

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

JEFFERY C. GEHRMANN,

Plaintiff,

v.

KNIGHT-SWIFT TRANSPORTATION  
HOLDINGS INC, et al.

Defendants.

CASE NO. C20-6002 BHS

ORDER GRANTING  
DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO  
TRANSFER VENUE

This matter comes before the Court on Defendants Knight-Swift Transportation Holdings, Inc., Mohave Transportation Insurance Co., and Interstate Equipment Leasing, LLC's (collectively "Contract Defendants") motion to transfer venue. Dkt. 11. The Court has considered the pleadings filed in support of and in opposition to the motion and the remainder of the file and hereby grants the motion for the reasons stated herein.

**I. FACTUAL & PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

This case arises out of two contracts between Plaintiff Jeffery Gehrmann and Contract Defendants to transport freight and to lease a semi-truck and a collision

1 involving Gehrman’s truck with a C.R. England truck in Foristell, Missouri. Dkt. 1-1,  
2 ¶¶ 3.1–3.4.

3 Gehrman alleges that he was employed by or was contracted with Knight-Swift  
4 as an owner-operator of a truck since approximately 2012. *Id.*, ¶ 3.1. On April 3, 2014,  
5 Gehrman entered into a contractor agreement with Swift Transportation Co. of Arizona,  
6 LLC to transport freight provided by Swift. Defendant Knight-Swift is a successor in  
7 interest of Swift, and Swift is not a party to this action. The contractor agreement  
8 contains the following forum-selection clause:

9 The parties agree that any legal proceedings between the parties arising  
10 under, arising out of, or relating to the relationship created by this  
11 Agreement, including arbitration proceedings discussed above, shall be  
12 filed and/or maintained in Phoenix, Arizona or the nearest location in  
Arizona where such proceedings can be maintained. The parties specifically  
waive any defense as to personal jurisdiction in any federal or state court in  
Arizona.

13 Dkt. 12, Exhibit 1, at 7, ¶ 33.

14 The same day, Gehrman entered into an equipment lease agreement with  
15 Defendant Interstate Equipment for the lease of a 2013 Kenworth semi-truck to transport  
16 freight. The equipment lease contract contains a similar forum-selection clause:

17 This Lease shall in all respects be governed by and construed in accordance  
18 with the laws of the United State and the State of Arizona without regard to  
19 the choice-of-law rules of Arizona or any other state. THE PARTIES  
20 AGREE THAT ANY CLAIM OR DISPUTE ARISING FROM OR IN  
21 CONNECTION WITH THIS AGREEMENT, WHETHER UNDER  
22 FEDERAL, STATE, LOCAL OR FOREIGN STATUTES,  
REGULATIONS, OR COMMON LAW (INCLUDING BUT NOT  
LIMITED TO 49 C.F.R. PART 376), SHALL BE BROUGHT  
EXCLUSIVELY IN THE STATE OR FEDERAL COURTS SERVING  
PHOENIX, ARIZONA. LESSOR AND LESSEE HEREBY CONSENT  
TO THE JURISDICITON OF SUCH COURTS.

1 *Id.*, Exhibit 2, at 11, ¶ 21 (emphasis in original).

2 On July 9, 2017, Gehrman alleges that an employee of Defendant C.R. England  
3 collided with Gehrman’s truck at a truck stop Foristell, Missouri. Dkt. 1-1, ¶ 3.4. He  
4 alleges that the damage to his truck was very significant and that Knight-Swift and  
5 Defendant Mohave Transportation Insurance advised him all repairs had to be “handled”  
6 through Mohave. *Id.*, ¶¶ 3.5, 3.10. Gehrman further alleges that the truck was in and out  
7 of repair and that, while Mohave initially authorized the repairs and paid for them,  
8 Mohave refused to make payments and Knight-Swift paid for the repairs. *Id.*, ¶¶ 3.12–  
9 3.13. He asserts that Knight-Swift then took the cost of repair out of his paycheck. *Id.*

10 Gehrman thus sues Contract Defendants for breach of contract, tortious damage  
11 to property, breach of fiduciary relationship, and breach of the covenant of good faith and  
12 fair dealing. *Id.*, ¶¶ 4.3–4.7. He also sues Defendant C.R. England for negligence in  
13 causing the July 2017 collision. *Id.*, ¶¶ 4.1–4.2

14 On December 23, 2020, Contract Defendants filed the instant motion to transfer  
15 venue to the District of Arizona pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a). Dkt. 11. On January 27,  
16 2021, Gehrman responded. Dkt. 20. On January 29, 2021, Contract Defendants replied.  
17 Dkt. 21. Defendant C.R. England has not responded in opposition to or in support of  
18 Contract Defendants’ motion.

## 19 **II. DISCUSSION**

20 “For the convenience of parties and witnesses, in the interest of justice, a district  
21 court may transfer any civil action to any other district or division where it might have  
22 been brought or to any district or division to which all parties have consented.” 28 U.S.C.

1 § 1404. “When the parties have agreed to a valid forum-selection clause, a district court  
2 should ordinarily transfer the case to the forum specified in that clause.” *Atl. Marine*  
3 *Const. Co., Inc. v. U.S. Dist. Court for W. Dist. of Texas*, 571 U.S. 49, 62 (2013). “Only  
4 under extraordinary circumstances unrelated to the convenience of the parties should a  
5 § 1404(a) motion be denied.” *Id.*

6 Although there is a presumption in favor of enforcing forum-selection clauses,  
7 there are three exceptions that can make a forum-selection clause unenforceable. *Murphy*  
8 *v. Schneider Nat’l, Inc.*, 362 F.3d 1133, 1140 (9th Cir. 2004) (citing, *inter alia*, *Bremen v*  
9 *Zapata Off-Shore Co.*, 407 U.S. 1 (1972)). A forum-selection clause may be unreasonable  
10 and unenforceable: (1) if the inclusion of the clause in the agreement was the product of  
11 fraud or overreaching; (2) if the party wishing to repudiate the clause would effectively  
12 be deprived of his day in court were the clause enforced; and (3) if enforcement would  
13 contravene a strong public policy of the forum in which suit is brought. *Id.* (citing and  
14 quoting *Richards v. Lloyd’s of London*, 135 F.3d 1289, 1294 (9th Cir. 1998)). The party  
15 challenging the forum-selection clause carries a “heavy burden of proof” and must  
16 “clearly show that enforcement would be unreasonable and unjust, or that the clause was  
17 invalid for such reasons as fraud or overreaching.” *Bremen*, 407 U.S. at 15, 17.

18 In this case, Gehrman and Contract Defendants specified a forum in their  
19 agreements. Gehrman and Knight-Swift mutually agreed to litigate any dispute relating  
20 to or arising from the contract to transport freight in Phoenix, Arizona or the nearest  
21 location to Arizona where proceedings could be maintained. Gehrman and Interstate  
22 Equipment mutually agreed to litigate any dispute relating to or arising from the contract

1 to lease the freight truck in Phoenix, Arizona. Contract Defendants argue that the  
2 language is clear and should be enforced. Gehrman, however, argues that the Court  
3 should invalidate the forum-selection clauses for two reasons.

4 First, Gehrman argues that the forum-selection clauses are unreasonable, as they  
5 result from “overweening” bargaining power. Dkt. 20 at 2–3. The Court understands his  
6 argument to be that he did not have equal bargaining power with Knight-Swift or  
7 Interstate Equipment when he entered into the contracts and agreed to the forum-selection  
8 clauses. However, Gehrman does not provide any authority or evidence to support his  
9 assertion that Knight-Swift or Interstate Equipment had “overweening” bargaining  
10 power. To the contrary, the Supreme Court has upheld a forum-selection clause in the  
11 context of an adhesion contract when the challenging party was given notice of the  
12 clause’s terms before executing the contract. *See Carnival Cruise Lines, Inc. v. Shute*,  
13 499 U.S. 585, 594–95 (1991). And the Ninth Circuit upheld a forum selection clause in  
14 an employment contract where the employee failed to present evidence that he was  
15 improperly induced into entering the contract. *See Spradlin v. Lear Siegler Mgmt Servs*  
16 *Co.*, 926 F.2d 865, 868 (9th Cir. 1991) (“Given appellant’s failure to come forward either  
17 here or in the district court with anything beyond the most general and conclusory  
18 allegations of fraud and inconvenience, we are compelled to affirm.”). The Court thus  
19 concludes that Gehrman has not carried his burden under an “overweening” bargaining  
20 power theory to preclude the enforcement of the forum-selections clauses.

21 Next, Gehrman argues that enforcing the forum-selection clause would make the  
22 litigation so difficult that, for all practical purposes, he would be deprived of his day in

1 court. Dkt. 20 at 3. To support his argument, he asserts that the accident and accident  
2 witnesses are not in Arizona, that he does not reside in Arizona, and that he will be  
3 unable to afford to find and hire another attorney licensed in Arizona. *Id.*; *see also* Dkt.  
4 19. Gehrman additionally argues that while a showing of increased expense is  
5 insufficient to meet the challenging party’s burden, “a showing that plaintiff is financially  
6 unable to conduct the litigation in the contract state may be conclusive.” *Borst v. Hi-Line*  
7 *Elec. Co.*, 698 F. Supp. 223, 226 (S.D. Ala. 1988) (citing *Bremen*, 407 U.S. at 18).

8 The Court is sympathetic to Gehrman, but he has not met his “heavy burden of  
9 proof” in establishing that he will be deprived of his day in court if this case is transferred  
10 to the District of Arizona. Gehrman declares that he would not be able to afford to hire  
11 an attorney in Arizona, but he has not made a specific showing that he has contacted  
12 potential counsel in Arizona and counsel is unaffordable or unwilling to work on a  
13 contingent basis. And as Contract Defendants highlight, Gehrman’s current counsel  
14 could seek *pro hac vice* admittance in Arizona to represent him. Gehrman may have to  
15 hire local counsel, but this burden does not foreclose him from pursuing a remedy.  
16 Further, although the accident and accident witnesses are not in Arizona, neither are they  
17 in Washington.

18 The Court thus concludes that the forum selection clauses are mandatory and that  
19 Gehrman has not shown that enforcement of the clauses would be unreasonable and  
20 unjust.

**III. ORDER**

Therefore, it is hereby **ORDERED** that Defendants Knight-Swift Transportation Holdings, Inc., Mohave Transportation Insurance Co., and Interstate Equipment Leasing, LLC's motion to transfer venue, Dkt. 11, is **GRANTED**. The Clerk shall transfer this case to the District of Arizona.

Dated this 22nd day of March, 2021.



---

BENJAMIN H. SETTLE  
United States District Judge