DEFENSE NEWS

Fighting for Justice and Balance in Civil Courts

WDTL
WASHINGTON DEFENSE TRIAL LAWYERS
Fighting for Justice and Balance in Civil Courts

Late Summer 2007

IN THIS ISSUE

It's the End of an Era: Securities Class Actions Are Way Down, and the Practice Shows Little Sign of Recovering

By Andrew Longstreth, The American Lawyer

The era was marked by mysterious envelopes. When opened, the official-looking documents inside informed the reader that, because he owned three shares of, say, Microsoft Corp. stock some years ago, he was part of a class of plaintiffs. The class had already brought a lawsuit against Microsoft for a problem the reader had never noticed. Now the settlement was being divided, and the reader might be entitled to something. But the reader, disheartened by the sheaf of forms asking for details about a barely remembered transaction, usually tossed the notice in the trash and started flipping through that day's Pottery Barn catalog.

Those envelopes are disappearing. Securities class actions are on the wane. For decades, corporate America fought them hard, writing checks to settle cases with one hand, and checks to K Street lobbyists with the other. But the plaintiffs proved tenacious, and the cases kept coming.

Until recently, that is. Last year, plaintiffs filings were down nearly 40 percent from the previous year, to the lowest level of securities class actions in more than a decade. The downward trend is expected to continue this year.

Why? Take your pick from among several explanations. (A) The stock market is near an all-time high, and fraud tends to be discovered when the market is down. (B) The field's most prolific plaintiffs firm, Milberg Weiss, has been reduced to a shadow of its former self. (C) Recent appellate court rulings, including a couple at the U.S. Supreme Court, have made it tougher on plaintiffs. And no one can rule out (D), that the Sarbanes-Oxley Act and increased enforcement by the Securities and Exchange Commission and the U.S. Department of Justice have made corporate America more honest.

This fantasy-come-true for corporate America means bad news for the law firms that represent it. Since 1997, defense firms could expect around 200 new cases a year. Scandals at companies like Enron Corp. and WorldCom Inc., supersized the stakes – and the fees.

The prosperous defense bar owes a good chunk of its fortune to its antagonist, Melvyn Weiss. In the 1960s Weiss was one of a handful of attorneys who explored the commercial applications of new amendments to federal rules of procedures, which allowed for expanded class actions. Weiss distinguished himself by aggressively growing the business. "He was willing to throw a lot money at the cases and take them further [than anyone else]," says Fred Isquith, a class action attorney at Wolf Haldenstein Adler Freeman & Herz. "He was prepared

Continued on Page 2

Editor: Grant Lingg
T. 206.689.8500 | F. 206.689.8501 glingg@forsberg-umlauf.com

Editor: Jody K. Reich
T. 206.292.9988 | F. 206.343.7053 jreich@bpmlaw.com

www.wdtl.org

WDTL
WASHINGTON DEFENSE TRIAL LAWYERS
Fighting for Justice and Balance in Civil Courts

DEFENSE NEWS

The Defense News is published bi-monthly by the Washington Defense Trial Lawyers, c/o WDTL, 701 Pike St., Ste 2200, Seattle WA 98101. **SUBSCRIPTION:** Included in dues of all active members. **EDITORIAL POLICY:** Defense News is edited for members of the Washington Defense Trial Lawyers. Publishing and editorial decisions are based on the editors' judgment of the quality of the writing, the timeliness of the article, and the potential interest to Defense News readers. The views expressed in the Defense News are those of the authors and may not reflect the official policy or position of WDTL or Defense News. **SUBMISSIONS:** All submissions must be typewritten, double-spaced (including citations). Include with the article an electronic format – either by email or disk. Articles may be submitted to kristin@wdtl.org or glingg@forsberg-umlauf.com. **ADVERTISING:** All advertising inquiries should be directed to: Kristin Lewis, 701 Pike St., Suite 2200, Seattle, WA 98101, (206) 749-0319 or e-mail: kristin@wdtl.org

End of an Era *From Page 1*

to build a bigger firm. Others were more... risk-averse."

Weiss created a lucrative practice for himself and others. Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, Milberg Weiss was to securities class actions what Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz was to M&A. The passage of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act in 1995 – legislation designed to curb the suits – hardly made a dent. From 1995 to 2003, Milberg served as lead or co-lead plaintiff in more than half the cases settled, according to a report by Cornerstone Research Inc. At its peak, the firm had more than 200 lawyers. In 2002, as the scandal wave hit, the firm filed 361 securities cases, according to Westlaw.

But the firm has been diminished. After being indicted last year on charges that it illegally paid named plaintiffs, it has shrunk to less than 70 lawyers, and last year it filed only 59 cases. In July former name partner David Bershad pled guilty to conspiracy and agreed to cooperate with prosecutors. Observers see the plea as an inexorable step to the indictment of Weiss, who declined to comment for this article, and former partner Bill Lerach.

The sinking of Milberg, and securities class action litigation in general, is having an impact on the defense side. For example, in 2003 Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom appeared on 155 federal and state dockets in securities cases, according to figures collected by Westlaw. Last year the firm appeared on 58. Similarly, Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft appeared on 49 new dockets involving securities cases in 2002 and only nine last year. Those firms are not alone in feeling a drop-off. "Where we would get eight to ten new cases [every year], maybe it's three to six now," says Jeffrey Rudman, who cochairs the securities department at Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr.

Most defense lawyers feign indifference. "It's not a concern," says William Sullivan, a partner at Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker. Sullivan and others express a deep and abiding faith in the creativity of the plaintiffs bar to overcome legal obstacles.

History gives them comfort. After the PSLRA was enacted, plaintiffs lawyers showed resiliency in adapting to the new legal standards. After a dip in 1996, the number of filings shot back up. Plaintiffs lawyers also learned to court financial institutions as clients, which have become the vehicle to control cases and reap the lion's share of fees.

Defense lawyers say that other kinds of matters are keeping them busy. Backdating stock options investigations, for example. The SEC says that it has initiated more than 100 inquiries into the practice. Some firms, like Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati, Quinn Emanuel Urquhart Oliver & Hedges, and O'Melveny & Myers, have each landed more than a dozen cases. Other defense lawyers are finding work on litigation arising from the current private equity buyout boom. Just after the pipeline operator Kinder Morgan Inc., announced a management-led buyout, for example, Lerach

Continued on Next Page

End of an Era *From Page 2*

Coughlin Stoia Geller Rudman & Robbins filed a suit against the buyers on behalf of shareholders, claiming that the price was "grossly inadequate and unfair" to shareholders. Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann, another traditional plaintiffs securities fraud firm, has also brought cases challenging the value of deals, like the Dolan family's buyout of Cablevision Systems Corp.

Of course, defense lawyers can be expected to put a positive spin on their business, but are they whistling past the graveyard?

Backdating, for example, has limited potential. There are a few major investigations, but many are relatively small matters, which can be handled by fewer than a half-dozen attorneys. And litigation over private equity deals tends to be shorter than securities class actions, and doesn't require the massive amount of discovery.

Nor is there a new Milberg on the horizon. After several years, and several key court rulings, the PSLRA's goal of forcing plaintiffs to allege highly specific allegations appears to be working, according to both plaintiffs and defense lawyers. That makes a firm model based on filing lots of actions harder to maintain, since plaintiffs cases are more prone to dismissal. A handful of major players in the practice – Bernstein Litowitz and Grant & Eisenhofer, for example – file the major cases that Milberg did at its peak, but don't bring the bevy of smaller cases that Milberg also did.

Lerach Coughlin, a successor firm to Milberg Weiss, has the resources to be a major filer. It has nearly 180 lawyers. But the firm has said its leader, Bill Lerach, is considering retiring at the end of the year, which has fueled speculation among competitors that the firm could splinter. Patrick Coughlin, a cofounder of the firm, denies that a split is imminent. But he doesn't promise that the firm will maintain its current size. "If the market [for class actions] gets cut in half, we'll shrink," says Coughlin.

The new environment has not left every defense attorney sanguine about the future. Cadwalader partner Gregory Markel believes the golden age of securities class actions has likely come to an end. When asked what the drop-off means for his business, Markel answers, "I think it means you diversify."

Spoken like a true lawyer.

WDTL STAFF

Member Services
David Penrose
4141 Agate Road
Bellingham WA 98226-8745
Phone: (206) 529-4128
Fax: (206) 202-3776
Email: service@wdtl.org

Accounting
Jackie Mintz
PO Box 27644
Seattle WA 98125-2644
Phone: (206) 522-6496
Email: accounting@wdtl.org

Executive Director
Kristin Lewis
701 Pike Street, Suite 2200
Seattle WA 98101
Phone: (206) 749-0319
Fax: (206) 749-0321
Email: kristin@wdtl.org

WDTL Wants to Thank Our 2007 Convention Sponsors

DRI
The Voice of the Defense Bar
150 North Michigan Ave. Suite 300
Chicago, IL 60601
Phone: 312.795.1101
Fax: 312.795.0747
www.dri.org

Exponent, Inc.
Engineering and Scientific Consulting
15375 SE 30th Place, Suite 250
Bellevue, WA 98007
Toll Free: 888. 656.EXPO
Phone: 425.643.9803
Fax: 425.643.9827
www,exponent.com
info@exponent.com

IDEX
Expert Witness Research
8691 W. 96th Street
Overland Park, KS 66212
Phone :800.521.5596
Fax: 913.341.1050
www.idex.com
rstiner@idex.com

JAMS
Dispute Resolution Services
600 University Street, Suite 1910
Seattle WA 98101
Phone: 206.622.5267
Fax: 206.292.9082

950 Pacific Avenue, Suite 500
Tacoma, WA 98402
Phone:253.627.3059
Fax:253.572.7517
www.jamsadr.com
mnemeth@jamsadr.com

Madsen, Kneppers & Associates
Construction Consulting
200 W. Thomas Street, Suite 450
Seattle, WA 98119
Phone :206. 267.2927
Fax: 206. 267.2906
www.mkainc.com
dschellberg@mkainc.com

Matson, Driscoll & Damico
Certified Public Accountants
10900 NE 8th Street, Suite 1040
Bellevue, WA 98004
Phone: 425.455.0056
Fax: 425.453.0052
www.mdd.net
pdelangis@mdd.net

Medical Consultants Network
Independent Medical Evaluations
1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 1800
Seattle, WA 98101
Phone: 206.343.6100
Fax: 206.287.1908
www.mcn.com
info@mcn.com

Naegeli Reporting Corporation
Court Reporting, Trial Presentation, Videoconferencing, Videography
Corporate Headquarters
111 S.W. Fifth Avenue, Suite 2020
Portland, OR 97204
Phone: 503.227.1544
Fax: 503.227.7123

Naegeli Reporting Corporation
2 Union Square Building
601 Union Street, Suite 1624
Seattle, WA 98101
Phone: 206.622.3376
Toll-free: 800.528.3335

The Fernwell Building
5050 W. Riverside Ave., Suite 500
Spokane, WA 99201
Phone: 509.838.6000

www.naegelireporting.com
info@naegelireporting.com

Objective Medical Assessments Corporation (OMAC)
Independent Medical Evaluations
401 Second Avenue South, Suite 110
Seattle, WA 98104
Phone: 800.331.6622
Fax: 206.726.8605
www.omacime.com
jcutler@omacime.com

Prolumina Trial Technologies
Trial Consulting and Presentation Services, Technology Integration, Depositions, Duplication, Scanning and Videoconferencing
601 Union Street, Suite 1420
Seattle, WA 98101
Phone: 888.622.6722 or 206.622.6700
Fax: 206. 467.1777
www. Proluminatech.com
info@proluminatech.com

Synaptic Analysis Consulting Group
Injury Biomechanics Consulting
820 West Broadway, Suite 202
Vancouver, B.C, Canada V5Z1JB
Phone: 604.872.1788
Fax: 604.608.4814
www.synapacg.com
greaves@synapacg.com

T-SCAN Corporation
Record Retrieval
4200 23rd Avenue West, Suite 200
Seattle, WA 98199
Phone: 206.285.6322
Fax: 800.238.7307
www.tscan.biz
Jay_J@tscan.biz

No Hearsay in Electronically Generated Information

By Bradford E. Biegon, Spriggs & Hollingsworth, Washington D.C.

Are you facing a mountain of electronic discovery and wondering if you can get it into evidence? Take heart: A recent 101-page opinion out of Baltimore, issued in a case involving a small maritime insurance dispute, tells you how. The opinion, written by U.S. Magistrate Judge Paul Grimm, is a road map to how to use the fruits of electronic discovery as evidence at trial.

But be careful. For all of Grimm's step-by-step directions, he includes a detour through electronically generated information that could be a highway to nowhere. And whether you agree with his conclusions or not, you are almost certain to see Grimm's opinion in future disputes about the admissibility of electronic information at trial.

Although the case (*Lorraine v. Market American Insurance*) began as a $15,000 insurance dispute when lightning struck a yacht anchored in the Chesapeake Bay, Grimm's May 4 opinion veered off on an entirely different tack to give lawyers a clear, step-by-step framework for understanding how electronic evidence fits – or does not fit – into courtroom evidence.

The Lorraine opinion is important. Grimm provides an evidentiary manual of how to use documents that people create and store in computers as evidence at trial. In other words, this opinion will turn out to be a great study guide for corporate counsel confronting electronic evidence at trial. Because the object of electronic discovery is supposedly to gather evidence for trial, Grimm's observations also shed important light on questions of e-discovery.

Look Who's Talking

Perhaps the more important – and interesting – aspect of Grimm's opinion is his conclusion that information he describes as "electronically generated" is completely outside the hearsay rule. The hearsay rule is among the best known and important of the gate-keeping rules to screen evidence before it reaches the jury. Under the hearsay rule, a statement made outside of court may not be offered into evidence for its truth unless the statement falls within one or more specific exceptions (for example, when the statements are contained in business records, made by employees or agents, or made against the speaker's interests). Hearsay evidence is excluded at trial because there is no opportunity to cross-examine its creator to determine how reliable the evidence is.

By electronically generated information, Grimm means information a computer creates itself. Electronically generated information can take a variety of forms. Grimm cites as an example the report a fax machine prints whenever a fax is sent. Another example (but which he does not cite) is "metadata." Metadata is information "created" by the computer that records (often without the user's knowledge and often without the user ever seeing it) what has happened to a particular document, such as who created the document, when it was created, who viewed it and who changed it.

Treating electronically generated information as outside the hearsay rule has consequences. If electronically generated information is outside the hearsay rule, it can be used for a number of purposes at trial. And if that is so, then electronically generated information becomes an even more valuable discovery target.

> Metadata is information "created" by the computer that records what happened to a particular document, when it was created, who viewed it and who changed it.

When Grimm excluded electronically generated information such as fax reports and metadata from the hearsay rule, it was not because he concluded it was somehow inherently more reliable than other evidence. Instead, he said it can't be considered hearsay because it's a statement "made" by a computer instead of by a human, and the hearsay rule applies only to humans who make statements.

Grimm reasoned that when a fax machine issues a report saying a fax was sent, it is the fax machine that is the "declarant." Using the same logic, when a computer collects and exports metadata information about when a file was created, who created it, and who changed it, it is a computer doing the talking. Because the rules of evidence say a hearsay declarant must be human, Grimm concluded, information created by a computer simply could not qualify as hearsay. And this is where Grimm makes his detour.

Continued on Page 6

When he concluded that a fax machine or computer is the "declarant" of electronically generated information, Grimm surprisingly didn't answer an important question: Can fax machines and computers really be "witnesses"? The rules of evidence require witnesses to have personal knowledge of the events they describe – or the testimony is not evidence – and, obviously, a computer simply cannot have personal knowledge.

Even if we ignore the personal knowledge problem and treat a fax machine or a computer as a witness, why should the fax machine or computer's "statements" be attributed to its owner? A computer isn't the owner's employee or its agent: both terms apply only to humans – which was Grimm's reason for excluding electronically generated information from the hearsay rule in the first place. Besides, if a computer is really following a software programmer's instructions when it makes its "statement," why should those statements be attributed to a user or owner who had nothing to do with the programming?

Some courts may accept Grimm's analysis at face value, and you must be prepared for that. But other courts may consider it a dead end that leaves all of this electronically generated information in the middle of nowhere. After all, if computers can't be witnesses, then their "statements" most likely aren't evidence and may not be admissible at all. In short, treating computers as declarants and putting their "statements" outside of the hearsay rule may be an evidentiary cul-de-sac.

Some Way Out of Here

The only way out of a cul-de-sac is a U-turn, and here it might save the day. Recall that it is Grimm's decision to treat machines as the declarants of electronically generated information that creates this problem. If a human declarant were actually at the heart of this electronically generated information, then it could easily be analyzed under the hearsay rule. And conveniently, there really is a human "declarant" behind electronically generated information.

Consider a fax report. The fax report is a statement that a fax containing a certain number of pages was sent to a certain number at a certain time. It is a human's statement because it was a human who wrote the software program that spells out the exact conditions under which the fax report will be printed and what it will say. When a fax report is created, it is the software programmer's statement that those predetermined conditions have been met.

Of course, the programmer does not actually witness any faxes being sent, but that does not matter under the hearsay rule. The hearsay rule does not require that a declarant actually witness the events described in her declaration to be considered a "declarant" under the rule. In fact, one reason we do not allow hearsay testimony is that the declarant is not available for cross-examination about what she observed (if anything).

Once the information is treated as hearsay, Grimm's opinion lays out the circumstances in which it might be admitted as evidence. For example, did the producing corporation maintain the fax report as a business record? If so, it might qualify for an exception under the hearsay rule. But whatever the answer to that particular question, at least it affords a well-recognized and well-tested framework for dealing with such evidence.

There is even an advantage to treating fax reports and other electronically generated information as hearsay. Under Grimm's approach, a fax report qualifies as evidence of when a fax was sent, even if the clock on the machine is blinking "12:00" and was never properly set. But if treated as hearsay, the fax report would most likely be allowed into evidence under the business records exception. And if the fax machine's owner used fax reports as business records, we can more safely assume that the business made sure that the machine's clock was accurately set.

These concerns are not merely academic. They go directly to the rising costs of litigation. Last year's amendments to the discovery rules opened the floodgates of electronic discovery, which can be expensive and time-consuming. Yet the changes did not address whether any of the resulting discovery materials were actually admissible at trial.

To be sure, parties may seek discovery of materials that are not admissible. But courts are charged with weighing the burdens and benefits of discovery. If a party seeks discovery of electronically generated information such as metadata, which may not be evidence at all – or at best, hearsay – the courts might do well to consider such discovery unjustified, particularly

Continued on Next Page

Hearsay *From Page 6*

considering that the desired information might be found through more traditional and less burdensome means.

But whether electronically generated information is evidence at all or hearsay, Grimm's opinion has given corporate counsel and their trial lawyers much to think about as they prepare to prove their cases with electronic information. Lawyers may ignore this opinion at their peril and hope that lightning strikes for them – but as Grimm observed, "counsel would be wise not to test their luck unnecessarily. If it is critical to the success of your case to admit into evidence computer stored records, it would be prudent to plan to authenticate the record by the most rigorous standard that may be applied."

Your Board's Work

By Jillian Barron, Sebris Busto James, WDTL Secretary

The WDTL Board of Directors held its annual retreat in June and met again during the annual convention in Vancouver, B.C. in July. During these sessions, the Board discussed its objectives for the upcoming year, as well as a variety of other issues.

Mandatory Arbitration. The Board discussed concerns about apparent bias on the part of individuals serving as arbitrators, and potential remedial action. It was agreed that the Board will encourage more participation by WDTL members as Panel arbitrators; consider what action can be taken to encourage government attorneys to be able to sign up as arbitrators (some government agencies currently have rules that create hurdles to their attorneys serving as arbitrators); and have the Judicial Liaison Committee approach judges about the possibility of putting together a non-mandatory CLE for arbitrators, which would address issues such as bias.

Limited Practice Officers. The Board discussed the State Bar's current consideration of creating a limited legal license for non-lawyers to practice in some areas, such as preparing documentation for real estate transactions. It was agreed that the Board should monitor the Bar's progress on this issue and gather information about the experience in other states that have authorized limited practice.

Rules of Engagement for Medical Discovery. The Board discussed initiating an interactive process with doctors to come up with some general protocols for working together. The process might involve creating a universal medical release that would be accepted by WDTL, WSTLA, and the medical profession. Former WDTL President Steve Stocker will lead a special study group that will propose some model guidelines.

Creation of a WDTL PAC. The Board approved a proposal to take initial steps to create a WDTL PAC and a PAC committee to review and recommend potential contributions.

Judicial Independence. Former WDTL President Jeff Frank has volunteered to work with the Judicial Liaison Committee to decide what WDTL can do to support an independent judiciary. Jeff has been active in various efforts in this regard, and helped establish the Voting for Judges website, which provides information on judicial candidates.

Committee Involvement. In order to encourage committee involvement, the Board has invited Committee Chairs to attend Board meetings, and will be asking them to attend and provide updates on their committees on a rotating basis over the year. The Board will also be inviting regional representatives to attend Board committee meetings in September, and possibly later in the year.

President's Column – Rick Roberts

By Rick Roberts, Law Office of Sharon J. Bitcon

It is an honor and privilege to serve as your President. There are a number of issues I hope to work on this year, not the least of which is the subject of this column, mandatory arbitration. However, before I move on to that, I wish to thank everyone who attended in the Annual Convention in Vancouver. I planned an open format to encourage the discussion of issues we face in our practice, and I am pleased that it turned out as well as it did. Special thanks go to our Executive Director, Kristin Lewis, for making our stay at the elegant Sutton Place Hotel so wonderful, and to past Presidents, Andy Cooley and Roy Umlauf, for leading the discussion panels.

Mandatory Arbitration: Is It Broken?

Recently, a member contacted me about a bad experience he had in an arbitration that forced him to exclaim: "Arbitration is so broke, it can't be fixed. It should be scrapped altogether." I sympathized with him as his particular experience was egregious, but MAR arbitration is here to stay. Although we are trial lawyers, we do so many more arbitrations these days. Is arbitration an adequate substitute for trial? No. The courts believe it has reduced their case load. For our clients, arbitration is less expensive than trial, but the results are only occasionally satisfactory. While arbitration may not be an adequate substitute for trial, it is here to stay, and the better question to ask ourselves is, "What can we do to make it better?"

Are You on the List?

One of the biggest complaints about arbitration strike lists is that they mostly seem to be made of plaintiff lawyers. Have you and all of your colleagues in your office signed up to be an arbitrator for the counties where you practice? Please contact the arbitration department for those counties or visit the WDTL website for links to signup forms and oaths for a number of counties. If you are signed up, is the information current? For those counties that provide information on proposed arbitrators, it is always encouraging to see a potential arbitrator who has arbitrated 10, 20, or even more times. If you have not updated your information since you initially signed up then you are not letting everyone know how experienced you are.

Check the List-Serve

If there are proposed arbitrators on your strike list that you are not familiar with, send a request on the list serve to get information from other members. It may be best to limit your request to the one or two you don't know rather than all five. Also, help others. When you recognize someone who has arbitrated one of your cases, let that person know. Especially if you have had a great experience, let others know. A great arbitrator can have either a plaintiff or defense practice. An arbitrator who fairly evaluates a case and makes appropriate rulings should be identified and promoted.

When You Serve, Serve Fairly

"Leveling the playing field" does not mean making up for every bad arbitration award you have received. It means taking your job as the arbitrator seriously. Read all of the submitted materials, make rulings that are based on the evidence and are consistent with the rules, and ignore outside influences. Every party benefits when the arbitrator takes his or her job seriously and works to render a result that is fair, reasonable, and based on the evidence. It should be the goal of every arbitrator that at the end of the hearing, both parties walk away with the belief that process was fair, the evidence was carefully reviewed, their arguments were heard, and if given the opportunity, they would agree to appear before that arbitrator again.

News Flash: Civil Defense Lawyers are Great People

By John Laney, Seattle University School of Law

With the summer about to end and another fall coming, another bright eyed crop of 1Ls will be entering our state's three law schools. This may come to a shock to many readers, but most people do not enter law school thinking, "I want to be a civil defense attorney." Unfortunately, from a law student's perspective, a civil defense practice is not viewed as favorably as other practice areas. If you are willing to take some time and visit your local law school, you can help change that perception.

As a former small business owner, I became interested when the WDTL gave a panel discussion at Seattle University. Afterwards, I became a member and started attending various meetings and brown bag lunches. I found the brown bag lunches a great place to obtain context to some of the general doctrines learned in law school. Through this exposure, I started to feel like civil defense is where I want to practice.

Currently, I am working as a law clerk at Forsberg & Umlauf, P.S., a law firm that is devoted to civil defense. The attorneys at Forsberg & Umlauf have consistently showed me that civil defense lawyers are ethical, fun, and talented attorneys. My interactions with the attorneys there (all WDTL members) have increased my substantive legal skills and given me great perspective. It has also ensured that after the bar I will be practicing an area of law with peers (WDTL members) who are more than just great attorneys but who are also great people.

Furthermore, my experience at Forsberg & Umlauf has showed me that despite popular belief, civil defense firms are filled with attorneys who help the community. At the annual attorney retreat, we participated in a team-building exercise that built bikes to be donated to the First School.

Continued on Next Page

News Flash *From page 10*

Additionally, Ms. Susan McIntosh has introduced me to the fantastic work she does for children through Family Law/CASA of King County.

Many idealistic young law students can think of nothing worse than being a defense attorney. It may be "sexy" to tell someone that your last success involved obtaining a million dollars on behalf of a client who suffered a million dollars worth of damage. However, to proclaim that you just got a jury to agree that your client was not negligent can be just as fulfilling. It is always unfortunate when someone is injured or suffers a loss, but it is also a tragedy when Mom & Pop Small Business is shut down because it can't afford a loss that it did not cause. My work at Forsberg & Umlauf has helped show me that a good defense attorney will uncover the facts to ensure that his or her client only pays their fair share. Justice requires a fair outcome for all parties in a lawsuit.

WDTL attorneys do not have a strong enough presence in the law schools. Without exposure, it is easy to forget that justice requires zealous advocates on both sides of the "v." I encourage you all to take some steps to raise the profile of civil defense attorneys in local law schools. Last year the WDTL sponsored a networking event at Seattle University School of Law, and this upcoming year I ask that you take it to the next level.

All of the law schools have a variety of programs for practitioners to help mold future ranks. I encourage you all to participate, be it through mentoring a law student, attending a networking event, or giving a presentation in a substantive practice area. Furthermore, you could also invite law students when you give presentations or CLE's in the community. If you are interested in helping to raise the average law student's awareness of what the WDTL is all about, please get involved.

Ryan, Courtney amd Jack
Welcome
Briggs Thomas Beaudoin
Born May 9, 2007 at 4:40 am
7lbs, 6 oz., 19 inches
and cute as can be!

Mediation Services

WDTL Member David LeMaster is pleased to announce the expansion of his practice as a mediator with an emphasis on life and disability insurance coverage disputes involving the application of ERISA (Employee Retirement Income Security Act) and property damage insurance coverage claims involving allegations of bad faith. Dave is a shareholder at Porter, Kohli & LeMaster, P.S. He began serving as a mediator in 1997 and is on the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Washington's Rule 39.1 Mediator Panel.

Welcome New Members

WDTL welcomes the following members who have recently joined our organization.

A big THANK YOU to our members who referred these individuals to WDTL.

Dylan T. Becker
Smith Freed & Eberhard
Referred by Glenn Barger

Catherine G. Brumbaugh
Betts, Patterson & Mines, P.S.
Referred by Karen Bamberger

Eric S. Chavez
Referred by Shawn Lipton, Seattle U Law

Evan Daniel Chinn
Sebris Busto James
Referred by Jillian Barron

Patrice C. Cole
Allstate Staff Counsel
Referred by Anthony Vidlak

Mark K. Conley
Slagle Morgan LLP
Referred by Slagle Morgan LLP

Teresa Daley
Meyer, Fluegge & Tenney, P.S.

Mary R. DeYoung
Soha & Lang, P.S.

Michael S. Deleo
Eisenhower & Carlson, PLLC

Susan Marjorie Edison
Office of the Attorney General

Sarah Eversole
Cole, Lether, Wathen & Leid, P.C.
Referred by Kevin Kay

Daniel Troy Logan
Fasy Gordon, Thomas, Honeywell, Malanca, Peterson & Daheim LLP
Referred by David Jensen

Ronald Alan. Franz
WA State Transit Insurance Pool

Nicholas Gasca
Seattle University School of Law
Referred by Sean Lipton, Career Services SU

Megan Hazel. Gebhardt
Johnson Andrews & Skinner PS

Patricia D. Gugin
United States Attorney Office
Referred by Kristin Johnson

Thomas V. Harris
WA Arbitration & Mediation Service
Referred by Doug Hofmann

Jay P. Harris
Harris, Wyatt and Amala, LLC
Referred by Washington State Bar

Andrew J. Kinstler
Helsell Fetterman LLP

John Joseph Kirschner
Office of The Attorney General

Nancy H. Maisano
Maisano Mediation, LLC

Lowell P. McKelvey
Mitchell, Lang & Smith

Eric J. Neal
Cole, Lether, Wathen & Leid, P.C.

Ann S. Nielsen
Warren Barber & Fontes PS
Referred by Stephanie Dikeakos

Lawerence A. Peterson
Corporate Counsel Division - Yakima County Prosecuting Attorney
Referred by Linda M Gallagher

Daniel Stephen Potts
Gordon, Thomas, Honeywell, Malanca, Peterson & Daheim LLP
Referred by David Jensen

Kyle Dustin Riley
Smith Freed & Eberhard, P.C.
Referred by Josh Hayward

Kevin M. Sampson
Bullivant Houser Bailey PC

Evan M. Schechter
Smith Freed & Eberhard, P.C.

Brian J. Scott
American Family Insurance

Robert Tad Seder
Civil Div Snohomish County Prosecutor's Office

Laurence Erickson Walker
Merrick, Hofstedt & Lindsey
Referred by Thomas R. Merrick

Brian Hancock Waters
Cole, Lether, Wathen & Leid, P.C.
Referred by Kevin Kay

Lisa Christine Williams
Williams, Kastner & Gibbs PLLC
Referred by Kimberly D Baker

Jennifer K. Wyatt
Schwabe Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.
Referred by Jennifer Campbell

2007 - 2008

OFFICERS

PRESIDENT
Rick Roberts
Law Offices of Sharon J. Bilson
200 West Mercer St, Ste 131
Seattle WA 98119
206.286.1890 x15 voice
206.286.1941 fax
richard.roberts2@thehartford.com

PRESIDENT-ELECT
Ted Buck
Stafford Frey Cooper
601 Union St, Suite 3100
Seattle WA 98101
206.623.9900 voice
206.624.6885 fax
tbuck@staffordfrey.com

SECRETARY
Jillian Barron
Sebris Busto James
14205 SE 36th Street, Suite 325
Bellevue WA 98006
425.454.4233 voice
425.453.9005 fax
jbarron@sebrisbusto.com

TREASURER
Emilia Sweeney
Lane Powell LLP
1420 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4100
Seattle WA 98101
206.223.7087 voice
206.223.7107 fax
sweeneye@lanepowell.com

TRUSTEES

Board Advisor
Emilia Sweeney
Lane Powell LLP
1420 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4100
Seattle WA 98101
206.223.7087 voice
206.223.7107 fax
sweeneye@lanepowell.com

Committee Coordinator
Emilia Sweeney
Lane Powell LLP
1420 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4100
Seattle WA 98101
206.223.7087 voice
206.223.7107 fax
sweeneye@lanepowell.com

Community Service Chair
Matthew Wojcik
Jackson & Wallace LLP
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 3080
Seattle WA 98101
206.386.0214 voice
206.386.0216 fax
mwojcik@jacksonwallace.com

Court Rules Chair
Michael Runyan
Lane Powell PC
1420 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4100
Seattle WA 98101-2338
206.223.7062 voice
206.223.7107 fax
runyanm@lanepowell.com

DRI State Representative
Joanne T. Blackburn
Jackson & Wallace LLP
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 3080
Seattle WA 98101
206.386.0214 voice
206.386.0216 fax
jblackburn@jacksonwallace.com

Judicial Liaison Chair
Jayne Freeman
Keating, Bucklin &
McCormack, Inc., P.S.
800 5th Ave, Suite 4141
Seattle WA 98104-3175
206.623.8861 voice
206.223.9423 fax
jfreeman@kbmlawyers.com

Legislative Chair
Greg A.V. Clark
Foster Pepper PLLC
1111 Third Ave., Ste. 3400
Seattle, WA+ 98101-3299
206.447-2915 voice
206.749-2029 fax
gclarg@foster.com

Membership Chair
Dan L. Johnson
Law Offices of Shahin Karim
520 Pike Street, Suite 1300
Seattle, WA 98101
206.405.1911 voice
206.405.1916 fax
Dan.Johnson@usaa.com

Past President
Steven Stocker
Stocker, Smith, Luciani & Staub
312 W. Sprague
Spokane WA 99201
509.327.2500 voice
509.327.3504 fax
sstocker@sssiawfirm.com

Practice Development
Jennifer Campbell
Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt
1420 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3020
Seattle, WA+ 98101
206.622.1711 voice
206.292.0460 fax
JCampbell@SCHWABE.com

Programs Chair
Aaron Rocke
Carney Badley Spellman
701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3600
Seattle, WA 98104-7010
206.622.8020 voice
206.962.5497 fax
Rocke@carneylaw.com

Publications Chair
Grant Lingg
Forsberg & Umlauf, P.S.
900 4th Ave, Suite 1700
Seattle WA 98164-1039
206.689.8500 voice
206.689.8501 fax
glingg@forsberg-umlauf.com

Trustee at Large
Ryan Beaudoin
Witherspoon, Kelley,
Davenport & Toole, P.S.
1100 U.S. Bank Building
422 W Riverside Ave
Spokane WA 99201-0302
509.624.5265 voice
509.458.2728 fax
rmb@wkdklaw.com

Trustee at Large
Edward Bruya
Keefe, King & Bowman, P.S.
Ste 1102, W 601 Main Ave
Spokane WA 99201
509.624.8988 voice
509.623.1380 fax
ebruya@kkbowman.com

Trustee at Large
Jesse Franklin
Preston Gates & Ellis LLP
925 Fourth Avenue, Suite 2900
Seattle WA 98104-1158
206.370.7817 voice
206.370.6063 fax
jessef@prestongates.com

Trustee at Large
Linda Gallagher
King County Prosecutor's Office
900 Fourth Avenue, Suite 900
Seattle, WA+ 98104
206.296.8816 voice
206.296.8819 fax
linda.gallagher@metrokc.gov

Trustee at Large
Jeffrey M. Kreutz
Meyer, Fluegge & Tenney, PS
230 S 2nd St
P.O. Box 22680
Yakima WA 98908
509.575.8500 voice
509.575.4676 fax
kreutz@mftlaw.com

Trustee at Large
Michael Nicefaro
Office of the Attorney General
Suite 2200 900 4th Avenue
Seattle WA 98164
206.464.7352 voice
206.587.4229 fax
mikenf@atg.wa.gov

Trustee at Large
Mark P. Scheer
Scheer & Zehnder L.L.P.
701 Pike Street, Suite 2200
Seattle, WA 98101
206.262.1200 voice
206.223.4065 fax
MScheer@scheerlaw.com

COMMITTEE CHAIRS

Amicus
Stewart Estes
Keating, Bucklin, McCormack
800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4141
Seattle WA 98101-2509
206.623.8861 voice
206.233 9423 fax
sestes@kbmlawyers.com

Board Development
Ted Buck
Stafford Frey Cooper
601 Union St, Suite 3100
Seattle WA 98101
206.623.9900 voice
206.624.6885 fax
tbuck@staffordfrey.com

Committee Coordinator
Emilia Sweeney
Lane Powell LLP
1420 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4100
Seattle WA 98101
206.223.7087 voice
206.223.7107 fax
sweeneye@lanepowell.com

Community Service/Pro Bono
Matthew Wojcik
Jackson & Wallace LLP
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 3080
Seattle WA 98101
206.386.0214 voice
206.386.0216 fax
mwojcik@jacksonwallace.com

Court Rules Committee
Michael Runyan
Lane Powell PC
1420 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4100
Seattle WA 98101-2338
206.223.7062 voice
206.223.7107 fax
runyanm@lanepowell.com

Judicial Liaison Committee
Jayne Freeman
Keating, Bucklin & McCormack,
Inc., P.S.
800 5th Ave, Suite 4141
Seattle WA 98104-3175
206.623.8861 voice
206.223.9423 fax
jfreeman@kbmlawyers.com

Legislative Committee
Greg A.V. Clark
Bullivant Houser Bailey PC
1601 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2400
Seattle WA 98101-1618
206.684.8229 voice
206.386.5130 fax
greg.clark@bullivant.com

Membership Committee
Dan L. Johnson
Law Offices of Shahin Karim
520 Pike Street, Suite 1300
Seattle, WA 98101
206.405.1911 voice
206.405.1916 fax
Dan.Johnson@usaa.com

Practice Development Committee
Jennifer Campbell
Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt
1420 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3020
Seattle, WA+ 98101
206.622.1711 voice
206.292.0460 fax
JCampbell@SCHWABE.com

Programs Committee
Aaron Rocke
Carney Badley Spellman
701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3800
Seattle, WA 98104-7010
206.622.8020 voice
206.962.5497 fax
rocke@carneylaw.com

Publications Committee
Grant Lingg
Forsberg & Umlauf, P.S.
900 4th Ave, Suite 1700
Seattle WA 98164-1039
206.689.8500 voice
206.689.8501 fax
glingg@forsberg-umlauf.com

Strategic Planning
Inactive at this time

Technology Committee
John Scheller
Lee Smart P.S. Inc.
1800 One Convention Place
701 Pike Street
Seattle WA 98101-3929
206.624.0405 voice
206.624.5944 fax
jws@leesmart.com

SECTION CHAIRS

Commercial Litigation
Jeff Tilden
Gordon Murray Tilden LLP
Suite 4000
1001 4th Ave
Seattle, WA 98154-1007
206.467.6477 voice
206.467.6292 fax
jtilden@gmtlaw.com

Construction
David S. Cottnair
Jackson & Wallace, LLP
1201 3rd Avenue, Suite 3080
Seattle WA 98101
206.386.0214 voice
206.386.0216 fax
dcottnair@jacksonwallace.com

Employment/Corporate Counsel
Jennifer A. Parda
Sebris Busto James
Suite 325
14205 SE 36th Street
Bellevue, WA 98006-1505
425.454.4233 voice
425.453.9005 fax
jparda@sebrisbusto.com

Government Liability
Robert Christie
Christie Law Group, PLLC
Julie's Landing on Lake Union
2100 Westlake Ave N, Suite 206
Seattle WA 98109
206.957.9669 voice
206.352.7875 fax
bob@christielawgroup.com

In-House Counsel
Maggie Sweeney
Law Offices of William D. Garcia
1601 Fifth Ave, Ste 1210
Seattle WA 98101-3602
206.633.1310 voice
206.925.0799
magswe@safeco.com

Insurance
Jeffrey Downer
Lee Smart P.S. Inc.
1800 One Convention Place
701 Pike Street
Seattle WA 98101-3929
206.624.7990 voice
206.624.5944 fax
jpd@leesmart.com

Maritime
Katie Mattison
Lane Powell
1420 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4100
Seattle WA 98101
206.223.7000 voice
206.223.7107 fax
mattisonk@lanepowell.com

Product Liability
Jennifer Campbell
Schwabe, Williamson and Wyatt
1420 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3010
Seattle, WA 98101-2338
206.689.3052 voice
206.292.0460 fax
jcampbell@schwabe.com

Professional Liability
Scott O'Halloran
Williams Kastner & Gibbs
1301 A St #900
Tacoma, WA 98402
253.593.5620 voice
253.593.5625 fax
sohalloran@wkg.com

Workers' Compensation
Mary E. Levenson
Elms & Flynn PS
216 First Avenue South, Suite 310
Seattle WA 98104
206.521.4944 voice
206.521.4940 fax
mlevenson@elms-flynn.com

REGIONAL REPRESENTATIVES

Central Washington
Jeffrey M. Kreutz
Meyer, Fluegge & Tenney, PS
230 S 2nd St
P.O. Box 22680
Yakima WA 98908
509.575.8500 voice
509.575.4676 fax
kreutz@mftlaw.com

South Sound
James B. Meade
Forsberg & Umlauf
950 Pacific Avenue, Ste. 400
Tacoma WA 98402
253.572.4200 voice
JMeade@forsberg-umlauf.com

Southwest Washington
Brian Weeks
Bullivant Houser Bailey
805 Broadway St., Suite 400
Vancouver WA 98660-3310
360.737.2313 voice
360.695.8504 fax
brian.weeks@bullivant.com

Eastern Washington
Ed Bruya
Keefe, King & Bowman, P.S.
Ste 1102, W 601 Main Ave.
Spokane WA 99201
509.624.8988 voice
509.623.1380 fax
ebruya@kkbowman.com

North Sound
Open

ADMINISTRATION

Executive Director
Kristin Lewis
701 Pike Street, Suite 2200
Seattle WA 98101
206.749.0319 voice
206.749.0321 fax
kristin@wdtl.org

WASHINGTON DEFENSE TRIAL LAWYERS

Application for Membership

1. The undersigned hereby makes application for membership with the Washington Defense Trial Lawyers, representing that a substantial portion of my practice is devoted to representing defendants, companies, or entities in civil litigation:

Name _____

Firm Name _____

Office Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Home Address _____

Phone (_____) _____ WSBA Bar # _____

FAX (_____) _____

E-mail _____

2. Year of Admission to Bar _____ Legislative District _____

3. State degrees held, both academic and law, year of graduation and school:

_____

4. If you were referred to WDTL by a fellow attorney, please list name here:

_____

5. 2007-2008 Membership Dues

Attorneys	
Admitted to the Bar more than 5 years	$250.00
Admitted to the Bar less than 5 years	$200.00
Other	
Government Attorney	$125.00
Retired Member	$100.00
Paralegal	$75.00
Law Student	$10.00

6.a. YES! I would like to serve on the following WDTL Committees.

- ☐ Amicus
- ☐ Court Rules
- ☐ Community Service/Pro Bono
- ☐ Judicial Liason
- ☐ Legislative
- ☐ Membership
- ☐ Practice Development
- ☐ Programs
- ☐ Publications
- ☐ Strategic Planning
- ☐ Technology

6.b. YES! I would like to join the following sections

- ☐ Construction
- ☐ Commercial Litigation
- ☐ Employment
- ☐ Government Liability
- ☐ In-House Counsel
- ☐ Insurance
- ☐ Maritime
- ☐ Product Liability
- ☐ Professional Liability
- ☐ Workers' Compensation

7. ☐ I would like to contribute $150.00, $100.00, $50.00 (minimum $20.00) to fund WDTL's legislative advocacy and outreach program.

I understand that pursuant to Public Law 103-66, this portion of my annual WDTL dues is not deductible from federal income taxes as a business expense

8. Dues $_____ + Legislative Contribution $_____ = TOTAL:$ _____

Please make check payable to: WASHINGTON DEFENSE TRIAL LAWYERS and mail to:

MEMBER SERVICES, 4141 AGATE ROAD, BELLINGHAM, WA 98226

Or fax with credit card information to (206) 202-3776

Payment: ☐MC ☐VC ☐AmEx Expires: ____/____ # _____

Credit Card Authorization Signature _____

Questions? Contact Kristin Lewis,WDTL Executive Director at (206) 749-0319 or kristin@wdtl.org

9. Dated this _____ day of _____, 20 _____

10. Signature of Applicant: _____

Proposed WDTL Events Calendar for 2007-2008 (register online at www.wdtl.org)

October

10-15	DRI Annual Meeting - Washington D.C.
3-24	CLE - Defense Academy II
30	CLE - Government Liability - Preston Gates - Seattle
30	Judges' Reception - Preston Gates - Seattle

November

2	CLE - Joint Idaho/Washington Ethics Seminar – Coeur D' Alene Resort, Idaho
	CLE - Law Practice Management - Puget Sound
	CLE - Update on E-Discovery – Seattle
	CLE - Yakima CLE

December

6	CLE - Ethics followed by WDTL Holiday Party – College Club
7	CLE - Annual Tort Law Update – Seattle
14	CLE - Asbestos Law Update – Seattle

January

22	Judicial Dinner – Tacoma
24-26	CLE - Snowbreak – Sun Valley (in conjunction with SLDO meeting)

February

1	CLE - Annual Update on Construction Law – Seattle

March

	CLE - Annual Update on Construction Law – Portland

April

4	CLE - Insurance Law Update – Seattle
	CLE - Judicial Reception – Spokane
	CLE - Advanced Trial Tactics – Seattle

May

	CLE - Construction Defect Academy – Seattle

July

17-20	Annual Convention - Harrison Hot Springs, B.C.

WDTL
WASHINGTON DEFENSE TRIAL LAWYERS
Fighting for Justice and Balance in Civil Courts