

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

TIMOTHY KEITH,)	
)	DIVISION ONE
Appellant,)	No. 70931-3-I
)	
v.)	
)	
AMANDA JAMISON)	UNPUBLISHED OPINION
)	
Respondent.)	
)	FILED: MAY 18 2015

FILED
 COURT OF APPEALS DIV 1
 STATE OF WASHINGTON
 2015 MAY 18 AM 9:13

PER CURIAM — Timothy Keith, appearing pro se, appeals an order of contempt imposing a sanction of \$1,000 in attorney fees. He contends the order should be reversed because the notice of hearing below did not comply with SCLCR 6(d)(1)¹ and he therefore “did not have proper time to respond” to the motion for contempt. Assuming without deciding that the order is appealable as a matter of right,² Keith fails to demonstrate reversible error.

A violation of the notice requirements for motion hearings is grounds for reversal only upon a showing of prejudice. O’Neill v. City of Shoreline, 183 Wn. App. 15, 22, 332 P.3d 1099 (2014) (addressing CR 6(d)(1)); Zimny v. Lovric, 59 Wn. App. 737, 740, 801 P.2d 259 (1990). Keith failed to demonstrate prejudice or request a continuance below. He merely stated that he received notice of the hearing “on Monday . . . , which only gave me four days [to prepare for the hearing] and I thought it had to be nine to fourteen days but I guess that’s beside

¹The rule provides in part: “Notes for the Motion Calendar shall be filed with the clerk of the court and served on all parties at least nine (9) court days before the hearing.”


² See In re Marriage of Wagner, 111 Wn. App. 9, 15-16, 44 P.3d 860 (2002) (“An adjudication of contempt is appealable if it is a final order or judgment; i.e., the contumacy—the party’s willful resistance to the contempt order—is established, and the sanction is a coercive one designed to compel compliance with the court’s order.”).

No. 70931-3-I/2

the point.” Report of Proceedings (Aug. 30, 2013) at 7. For the first time on appeal, Keith claims that he was prejudiced by the late notice.³ We need not consider arguments made for the first time on appeal. RAP 2.5(a).

Affirmed.

FOR THE COURT:

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Donald J. Spence, C.J.", is written over three horizontal lines. The signature is written in black ink.

³ He claims he “was up until 4:00 a.m. trying to put together his response which did not contain any proper legal points and or arguments, just his story and or babbling of what took place.” Appellant’s Br. at 1-2.