

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

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE**

NORITA SORENSEN, as General Personal  
Representative of the Estate of REID S.  
SORENSEN,

Plaintiff,

v.

AIR & LIQUID SYSTEMS CORPORATION,  
et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:23-cv-00804

**ORDER GRANTING UNOPPOSED  
MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

This matter comes before the Court on the following motions:

1. Defendant Alaskan Copper Companies, Inc.’s Motion for Summary Judgment, Dkt. # 525;
2. Defendant Crowley Maritime’s Motion for Summary Judgment, Dkt. # 547; and
3. Defendant Lone Star Industries, Inc.’s Motion for Application of General Maritime Law and for Summary Judgment, Dkt. # 551.

The Court has reviewed the materials submitted in support of the motions, the rest of the case file, and the governing law. The movants essentially argue that there is no evidence connecting

1 them to the alleged injury at issue.<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff did not file an opposition to any of the foregoing  
2 motions, and thus did not present any evidence or argument in response. Accordingly, the Court  
3 GRANTS the motions and DISMISSES the claims against these movant Defendants with  
4 prejudice. The Court also STRIKES as moot the following motions by the movant Defendants:

- 5 1. Defendant Alaskan Copper Companies, Inc.’s Motion to Exclude Expert  
6 Testimony of Michael Ellenbecker, Dkt. # 538;
- 7 2. Defendant Lone Star Industries, Inc.’s Motion to Exclude Expert Testimony of  
8 Michael Ellenbecker, Dkt. # 541; and
- 9 3. Defendant Crowley Maritime Corporation’s Motion to Exclude Expert Testimony  
10 of Michael Ellenbecker, Dkt. # 549.

11  
12 It is so ordered.

13 DATED this 23rd day of October, 2024.

14  
15   
16 JOHN H. CHUN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26 \_\_\_\_\_  
<sup>1</sup> Defendant Crowley Marine also argues in the alternative that the “turnover doctrine” precludes liability. The Court need not reach this issue.