

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

APRIL FERGUSON et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

NORTH KITSAP SCHOOL DISTRICT et
al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:23-cv-05921-DGE


ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
APPOINT SETTLEMENT
GUARDIAN AD LITEM (DKT. NO.
27)

Presently before the Court is Plaintiffs' unopposed motion for appointment of a settlement guardian ad litem ("GAL") to represent the interests of minor child M.F. (Dkt. No. 27.) The Court DENIES the motion as currently submitted. The proposed order does not identify or outline any specific duties or obligations required of the proposed GAL with respect to the settlement. (Dkt. No. 27-1.)

The Court instructs the parties to review Local Rule 17 and this Court's previous orders appointing GALs, *Smith v. Naphcare, Inc.*, Case No. 3:22-cv-05069-DGE, Dkt. No. 129 (W.D. Wash. Nov. 6, 2023); *Anderson v. McChord Communities LLC*, Case No. 3:21-cv-05391-DGE,

1 Dkt. No. 67 (W.D. Wash. Feb. 7, 2024); *Philadelphia Indemnity Insurance Company v. Olympia*
2 *Early Learning Center, et al.*, Case No. 3:12-cv-05759-DGE, Dkt. No. 234 (W.D. Wash. Aug. 6,
3 2024), and resubmit their motion and proposed order to include similar information, including
4 but not limited to: (1) the proposed plan for payment of the GAL’s fees and costs; (2) the
5 contents and timing of the GAL’s report on the reasonableness of the settlement; (3) the GAL’s
6 duties and responsibilities regarding the investigation and evaluation of the offered settlement;
7 (4) how the GAL’s appointment and report shall comport with Local Rule 17; (5) all other
8 issues, procedures, and costs the parties deem relevant to the GAL’s performance of her duties
9 based on the specific needs of this case.

10
11 Dated this 29th day of August, 2024.

12
13 
14 _____
15 David G. Estudillo
16 United States District Judge
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24