1 Honorable John C. Coughenour Hearing Date: February 26, 2016 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE 8 9 **CURTISS WILSON,** No. 2:15-cv-00629-JCC 10 Plaintiff, **DEFENDANT HORTON'S TOWING'S** REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR 11 SUMMARY JUDGMENT VS. 12 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, JOHN OR WHATCOM COUNTY SUPERIOR JANE DOE, Director of the Department of COURT CAUSE NO.: 14-2-02821-7 13 Licensing, a subdivision of the State of Washington, In his/her official capacity and the 14 STATE OF WASHINGTON, and HORTON'S TOWING, a Washington Corporation, 15 Defendants. 16 Plaintiff's opposition to Horton's Towing's ("Horton's") Motion for Summary 17 Judgment focuses primarily upon facts and jurisdictional arguments relating to actions taken by 18 the Lummi Nation and Lummi Nation Officer Brandon Gates. None of these arguments are 19 relevant; the Plaintiff has not shown that there is a genuine issue for trial with respect to his 20 conversion claim against Horton's. Indeed, the Plaintiff only briefly mentions his lawsuit

against Horton's Towing, stating that his conversion claim is based solely on Horton's release

DEFENDANT HORTON'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT - PAGE 1 CAUSE NO.: 2:15-cv-00629-JCC

of the vehicle to the Lummi Tribe.

1540984 / 2310.0110

21

22

23

FORSBERG & UMLAUF, P.S. ATTORNEYS AT LAW ONE N. TACOMA AVE. • SUITE 200 TACOMA, WASHINGTON 98403

(253) 572-4200 • (253) 627-8408 FAX

20

21

22

23

The Plaintiff contends that the Lummi Tribe was not lawfully authorized to seize the vehicle and, as a consequence, Horton's acted without lawful justification when it "gave away plaintiff's truck" pursuant to the Lummi Tribal Court Notice of Seizure. (Dkt. #61, p.7). Plaintiff further argues that Horton's breached a "duty to keep custody of the 1999 Ram Pickup" and "should have advised Lummi Nation Officer Gates that [it] would not honor the Lummi Nation seizure process." (Dkt. #61, p.6). None of these arguments are supported by the facts or the law.

To be sure, the Plaintiff's citations to the Washington impound statute, RCW 46.55, et. seq., are correct. This is the controlling statutory authority regarding duties owed by tow truck operators. Under the express terms of the statute, towing companies are authorized to remove vehicles at the direction of law enforcement. See, First Class Cartage, Ltd. v. Fife Serv. & Towing, Inc., 121 Wn. App. 257, 264, 89 P.3d 226, 230 (2004) citing, Laws of 1969, 1st Spec. Sess., ch. 42, § 7. After a vehicle is impounded, a tow truck operator must then provide notice within twenty-four hours to the last known registered and legal owners of the vehicle. RCW 46.55.110(1).

In all respects, Horton's Towing fully complied with statutory requirements. First, there is no dispute that Horton's impounded the vehicle at the direction of the Washington State Patrol after Plaintiff was arrested under suspicion of DUI on October 23, 2014. See Exh. 1 to the Declaration of Daniel J. Johnson, Sr., Owner, Horton's Towing ("Johnson Decl.") – Impound Call Receipt. Second, there is no dispute that Horton's Towing issued a Notice of Vehicle Impound to Mr. Wilson that same day, as required under RCW 46.55.110(1). <u>Id.</u>, Exh.

2 - Notice of Vehicle Impound. The Notice was sent by first-class mail and included the

DEFENDANT HORTON'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT - PAGE 2 CAUSE NO.: 2:15-cv-00629-JCC

1540984 / 2310.0110

FORSBERG & UMLAUF, P.S. ATTORNEYS AT LAW ONE N. TACOMA AVE. • SUITE 200 TACOMA, WASHINGTON 98403 (253) 572-4200 • (253) 627-8408 FAX

identity of the agency authorizing the impound; the name of the impounding tow firm, its address, and telephone number; and the location and time of the impound, and by whose authority the vehicle was impounded. <u>Id.</u> The Notice also included the written notification of the right of redemption and opportunity for a hearing to contest the validity of the impoundment. <u>Id.</u>

Finally, there is no dispute that Lummi Nation Officer, Brandon Gates, appeared at Horton's Towing on the same day the vehicle was impounded and presented an official Lummi Tribal Court Notice of Seizure. <u>Id.</u>, **Exh. 3** - *Notice of Seizure*. At the direction of Officer Gates, Horton's Towing complied with the Lummi Nation Notice of Seizure and released the vehicle. <u>Id.</u> Horton's had no further involvement in this matter.

Contrary to plaintiff's assertions, there is absolutely no legal authority to support a ruling that a tow truck operator is under an affirmative duty to conduct an independent investigation into jurisdictional issues, or to advise law enforcement on such matters. In truth, Washington courts have specifically rejected similar arguments regarding the scope of the impound statute and the duty to investigate. *See*, First Class Cartage, Ltd. v. Fife Serv. & Towing, Inc., 121 Wn. App. 257, 89 P.3d 226, 231 (Div. 2, 2004). In First Class, the registered owner of an impound vehicle brought claims for negligence regarding notice and conversion against a towing company that sold a vehicle at auction. Id. The plaintiff argued that the towing company was under a duty to investigate and independently determine the lawful legal owner prior to providing notice and selling the vehicle. Id. at 258. The court examined the impound statute and ruled, in pertinent part, that that the tow truck operator was under no duty to conduct an independent investigation and had a right to rely on information provided by

DEFENDANT HORTON'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT – PAGE 3 CAUSE NO.: 2:15-cv-00629-JCC

1540984 / 2310.0110

FORSBERG & UMLAUF, P.S. ATTORNEYS AT LAW ONE N. TACOMA AVE. • SUITE 200 TACOMA, WASHINGTON 98403 (253) 572-4200 • (253) 627-8408 FAX

law enforcement agencies and the Department of Licensing. <u>Id.</u>, at 258-259, 267. Although the issue raised in <u>First Class</u> related to notice rather than jurisdiction (as in this case), the reasoning of the court is equally applicable. Just as the court noted in <u>First Class</u>, ". . . [w]hile it is *conceivable* that the legislature could require a towing company to investigate [jurisdiction] it has not done so." Id., at 266.

Here, reasonable minds can only agree that Horton's Towing complied with the impound statute and acted under the direction of law enforcement when the vehicle was impounded at the request of the WSP. Reasonable minds can only agree that Horton's released the vehicle to Lummi Nation Officer Gates pursuant to a Lummi Nation Trial Court Notice of Seizure. Horton's Towing was under no duty to conduct an independent jurisdictional investigation, but rather was entitled to rely upon information provided by both law enforcement agencies. The Plaintiff has failed to present *any* evidence that could possibly lead a rational trier of fact to conclude that Horton's Towing acted without lawful justification. The Plaintiff's conversion claim, therefore, fails as a matter of law.

DATED this 25th day of February, 2016.

FORSBERG & UMLAUF, P.S.

By: /s/Robert W. Novasky
Robert W. Novasky, WSBA #21682
FORSBERG & UMLAUF, P.S.
One North Tacoma Ave. Suite 200
Tacoma, WA 98403
Email: rnovasky@forsberg-umlauf.com
Attorneys for Defendant Horton's Towing

DEFENDANT HORTON'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT – PAGE 4 CAUSE NO.: 2:15-cv-00629-JCC

1540984 / 2310.0110

FORSBERG & UMLAUF, P.S.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
ONE N. TACOMA AVE. • SUITE 200
TACOMA, WASHINGTON 98403
(253) 572-4200 • (253) 627-8408 FAX

1	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
2	The undersigned certifies under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of
3	Washington that I am now and at all times herein mentioned, a citizen of the United States, a
4	resident of the State of Washington, over the age of eighteen years, not a party to or interested
5	in the above-entitled action, and competent to be a witness herein.
6	On the date given below I caused to be served the foregoing DEFENDANT
7	HORTON'S TOWING'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY
8	JUDGMENT on the following individuals in the manner indicated:
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Mr. Thomas B. Nedderman Floyd, Pflueger & Ringer, P.S. 200 W. Thomas St., Suite 500 Seattle, WA 98119-4296 Facsimile: 206-441-8484 () Via U.S. Mail () Via Facsimile () Via Hand Delivery (XX) Via ECF William Johnston Attorney at Law P.O. Box 953 Bellingham, WA 98227 Facsimile: 360-676-1510 () Via U.S. Mail () Via Facsimile () Via U.S. Mail () Via U.S. Mail () Via Hand Delivery (XX) Via ECF Annette L. Hayes United States Attorney P.O. Box 953 Bellingham, WA 98227 Facsimile: 360-676-1510 () Via U.S. Mail () Via Facsimile () Via U.S. Mail () Via Facsimile () Via Hand Delivery (XX) Via ECF Via Hand Delivery () Via Hand Delivery (XX) Via ECF
19 20 21 22 23	SIGNED this 25 th day of February, 2016, at Tacoma, Washington. /s/Myia McMichael Myia O. McMichael

DEFENDANT HORTON'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT – PAGE 5 CAUSE NO.: 2:15-cv-00629-JCC

1540984 / 2310.0110

FORSBERG & UMLAUF, P.S.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
ONE N. TACOMA AVE. • SUITE 200
TACOMA, WASHINGTON 98403

(253) 572-4200 • (253) 627-8408 FAX