

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

NORTHWEST CARPENTERS
HEALTH AND SECURITY TRUST;
NORTHWEST CARPENTERS
RETIREMENT TRUST; NORTHWEST
CARPENTERS INDIVIDUAL
ACCOUNT PENSION TRUST;
NORTHWEST CARPENTERS
VACATION TRUST; CARPENTERS-
EMPLOYERS APPRENTICESHIP
AND TRAINING TRUST FUND OF
WA-ID,

Plaintiffs,

v.

GREYROCK DRILLING &
PILEDIVING, LLC,

Defendant.

v.

PACIFIC PREMIER BANK, N.A.,

Garnishee.

CASE NO. 2:24-mc-00088-JNW

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiffs' Motion for Judgment on Answer of Garnishee Defendant and for an Order to Pay. Dkt. No. 7. Upon review of

1 Plaintiffs’ motion, the record, and the law, the Court has identified three issues that
2 require attention before judgment can be issued.

3 First, Plaintiffs’ Proposed Order states that “Garnishee Defendant Pacific
4 Premier Bank, N.A. was indebted to Defendant/Judgment Debtor Greyrock Drilling
5 & Piledriving LLC in the nonexempt amount of \$26,575.58.” Dkt. No. 7-1 at 2. But
6 Garnishee-Defendant Pacific Premier Bank, N.A.’s Answer states that Pacific
7 Premier Bank, N.A. owed no debt to Judgment-Debtor Greyrock Drilling &
8 Piledriving LLC. Dkt. No. 5 at 2; *see also id.* at 3 (indicating Defendant’s property or
9 effects in Garnishee-Defendant’s possession); *see also* RCW 6.27.270 (authorizing
10 court to order garnishee to deliver up defendant’s personal property or effects in
11 garnishee’s possession or control). The Court DIRECTS Plaintiffs to clarify this
12 issue or, alternatively, amend their Proposed Order to ensure accuracy.

13 Second, Plaintiffs’ filings are inconsistent as to post-judgment interest. While
14 their Proposed Order calls for the Court’s judgment to bear interest at 12 percent,
15 Dkt. No. 7-1 at 2, their Proposed Judgment states that “Plaintiffs are not entitled to
16 post-judgment interest,” Dkt. No. 7-2 at 1. Meanwhile, the Writ of Garnishment
17 provided for a “Per Day Rate of Estimated Interest” in the amount of 8.2 percent.
18 Dkt. No. 4 at 2. The Court DIRECTS Plaintiffs to clarify the amount of post-
19 judgment interest sought, in accordance with state law. *See* 6.27.090(3) (“The
20 amount must be based on an interest rate of twelve percent or the interest rate set
21 forth in the judgment, whichever rate is less.”).

22 Third, Plaintiffs’ filings appear inconsistent as to the calculation of costs.
23 Plaintiffs seek a garnishment judgment for \$26,575.58 and a separate cost

1 judgment for \$387.50. *See* Dkt. Nos 7-1, 7-2. But the writ of garnishment that
2 Plaintiffs sought, which the Court issued, provided for a total garnishment amount
3 of \$26,575.58, which included not only a judgment balance of \$24,391.60 and
4 interest of \$1,796.48, but also costs in the amount of \$387.50. Dkt. No. 4 at 2. In
5 other words, Plaintiffs may be double-counting costs. The Court DIRECTS Plaintiffs
6 to clarify or explain this apparent issue or amend their request to ensure accurate
7 cost calculation.

8 In sum, the Court ORDERS Plaintiffs, within FOURTEEN (14) days of this
9 Order, to show cause why the Court should grant the requested relief despite the
10 above-listed issues or amend and re-file their Motion for Judgment to rectify these
11 issues.

12 It is so ORDERED.

13 Dated this 6th day of March, 2025.

14 

15 _____
16 Jamal N. Whitehead
17 United States District Judge
18
19
20
21
22
23