1		
2		
3		
4		
5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA	
6		
7		Q 1.2. 2
8	CONFEDERATED TRIBES OF THE	
9	CHEHALIS RESERVATION,	CASE NO. C08-5562 BHS
10	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR
11	v.	DECLARATORY JUDGMENT
12	THURSTON COUNTY BOARD OF EQUALIZATION, et al.,	
13	Defendants.	
14		
15	This matter comes before the Court on Defendants Patricia Costello, Shawn	
16	Myers, and Thurston County's ("Defendants") motion for declaratory judgment (Dkt.	
17	210). The Court has considered the pleadings filed in support of and in opposition to the	
18	motion and the remainder of the file and hereby denies the motion and directs the Clerk	
19	to enter judgment in favor of Plaintiff Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation	
20	for the reasons stated herein.	
21	On July 30, 2013, the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit "reverse[d] the	
22	[D]istrict [C]ourt's summary judgment order and remand[ed] for proceedings consistent	

with this opinion." Dkt. 206 at 15. On October 4, 2013, the Ninth Circuit issued its 2 Mandate. Dkt. 209. On November 21, 2013, Defendants filed a motion for declaratory judgment 3 requesting that the Court "enter a declaratory judgment that the property taxes on the 4 5 non-permanent, removable business personal property are not preempted as a matter of 6 law " Dkt. 210 at 8–9. On December 9, 2013, Plaintiff opposed the motion on the grounds that it is procedurally improper and seeks relief outside of the pleadings. Dkt. 217 at 4–8. The Court agrees with Plaintiff on both points because (1) the amended complaint for declaratory judgment seeks relief for improvements that are not removable 10 (Dkt. 46, ¶ 19) and (2) "a party may not make a motion for declaratory relief, but rather, 11 the party must bring an action for a declaratory judgment." Kam-Ko Bio-Pharm Trading 12 Co. Ltd-Australasia v. Mayne Pharma (USA) Inc., 560 F.3d 935, 943 (9th Cir. 2009) 13 (citing Int'l Brotherhood of Teamsters v. E. Conference of Teamsters, 160 F.R.D. 452, 14 456 (S.D.N.Y. 1995)). Therefore, the Court **DENIES** Defendants' motion. 15 Upon review of the Mandate and the file, the Court directs the Clerk to enter judgment in favor of Plaintiff. 16 17 IT IS SO ORDERED. 18 Dated this 16th day of December, 2013. 19 20 21 United States District Judge 22