IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF WASHINGTON FOR KING COUNTY

In re INQUEST INTO THE DEATH OF CHARLEENA LYLES,

NO. 517IQ9301

FAMILY'S REPLY REGARDING ADMISSIBLE INQUEST EVIDENCE

I. REPLY

The City and the Officers' opposition to the Paternal Family's motion boils down to two claims: first, that the Family is attempting to "conflate" or "merge" this inquest with the so-called "much broader" civil litigation; and second, that the Family's request is "premature." Both claims misapprehend what the Family is seeking, the purpose and scope of this inquest, and the authority of this Administrator.

As the City and the Officers fully acknowledge, the Administrator has made no ruling yet on the scope of discovery. In fact, the Executive's Order provides that the administrator shall determine the inquest scope *after* consultation with the participating parties. PHL-7-1-2-EO Appendix 1:3.2. The purpose of the Family's motion is to present, as part of that consultation process, those materials in their possession that are in line with the inquest's purpose of ensuring "full, fair, and transparent review of [Charleena's] death, and to issue findings of fact regarding

the facts and circumstances surrounding the death." PHL-7-1-2-EO Appendix 1:2.0. All evidence the Family has requested be admitted is relevant and necessary to ensuring *full*, *fair* and *transparent* review of Charleena's death.

The Family is not seeking "blurred lines" between the inquest and the civil litigation. We only request the admission of relevant discovery that has already been collected in the civil proceeding, some of which may be difficult or impossible to obtain through any other means. This would serve the dual purposes of saving the Administrator and the parties of this inquest the time and resources needed to collect this discovery anew, and ensuring that the inquest review and consider <u>all</u> information and materials relevant to the purpose of the inquest – finding the truth behind the facts and circumstances of Charleena's death.

For example, PHL-7-1-2-EO Appendix 1:4.2 provides that copies of statements of any witnesses obtained by any party is discovery material:

Discovery materials are to be used by the attorneys solely for the inquest proceeding. Such materials include the police and/or agency investigative file of the incident that resulted in the death. They also include the report of the medical examiner, crime laboratory reports, and the names, addresses, and summaries and/or copies of statements of any witnesses obtained by any party.

In the civil litigation, the Family obtained statements and/or deposition testimony from Officers Anderson and McNew, multiple City of Seattle 30(b)(6) designees, Officer Kerry Ziegler, multiple SPD officers who responded to prior interactions with Ms. Lyles, and Solid Ground employees. All of these statements are relevant to the purpose of the Inquest and admissible pursuant to the Executive's Order.

Not surprisingly, the City and the Officers claim the Family's request is "overbroad" by focusing their attention on "the death." This narrow viewpoint is not shared or supported by the Executive's Order, which authorizes inquiry into all the facts and circumstances surrounding a

death involving law enforcement, including "any other factor that touches on the connection between the manner of death and the actions of law enforcement." PHL-7-1-2-EO Appendix 1:6.2. As noted by the Executive, "the term 'involving' is to be construed broadly." *Id*.

The Family acknowledges that the purposes behind the inquest and the civil litigation are not identical. However, as recognized by the Executive's Order, although the purpose of the inquest is not to determine if officers should be disciplined, if the use of force was justified, or whether civil or criminal liability exists, "the facts determined in the course of the inquest may sometimes have an indirect bearing on such determinations." PHL-7-1-2-EO Appendix 1:2.3. The discovery offered by the Family speaks to those facts and is just as relevant to the inquest's purpose as it is to the civil proceeding.

For instance, the Officers argue that training and historical records are irrelevant to the inquest and overbroad. Yet a purpose of the inquest is to determine whether the officers acted pursuant to policy and training. PHL-7-1-2-EO Appendix 1:2.0. Relevant to that analysis is whether the officers were properly trained to respond to a call with notice of a mental health caution. Also relevant to that analysis is whether Charleena's death could have been prevented had the officers followed their policies on less lethal use of force options. Determining whether the officer's acted pursuant to policy and training would be impossible without the City's training policies and records. Again, under the Rules of evidence, all relevant evidence is admissible, except as limited by Constitutional requirements or as otherwise provided by statute, by these rules or by other rules or regulations applicable in the courts of this state. ER 402. ER 401 defines "relevant evidence" as:

¹ It is unclear whether "Seattle Police Officers' Response to the Family's Discovery Request" was intended to respond in any way to the Paternal Family's Motion re Admissible Inquest Evidence, so we address their arguments briefly here.

² The officers admit that they responded "with knowledge that [Charleena] had previously threatened officers, likely in a mental health crisis.

... evidence having a tendency to make the existence of any fact that is of consequence to the determination of the action more probable or less probable than it would be without the evidence.

Finally, the family is not requesting that the Administrator "all but vacate" the protective order in the civil case. The order also protected (and still would protect) information about Charleena's four minor children, Charleena's medical records, unsustained City internal documents, unsustained police internal investigations, and HIPAA protected information from Solid Ground. To the extent the protective order does apply to the discovery materials previously discussed (statements, police documents, etc.), both the protective order and the Executive's Order regarding inquests permit the use of relevant confidential materials with Court's (or in this case the Administrator's) approval. The Executive's Order further provides that discovery materials are not to be used for any purpose, but rather "solely for the inquest proceeding." PHL-7-1-2-EO Appendix 1:4.2. That is all the Family is seeking here.

II. CONCLUSION

For these reasons, the Paternal Family of Charleena Lyles requests admission of relevant evidence previously discovered in *Lyles v. City of Seattle*, 17-2-23731-1 SEA.

Dated this 9th day of September, 2019.



Karen K. Koehler, WSBA #15325 Melanie Nguyen, WSBA #51724 Lisa Benedetti, WSBA #43194 STRITMATTER KESSLER KOEHLER MOORE

and

Edward H. Moore, WSBA #41584 LAW OFFICES OF EDWARD H. MOORE, PC

CERTIFICATION

1

2 I hereby certify that on September 9, 2019, I delivered a copy of the document to which this certification is attached for delivery to all parties of record as follows: 3 **Inquest Program Personnel** U.S. Mail (First Class and Certified) 4 Hon. Michael Spearman Fax Dee Sylve **Process Server** 5 Matt Anderson Electronic Delivery DES-Dept. of Executive Services 401 5th Ave., suite 131 6 Seattle, WA 98104 7 Mailstop: CNK-DES-135 Email: <u>Dee.Sylve@kingcounty.gov</u> Phone (Ms. Sylve): 206.477.6191 8 Email: Matt.Anderson@kingcounty.gov 9 Phone (Mr. Anderson): 206.263.7568 10 Corey Guilmette U.S. Mail (First Class and Certified) Prachi Dave Fax 11 Public Defender's Association **Process Server** 810 Third Avenue, Suite 705 Electronic Delivery 12 Seattle, WA 98104 Email: Corey.Guilmette@defender.org Phone (Mr. Guilmette): 206.641.5334 13 Email: Prachi.Dave@defender.org 14 Phone (Ms. Dave): 610.517.9062 15 Counsel for Tiffany Rogers, Monika Williams, Domico Jones, Jr., Katrina 16 Johnson, Tonya Isabelol (Siblings and **Cousin re Inquest)** 17 Ghazal Sharifi U.S. Mail (First Class and Certified) 18 Jeff Wolf Fax Rebecca Boatright Legal messenger 19 Kelly Nakata (paralegal) Electronic Delivery Jennifer Litfin (legal assistant) Seattle City Attorney's Office 20 Civil Division - Police Action Team 21 701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2050 Seattle, WA 98104-7097 22 Email: Ghazal.Sharifi@seattle.gov Phone (Ms. Sharifi): 206.684.8217 23 Email: Jeff.Wolf@seattle.gov Phone (Mr. Wolf): 206.233.2166 24

FAMILY'S REPLY REGARDING ADMISSIBLE INQUEST EVIDENCE - 5

Email: Rebecca.Boatright@seattle.gov	
Email: Kelly.Nakata@seattle.gov	
Phone (Ms. Nakata): 206.233.2164	
Email: Jennifer.Litfin@seattle.gov	
Phone (Ms. Litfin): 206.684.5939	
Counsel for Seattle Police Department	
Ted Buck	II C Mail (First Class and Cartifical)
Karen Cobb	U.S. Mail (First Class and Certified) Fax
Lisa Smith (paralegal)	Process Server
Frey Buck, PS	Electronic Delivery
1200 5 th Ave, Suite 1900	Electronic Derivery
Seattle, WA 98101	
Email: tbuck@freybuck.com	
Email: kcobb@freybuck.com	
Email: <u>lsmith@freybuck.com</u>	
Phone: 206.486.8000 (main)	
Counsel for Officers Anderson and McNew	
Commissioner Eric Watness	
Ericwatness1@gmail.com	U.S. Mail (First Class and Certified)
	Fax
Personal Representative of the Estate of	Process Server
Charleena Lyles	Electronic Delivery
Charles Lykes	
	/s/ Elodie Daquila
	Elodie Daquila, Paralegal
	STRITMATTER KESSLER
	KOEHLER MOORE