

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
26
27

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

CHONG and MARILYN YIM, KELLY)	Civil Action No. 2:18-cv-00736-BJR
LYLES, EILEEN, LLC, and RENTAL)	
HOUSING ASSOCIATION OF)	
WASHINGTON,)	STATUS REPORT AND STIPULATED
)	MOTION TO SET BRIEFING
Plaintiffs,)	SCHEDULE ON REMAND
v.)	
)	
THE CITY OF SEATTLE, a Washington)	
Municipal corporation,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

This is a challenge by landlords to the City of Seattle’s Fair Chance Housing Ordinance. With some exceptions, the Ordinance bans landlords from inquiring about (the “inquiry provision”) or taking an adverse action based upon (the “adverse-action provision”) a tenant’s or prospective tenant’s criminal history.

On March 21, 2023, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals issued its Opinion agreeing with Plaintiffs that the inquiry provision violates the First Amendment with respect to prospective tenants, and agreeing with the City that Plaintiffs had not proven that the adverse-action provision violates substantive due process guarantees. The parties’ attempts to seek further review of those holdings by an en banc panel of the Ninth Circuit and Plaintiffs’ petition to the

1 Supreme Court of the United States have concluded, leaving the Ninth Circuit’s Opinion in
2 force.

3 This matter now returns to this Court on remand from the Ninth Circuit to address
4 whether the inquiry provision can be severed from the rest of the Ordinance. Noting that the
5 Ordinance contains a severability clause and citing case law holding that such a clause ordinarily
6 creates a presumption in favor of severability, the panel remanded to give the parties “an
7 opportunity to brief and argue before the district court whether there is evidence in the record
8 that overcomes the presumption of severability.” Opinion at 30–31.

9 On remand, the parties propose briefing cross-motions for summary judgment on the
10 severability issue. Because the burden is on Plaintiffs to overcome the presumption and the issue
11 does not merit extensive treatment, the parties propose a three-brief schedule, with Plaintiffs
12 filing the first and final briefs. The parties agree that this Court should grant judgment to
13 whichever party prevails on the severability issue. The parties propose the following schedule,
14 with page limits according to LCR 7(e):

15	Plaintiffs’ Opening:	April 19, 2024
16	City’s Response:	May 17, 2024
17	Plaintiffs’ Reply:	May 31, 2024

18 The parties stipulate to this Court entering an order setting that briefing schedule.

19 DATED: February 8, 2024.

20 By: s/ BRIAN T. HODGES
21 Brian T. Hodges, WSBA # 31976
22 Pacific Legal Foundation
23 1425 Broadway, #429
24 Seattle, Washington 98122
Tel.: (425) 576-0484
BHodges@pacifical.org

25 *Attorney for Plaintiffs Yim, et al.*

By: s/ ROGER D. WYNNE
Roger D. Wynne, WSBA #23399
Seattle City Attorney’s Office
701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2050
Seattle, Washington 98104
Tel: (206) 684-8200
roger.wynne@seattle.gov

26 *Attorney for the Defendant City of Seattle*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on February 8, 2024, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification to all counsel of record.

s/ BRIAN T. HODGES
Brian T. Hodges, WSBA # 31976

Attorney for Plaintiffs

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
26
27