

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

---o0o---

---

RICHARD SUNG HONG WONG, MARI STONE WONG, and KATHLEEN WONG,  
Plaintiffs-Appellants

vs.

BENJAMIN CAYETANO, EARL I. ANZAI, MARGERY BRONSTER,  
THOMAS R. KELLER, LAWRENCE A. GOYA, CYNTHIA QUINN, HUGH R.  
JONES, DOROTHY SELLERS, STEVE GOODENOW, JOHN TSUKIYAMA,  
Defendants-Appellees

and

JOHN DOES 1-25, Defendants

---

NO. 27117

APPEAL FROM THE FIRST CIRCUIT COURT  
(CIV. NO. 02-1-2411)

AUGUST 29, 2006

ORDER OF CORRECTION  
(By: Duffy, J.)

EM RIMANDO  
CLERK, APPELLATE COURTS  
STATE OF HAWAII

2006 AUG 29 PM 2:13

FILED

The opinion of the court filed on July 26, 2006 is hereby corrected as follows (deletions are bracketed and additions are double underscored):

**Title:** OPINION OF THE COURT BY DUFFY, ACTING C.J.

**Line 5 from the bottom of page 1:** In this action for malicious prosecution [Defendants] Plaintiffs-

**Line 1 from the top of footnote 4 on page 4:** In this connection, we note that the Cayetano Group requests[,] that we

**Lines 4-5 from the top of footnote 4 on page 4:**

(noting that, where the record on appeal does not provide sufficient information, a court may take judicial notice of the record in a related case); Roxas v.

**Line 4 from the bottom of page 7:** entered a written order denying in part [Wong] Richard's motion to dismiss

**Line 2 from the bottom of page 12:** After the [Defendants] defendants filed a motion to dismiss or for

**Line 9 from the bottom of page 13:** grant the [Defendants] defendants' motion, they be "given leave to file an amended

**Line 4 from the bottom of page 13:** damages, holding that the [Defendants] defendants were entitled to absolute

**Line 12 from the bottom of page 17:** dismiss on December 24, 2002, arguing that: (1) the Wongs' claims

**Line 5 from the bottom of page 23:** the error was harmless because the judgment below is supported on

**Line 13 from the top of page 28:** 699 (1989), rev'd on other grounds by Hac v. Univ. of Hawai'i,

**Line 4 from the top of footnote 11 on page 28:** for malicious prosecution. However, the majority of courts appears to agree

Line 8 from the top of footnote 11 on page 28: [that], based on the "it cannot be revived" language, the Restatement of Torts

Line 9 from the top of page 40: nevertheless a judicially noticed fact sufficient to meet [the]

The Clerk of the Court is directed to incorporate the foregoing changes in the original opinion and take all necessary steps to notify the publishing agencies of these changes.

*James E. Duddy, Jr.*  
Acting Chief Justice

