



Carol DeCoursey <cdecoursey@gmail.com>

Re: Please let us known your intentions

1 message

Carol DeCoursey <cdecoursey@gmail.com>

Fri, Feb 25, 2011 at 11:16 AM

To: "Gabel, Andrew J." <GabelA@lanepowell.com>, "Degginger, Grant" <DeggingerG@lanepowell.com>, "McBride, Ryan" <mcbrider@lanepowell.com>

Andrew, Grant, Ryan:

In our last email, we asked questions of you, Grant, the answers to which will affect our decision. Perhaps you do not consider yourself to be our lawyer, as Ryan's and Andrew's names appear on our filings? Since Ryan is not available, and you do not answer our questions, we will spell out our questions more painstakingly and will specifically ask Andrew:

Andrew:

1. If we cross appeal or are seen as cross-appealing by writing an "in the alternative" option, will the attorney fees and costs be covered under CPA, or charged to us, and eventually subtracted by Lane Powell from our damages award?
2. Does the answer to the above question depend on whether we win the cross-appeal/"in the alternative" option of lose?
3. Will the fact that Lane Powell has not filed any motion for CR 11 sanctions argue against our prevailing in our "Windermere has vitiated the CPA through attrition warfare" position? (Be reminded that Brent mentioned Windermere's attrition warfare tactics in his brief on attorney fees/costs.)

Andrew, these are reasonable questions. Could you please answer them?

By the way, Mark and I make it a practice to agree to the emails we send. But right now, I can't get in touch with Mark. So I will send this off without the benefit of his review.

Many thanks,

Carol

On Fri, Feb 25, 2011 at 9:30 AM, Degginger, Grant <DeggingerG@lanepowell.com> wrote:[Carol and Mark,](#)[It's Friday. The brief is due Monday in Olympia. We need your decision today.](#)

From: Carol DeCoursey [mailto:cdecoursey@gmail.com]**Sent:** Friday, February 25, 2011 8:08 AM**To:** Degginger, Grant**Cc:** Gabel, Andrew J.; Mark DeCoursey; McBride, Ryan P.**Subject:** Re: Please let us known your intentions

Grant, Ryan, Andrew, especially Grant:

Throughout this conversation, you have insisted that that we are enjoying a great outcome, without ever

accepting our invitation to "do the math" and showing us the great outcome.

In fact, you anticipate the shortfall in the legal fees and costs will come from our pocket, from our damages award. Tell us why is it OK with you that the shortfall comes out of our pocket, rather than Windermere's?

We warned you about Windermere's attrition warfare program again and again. But you refused to write motions for CR 11 sanctions. Please tell us about Lane Powell's policy of not writing CR 11 motions, and how it serves and protects clients like us who can't write off the losses.

Snow we can take. A snow job we decline to take . . .

You insist what is happening to us is "the law" and recommend we go to the Legislature. But you cannot provide us with any subsection of RCW 19.86 that provides for our situation nor sanctions it. In fact, what is happening to us is contrary to Legislative intent. Read RCW.19.86.920. "Liberally construed" does not mean "vitiating" or "amputated" through litigation attrition warfare. The CPA fee and costs provision was not intended to trap the litigants, to bleed their damages award from them.

Ignoring the truth of what we say will not make it go away. What we're dealing with vis a vis the shortfall that you intend to come out of our pocket is judge-made law, not statutory law. So telling us to go to the Legislature is like telling us to spit in the wind.

We remember being at Lane Powell one day and complaining to Dennis Strasser about Windermere's litigation attrition warfare. He defended the Windermere lawyers, "They are just doing their job," he said. Well, when Windermere runs up huge legal bills and costs for us, and Lane Powell takes the shortfall from our damages, is Windermere just doing its job?

Grant, even if you think we'll have to eat sawdust, don't ask us to believe it's ice cream.

We informed you of Windermere's pattern of abuse of the court system and made the documentation available to you through our webpage, Windermere-Victims.com. We warned you about what was happening, and asked that you protect us against it.

Suppose the Supreme Court heard the question of Windermere's vitiating of the CPA and the public policy impact it has, given the Dept. of Licensing failure/refusal to enforce real estate law. Given Lane Powell's refusal to ask for CR 11 sanctions and failure to mention Windermere's pattern of abuse, are you concerned the Supremes might hear the argument and say: "Too bad, ya'll shudda taken steps to protect yourselves."

And if they do tell us that, what's to worry? Your legal bills would surely be covered by the CPA.

Tell us why the Supreme Court would not be interested in hearing about the vitiating of the CPA. We truly want to know.

And to keep the record straight, in this correspondence, we have not yet stated we have decided against including the "three pages," the contingent "in the alternative" option, or appealing the remand.

Give us answers, and we'll get on with it.

Carol & Mark

On Thu, Feb 24, 2011 at 5:35 PM, Degginger, Grant <DeggingerG@lanepowell.com> wrote:

Carol,

I'm not sure I understood your email. We have already discussed at length why a cross appeal of any kind is not in your best interest. We have explained that a legislative change will be necessary to achieve the outcome you desire. That said, we will need an answer to the question we posed in our email this morning.

Hope the snow isn't too bad in Redmond.

Grant

From: Carol DeCoursey [mailto:cdecoursey@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 24, 2011 10:18 AM
To: Degginger, Grant
Cc: Gabel, Andrew J.; Mark DeCoursey; McBride, Ryan P.
Subject: Re: Please let us known your intentions

Grant--

Thank you for this nice letter. We are glad y'all still like us! Allow us to make a suggestion.

This state needs a real Consumer Protection Act. When a huge, predatory corporation like Windermere vitiates the CPA by litigation attrition warfare and loses, the plaintiffs' attorney fees should be paid by the predator. Those fees should not be deducted from the plaintiffs' damages award.

That's only fair and just. Ryan should not have had to deal with the pettifogging arguments concerning the apportionment of attorney fees. That is rubbish.

The purpose of the legal system is to dispense justice, not provide a gold mine for those who use pettifoggers' tricks to crush the good guys.

This state needs competent people who will stand up for the public good.

Lane Powell does pro bono work. Please consider taking on an aggressive CPA cross-petition to the Supreme Court, pro bono. (That is, no "in the alternative" language.)

There is no chance that the real estate business will be conducted honestly when the Dept. of Licensing holds that using unfair and deceptive practices is not a violation of the real estate laws. Have you seen that famous letter?

<http://renovationtrap.com/dol/081208-dol.pdf>

This is a social policy issue par excellence. Think about, guys. This state needs help. This country needs help.

Grant Degginger for Governor. In the alternative, Ryan McBride for Governor. In the alternative, Andrew Gabel for Governor.

: -)

Carol & Mark

On Thu, Feb 24, 2011 at 9:12 AM, Degginger, Grant <DeggingerG@lanepowell.com> wrote:
[Carol and Mark,](#)

[First, Mark, I wanted to express my condolences over your father's passing and I hope your family found strength by being together in Vancouver over the weekend.](#)

[Second, if we understand your email correctly, we are glad to see that you no longer intend to file the additional three pages of argument that we discussed last week. We continue to strongly believe that your highest priority should be to have the Supreme Court deny review and one of our takeaways from our call last week was that you agreed. However, what we understand your new alternative to be--adding a footnote or an additional sentence in the text requesting "in the alternative" that the Court grant review of the scope of attorneys fees and costs recovery if they grant review of Windemere's appeal--presents the same multiple dilemmas. First, it allows Windemere yet another opportunity to submit a brief in opposition to granting review of your issue. As we have said multiple times, giving Windemere the last word is not in your best interest. Second, the request itself is not legally viable--the reasons for which we discussed at length last week. Finally, merely "slipping it in" to the brief will be insufficient to have the Court give it serious consideration.](#)

We do not wish to withdraw. The brief that Ryan wrote is excellent, and I believe you agree with that. We have thoroughly and seriously considered the points you raised last week. Our best professional judgment is that the brief should be filed as is. We have won at the trial court. We have won at the Court of Appeals. We have repeatedly demonstrated our commitment to your case. We are mindful that in litigation there are no guarantees, however, we have provided you with the best advice we have. We sincerely hope that over the last three years of work for you that we have earned your trust. At the end of the day, the final decision is yours. We ask that you authorize us to file Ryan's brief as it has been written.

I will be heading into a deposition for the better part of the day. Andrew is available if you would like to talk further. I can speak with you late in the day as well.

Grant

From: Carol DeCoursey [mailto:cdecoursey@gmail.com]

Sent: Wednesday, February 23, 2011 2:59 PM

To: McBride, Ryan P.; Gabel, Andrew J.; Degginger, Grant

Cc: Mark DeCoursey

Subject: Please let us known your intentions

Ryan, Andrew, Grant:

Concerning the February 28 deadline on our answer to Windermere's petition before the Supreme Court:

Is it your intention that Lane Powell withdraw as our counsel if we instruct you to broach the subject of Windermere's violation of the Consumer Protection Act through litigation attrition warfare?

As you know, we have suggested that we oppose a hearing by the Court of any of Windermere's issues, but that we add an "in the alternative" clause to the effect that if the Court decides to hear any of Windermere's issues, they hear the violation of the CPA through litigation attrition warfare issue.

We need to know were we sit.

We have no intention of firing y'all!

:-)

However, we need to know if you intend to quit, given instructions as above.

Could we have your answer by close of business, today, Wednesday?

Carol & Mark

This message is private or privileged. If you are not the person for whom this message is intended, please delete it and notify me immediately, and please do not copy or send this message to anyone else.

Please be advised that, if this communication includes federal tax advice, it cannot be used for the purpose of avoiding tax penalties unless you have expressly engaged us to provide written advice in a form that satisfies IRS standards for "covered opinions" or we have informed you that those standards do not apply to this communication.

This message is private or privileged. If you are not the person for whom this message is intended,

please delete it and notify me immediately, and please do not copy or send this message to anyone else.

Please be advised that, if this communication includes federal tax advice, it cannot be used for the purpose of avoiding tax penalties unless you have expressly engaged us to provide written advice in a form that satisfies IRS standards for "covered opinions" or we have informed you that those standards do not apply to this communication.

This message is private or privileged. If you are not the person for whom this message is intended, please delete it and notify me immediately, and please do not copy or send this message to anyone else.

Please be advised that, if this communication includes federal tax advice, it cannot be used for the purpose of avoiding tax penalties unless you have expressly engaged us to provide written advice in a form that satisfies IRS standards for "covered opinions" or we have informed you that those standards do not apply to this communication.