE 19

Mr. Elvidge resides next door to the property. He would have knowledge of conversations

1

POSSIBLE WITNESS

16) Tim Lasso

1420 5th Ave, Suite 2200 Seattle, WA 98101

Phone: (206) 521-5989

Mr. Mix has knowledge regarding Mr. Thenell's reputation for dealing with policyholders.

# **EXHIBITS**

# A. IDS's Exhibits

IDS intends to offer the following exhibits at trial:

Ex. No.	Description	Admissibility Stipulated	Authenticity Stipulated	Objection
1	IDS Homeowners Insurance Policy No. HI01499589	X	X	
2	Claim Log Notes	X	X	
3	Claims Correspondence	X	X	21 24 72 25
4	State Specific Claims Manuals and Best Practices Guides for the State of Washington	X	X	
5	Photographs taken by IDS (Sept. 2015)	X		
6	Estimate prepared by Robert Null (Sept. 2015)	X		
7	IDS Field Report (prepared by E. Michalak in Sept. 2015)	X	1000m2	
8	Certified Police Reports from Renton Police Dept. regarding charges and investigations of alleged violations of no- contact Protection Order against Fellows.			X
9	Order for Protection, Case No. 13-3-11851 KNT, Dated July 8, 2015	X		
10	Estimate prepared by Lawless	X	1978 St. 197	
11	Photographs taken by Lawless	X		
12	Transcript of Examination Under Oath of Charles Fellows (Nov. 5, 2015)	X	X	
13	Transcript of Examination Under Oath of Michaela Osborne (Dec. 18, 2015)	X	X	
14	Video of Examination Under Oath of Charles Fellows (Nov. 5, 2015)	X	X	
15	Video of Examination Under Oath of Michaela Osborne (Dec. 18, 2015)	X	Х	
16	Seattle Police Report (Oct. 2016)			X
17	Personal Property List (M. Osborne EUO Ex. 1)		Х	Х
18	Defendant's Answers to Plaintiff's First Interrogatories and Requests For Production		Х	Х
19	Defendant's First Supplemental Answers to Plaintiff's First Interrogatories and Requests For Production		Х	X

JOINT PRETRIAL ORDER - (Case No. 2:15-cv-2031) - PAGE 21

Ex. No.	Description	Admissibility Stipulated	Authenticity Stipulated	Objection
20	Defendant's Second Supplemental Answers to Plaintiff's First Interrogatories and Requests For Production		X	X
21	Defendant's Third Supplemental Answers to Plaintiff's First Interrogatories and Requests For Production		X	Х
22	Defendant's Fourth Supplemental Answers to Plaintiff's First Interrogatories and Requests For Production		X	X
23	Defendant's Fifth Supplemental Response to First Interrogatories & Request for Production	×	X	X
24	Defendant's Sixth Supplemental Response to First Interrogatories & Request for Production		X	X
25	Defendant's Answers to Plaintiff's Second Requests For Production		X	X
26	Defendant's Answers and Objections to Plaintiff's Second Interrogatories and Third Requests For Production		X	Х
27	Defendant's Answers to Plaintiff's Fourth Requests For Production		Х	X
28	Defendant's Privilege Log RE: Letheremails_000001 to Letheremails_000959		X	Х
29	Defendant's Privilege Log		X	X
30	10/28/13 Audio Call between IDS Mary DeGalan and Michaela Osborne – Audio Recording (IDS _000670)			Х
31	09/01/15 Call between IDS Rep Adrian Flanagan and Michaela Osborne - Audio Recording (IDS 000671)	Х	X	
32	09/01/15 Call between IDS Reps Amber Kiesling/Evan Brunner and Charles Fellows - Audio recording (IDS_000672)	X	X	
33	09/01/15 Call between IDS Reps April Lasecki/Corey Heim and Charles Fellows - Audio recording (IDS 000673)	Х	X	
34	09/02/15 Call between IDS Rep April Lasecki and Charles Fellows - Audio recording (IDS_000674)	X	X	

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

50

Reserved

2425

26

Ex. No.	Description	Admissibility Stipulated	Authenticity Stipulated	Objection
	09/02/15 Second call between IDS Rep	-		
35	April Lasecki and Charles Fellows -	X	X	
	Audio recording (IDS_000675)			
	09/10/15 Call between IDS Rep April			
36	Lasecki and Charles Fellows - Audio	X	X	
	recording (IDS_000676)			
27	09/10/15 Call between IDS Rep Kevin	37		
37	Craddock and Michaela Osborne -	X	X	
	Audio recording (IDS_000677)			ent says
20	Client server email exchange regarding	•		
38	the handling of the subject claim	X		
20	(IDS_003572-IDS_003610)			
39	09/10/15 Letter & Complaint from Office	X		
40	of Insurance Commissioner to IDS			
40	09/16/15 Letter from Office of Insurance	X		
41	Commissioner to IDS	**************************************		
41	09/18/15 Letter from IDS to Office of Insurance Commissioner	X		
42		Company of the Compan		
42	09/01/15 Policy Cancellation IDS 000158	X		
43				
43	10/28/10 Policy pending cancellation #AI00605086 IDS 004509			X
	01/29/16 Letter from Daniel Thenell to			
44	Office of the Insurance Commissioner	X		
45	Keller Rohrback email exchange(s)			X
46	Karen Koelher Blog			X
40	Lear vs. IDS WD Wash. Case No. C14-			
47	1040 RAJ Summary Judgment Order			X
7/	dated January 11, 2017			A
48	Reserved		N Park	
49	Reserved	15-	5	
T	1 Coci vea		and something the second	

Pursuant to LCR 16(h)(6), IDS reserves the right to submit additional exhibits as permitted by the Rules of this Court, including, but not limited to, exhibits introduced for the purposes of impeachment.

## B. Fellows' Exhibits

In addition to several of the exhibits listed by IDS, Fellows will offer the following exhibits.

Ex. No.	Description	Admissibility Stipulated	Authenticity Stipulated	Objection
101	Order finding Osborne in Contempt	X	X	

JOINT PRETRIAL ORDER - (Case No. 2:15-cv-2031) - PAGE 23

1	Ex. No.	Description	Admissibility Stipulated	Authenticity Stipulated	Objection
2	102	Photographs of damage taken by Charles Fellows	X	Supulated	
72	103	Lamb Hanson Lamb Appraisal	X		This rough
3		Lamb Hanson Lamb photographs	X		
4	105	Tersuli bid	X		
4	106	Tubro bid	X		
5	107	Maxcare bid and photos	X		
١	108	Personal Property List			Plf's Ex. 17
6	109	Photos of personal property taken by Charles Fellows	X		
7	110	Renewal declarations May 10, 2012 through May 10, 2016	X	X	
8	111	Renton police report and photos dated August 31, 2015	X	X	
9	112	2015 09 01 Call between IDS Rep Adrian Flanagan and Michaela Osborne Audio			Plf's Ex. 31
10	112	Recording 2015 09 01 Call between IDS Reps April			Plf's Ex. 33
11	113	Lasecki/Corey Heim and Charles Fellows Audio Recording			PH S EX. 33
12	114	2015 09 01 Call between IDS Reps Amber Kiesling/Evan Brunner and Charles Fellows			Plf's Ex. 32
13		- Audio recording			
	115	2015-09-02 Call between IDS Rep April			Plf's Ex. 34
14		Lasecki and Charles Fellows Audio recording			
15	116	2015-09-02 Call between IDS Rep April			Plf's Ex. 35
16		Lasecki and Charles Fellows Audio Recording			
ances I	117	2015 09-10 Call between IDS Rep April			Plf's Ex. 36
17		Lasecki and Charles Fellows Audio recording			
18	118	2015-09-10 Call between IDS Rep Kevin Craddock and Michaela Osborne			Plf's Ex. 37
19	119	IDS letter to insurance commissioner dated			Plf's Ex. 3
20		September 16, 2015			Pg. 46
20	120	IDS letter to insurance commissioner dated			Plf's Ex. 41
21		September 18, 2015			
21	121	Transcript of Oral orders by King County			X
22	***	Superior Court re preservations of home			11
		(Bench Trial June 30, 2015 and Presentation			
23		of Ruling July 8, 2015)			
24	122	Washington Court of Appeals Opinion In re			X
		Marriage of Fellows, 196 Wn.App. 1073,			
25	100	2016 WL 6948771 (Nov. 28, 2016)	20.00	*	
26	123	Dismissal of charges entered November 19,			X
20		2015			

1	Ex. No.	Description	Admissibility Stipulated	Authenticity Stipulated	Objection
2	124	Dismissal of charges entered December 19, 2016			X
3	125	Video of car circling cul-de-sac July 23, 2015	X		
4	126	Smart email dated December 10, 2014 (Fellows 002799)	X	Х	
5 6	127	Lether letter to IDS dated September 15, 2015			Plf's Ex. 3 Pgs. 22-23
7	128	Thenell email dated September 18, 2015 (LETHERFILE_000145-46)	X	X	
8	129	Colito letter to Thenell dated October 5, 2015			Plf's Ex. 3 Pgs. 1-2
9	130	Colito letter to Thenell dated October 13, 2015			Plf's Ex. 3 Pgs. 24-25
10	131 <del>132</del>	Thenell email dated October 13, 2015  Colito letter dated October 20, 2015	X	X	Plf's Ex. 3
11	133	Thenell email dated October 21, 2015	X	X	Pgs. 17-19
12 13	134	Thenell email dated October 27, 2015	X	v	Plf's Ex. 3 Pgs. 3-5
14	136	Colito emails dated November 2, 2015 Thenell ROR letter dated November 4, 2015	X	X X	
15	137	Thenell letter to Colito dated November 5, 2015	X	X	
16	138	Thenell letter to Colito dated November 10, 2015	X	X	
17	139	Colito letter to Thenell dated November 17, 2015			Plf's Ex. 3 Pgs. 20-21
18	140 141	Thenell email dated November 20, 2015 Thenell letter dated December 3, 2015	X	X	Plf's Ex. 3
19 20	142	Email exchange between Colito and Thenell December 15, 2015	X	X	Pgs. 27-28
21	143	Colito letter to Thenell dated December 16, 2015			Plf's Ex. 3 Pgs. 29-31
22	144	Colito letter to Thenell dated December 30, 2015	X	X	
23	145 146	Thenell email dated December 30, 2015 Thenell letter dated January 15, 2016	X	X	Plf's Ex. 3
24	147	IFCA Notice and Notification Sheet dated			Pgs. 50-53 Plf's Ex. 3
25	148	January 12, 2016  Kirstyn Kono and Christopher Kono v.			Pgs. 54-56 X
26		Pacific Star Insurance Company, et. al.	91. Unit 19		

1	Ex. No.	Description	Admissibility Stipulated
2		(King County Superior Court No. 12-2-30494-7 SEA) Findings of Fact,	
3		Conclusions of Law and Supplemental	
4		Order Granting Plaintiffs' Motion for Discovery Relief and Sanctions and to	
5		Compel Discovery dated October 18, 2013 and Order Granting Plaintiffs Motion for	
6		Discovery Relief and Sanctions and to Compel Discovery dated August 28, 2013	
7	149	Espinoza v. American Commerce Ins. Co.	
8		Yakima County Superior Court – Court's Ruling on In Camera Review of Claims File	
9	150	dated January 12, 2016  Beck v. Metroplitan, 2016 WL 4978411	3 10
10	15/	(D. Or. Sep. 16, 2016)  Email between Will Smart and Ann-	X
11		Peterson/Anita Rosenthal dated December 10, 2014-	2000/20
12	152	No. T97-4 Technical Assistance Advisory -	
13		October 31, 1997 (Subject: Denial of coverage to innocent co-insureds)	
14	153	RCW 48.18.550 RCW 26.50.010	
15	155 156	RCW 10.99.020 RCW 9A.48.070–.090	
16	157	WAC 284-20-010	
17	158	1943 New York Standard Fire Policy	
10			

Dated: March 13, 2017.

THENELL LAW GROUP, PC KELLER ROHRBACK L.L.P.

/s/ Daniel E. Thenell By: Daniel E. Thenell, WSBA No. 37297 Email: Dan@ThenellLawGroup.com
Alexander H. Hill, pro hac vice
Email: AlexH@ThenellLawGroup.com
Of Attorneys for Plaintiff IDS Property and

Casualty Insurance Company

Dated: March 13, 2017.

/s/ William C. Smart

William C. Smart, WSBA No. 8192 Email: WSmart@KellerRohrback.com Ian S. Birk, WSBA No. 31431

Email: IBirk@KellerRohrback.com

Attorneys for Defendant Charles H. Fellows

Authenticity

X

Stipulated

Objection

X

X

X

X X X X X

JOINT PRETRIAL ORDER - (Case No. 2:15-cv-2031) - PAGE 26

THENELL LAW GROUP 12909 SW 68th Pkwy., Suite 320 Portland, Oregon 97223 Telephone: (503) 372-6450 Facsimile: (503) 372-6496

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 17 day of March, 2017.

THOMAS S. ZIELY

United States District Judge