

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

9 AKLIKLU YOHANNES,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 OLYMPIC COLLECTION, INC., *et al.*,

13 Defendants.  
14

Case No. C17-509RSL

ORDER DENYING MOTION  
FOR DISQUALIFICATION  
AND DENYING MOTION  
FOR SANCTIONS

15 This matter comes before the Court on plaintiff's "Motion for the Disqualification of the  
16 Defendants' Attorney," Dkt. # 52, and defendants' "Motion for Imposition of Sanctions," Dkt.  
17 # 54. In the first motion, *pro se* plaintiff Akliklu Yohannes seeks to disqualify defense counsel  
18 Michael O'Meara. Washington Rule of Professional Conduct 1.7 provides that an attorney is  
19 presumptively disqualified from representing a particular client if representation involves a  
20 concurrent conflict of interest. RPC 1.7(a). A concurrent conflict exists if, among other things,  
21 there is significant risk that a lawyer's personal interest will materially limit representation of  
22 the client. Id.

23 Mr. Yohannes's most persuasive argument rests on Mr. O'Meara's alleged role in this  
24 case's underlying dispute. The complaint stems from defendants' debt-collection efforts, which  
25 Mr. Yohannes alleges violated various federal laws. He also alleges that Mr. O'Meara acted as  
26 defendants' attorney in those collection efforts and that Mr. O'Meara has a personal interest in  
27 this case's outcome because he faces liability for his participation. Mr. Yohannes has not added  
28

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION  
AND DENYING MOTION FOR SANCTIONS - 1


1 Mr. O'Meara as a party, so there is no risk of direct liability from this case's outcome. Compare  
2 In re Marriage of Wixom & Wixom, 182 Wn.App. 881, 898 (2014) (finding conflict where  
3 attorney was also a party to the appeal). Mr. Yohannes does not otherwise identify a particular  
4 way in which Mr. O'Meara's personal interests pose a substantial risk of materially limiting his  
5 representation of defendants. See RPC 1.7.

6 Mr. Yohannes's other arguments are either unavailing or irrelevant to whether Mr.  
7 O'Meara should be disqualified. Mr. Yohannes alleges various violations of state and federal  
8 laws related to debt collection. Mr. Yohannes could sue Mr. O'Meara himself or lodge a  
9 complaint with the state bar, but a motion to disqualify is not the proper vehicle for raising those  
10 concerns. In addition, assertions in defendants' responsive pleading that Mr. Yohannes simply  
11 disagrees with do not amount to frivolous arguments that merit disqualification.

12 For their part, the defendants move for sanctions, arguing that plaintiff's motion is  
13 frivolous and filed in bad faith. Dkt. # 54. Even though the Court denies Mr. Yohannes's  
14 motion, the motion does not rise to the level of being worthy of sanctions. Mr. O'Meara's dual  
15 role of representing defendants here and in collection efforts at least implicates relevant interests  
16 for conflict purposes. The Court has concluded that dual role does not merit disqualification, but  
17 the argument is not entirely frivolous.

18 For the foregoing reasons, Mr. Yohannes's motion to disqualify, Dkt. # 52, is DENIED;  
19 and defendants' motion for sanctions, Dkt. # 54, is DENIED.

20 DATED this 17<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2018.

21  
22   
23 Robert S. Lasnik  
24 United States District Judge  
25  
26  
27  
28