FILED

12 JUL 13 AM 9:00

THE HONORABLE CAROL A. SCHAPIRA KING COUNTY

HEARING DATE: July 13, 2012 at E-100 a.m.

CASE NUMBER: 12-2-21829-3 SEA

SUPERIOR COURT OF WASHINGTON FOR KING COUNTY

GEOFF TATE and **SUSAN TATE**, a married couple

No: 12-2-21829-3 SEA

9 || Coupic

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Plaintiffs,

٧.

DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO STRIKE

EDDIE JACKSON and TERESA GOLDEN-JACKSON, a married couple; SCOTT ROCKENFIELD and MISTY ROCKENFIELD, a married couple; MICHAEL WILTON and KERRIE LYNN WILTON, a married couple; TRI-RYCHE, CORPORATION, a Washington corporation; QUEENSRYCHE MERCHANDISING, INC., a Washington corporation; and MELODISC LTD., a Washington corporation.

Defendants.

TO: CLERK OF THE ABOVE COURT

AND TO: PLAINTIFFS AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD

COMES NOW Defendants EDDIE JACKSON and TERESA GOLDEN-JACKSON,
SCOTT ROCKENFIELD and MISTY ROCKENFIELD, MICHAEL WILTON and KERRIE
LYNN WILTON, TRI-RYCHE, CORPORATION, QUEENSRYCHE MERCHANDISING, INC.,
and MELODISC LTD., by and through their atterney of record. Themas T. Osinski, ir. of

and **MELODISC LTD**., by and through their attorney of record, Thomas T. Osinski Jr. of

DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO STRIKE - 1 of 4

Osinski Law Offices, P.L.L.C. 535 Dock St. Suite 108, Tacoma, Washington 98402 Tel (253) 383-4433 | Fax (253) 572-2223 | tto@osinskilaw.com

1	Osinski Law Offices P.L.L.C., and submit the following response and objection to the issuance
2	of a preliminary injunction.
3	I. RELIEF REQUESTED
4	Defendants request that Plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction be denied.
5	II. STATEMENT OF FACTS
6	III. ISSUES PRESENTED
7	A. Should the Declaration of Lars Sorenson be Struck? No
8	1. Was it Timely? Yes.
9	2. Was there an agreement to not submit further probative evidence to the
10	court if it was timely? No.
11	
12	B. Should the last 7 pages of Defendant's reply be struck? No
13	Is this a complex matter which cannot be properly addressed within a 12
14	page limit? Yes
15	2. Have Plaintiffs waived any right to challenge the over-length nature of the
16	Response by not raising the issue until noon before the hearing day and submitting an answer
17	anyways.? Yes
18	IV. EVIDENCE RELIED UPON
19	This response relies on the sworn declaration of Counsel Thomas T. Osinski Jr.
20	V. LEGAL AUTHORITIES
21	SORENSON DECLARATION SHOULD NOT BE STRUCK
22	KCLR 4(d) requires opposing documents to be submitted no later than noon, two court
23	days before the hearing. The Sorenson declaration was submitted well before that deadline
24	for the July 13, 2012 hearing. Moreover, the Sorenson Declaration is only 3 pages and is of
25	immense probative value as Lars Sorenson was Queensryche's manager from 2001-2005.

Defendants had been working diligently to procure Lars Sorenson's declaration, along with others, given the immense importance of this preliminary injunction motion and the shortened time frame. See <u>Declaration of Counsel</u>. The Sorenson declaration was obtained in the early evening of July 7, 2012. See <u>id</u>. It was filed and served through the county's eservice as soon as possible. See <u>id</u>. This gave Plaintiffs' more than the required 24 hours time before reply to review the Declaration and respond. Thus, there could be no prejudice. Additionally, the parties had already agreed to a continuance, and the issue of further submissions from Defendants was not discussed as part of that agreement. See <u>id</u>.

Thus due to its great probative value, and its timeliness, the Lars Sorenson Declaration should be admitted. And, even if it is struck, no claim for attorney's fees should be imposed as it was technically timely and no agreement was made otherwise.

The Last 7 Pages of Defendants' Response Should not be struck.

Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction was roughly 75 pages with declarations, and required an analysis of several legal standards, as well as copious facts due to the 30 year history of Queensryche. As such it could not be adequately addressed with 12 pages alone.

Counsel readily admits that it was not aware of the 12 page limit in the local rules and meant no disrespect to the court. See <u>Declaration of Counsel</u>. The granting of this injunction would be very detrimental to Defendants, and the likelihood of success on the merits standard is higher than summary judgment here, given the shortened timeframe and limited discovery. Therefore, it was impossible to adequately address the merits of Plaintiffs' motion in less pages than were submitted. See id.

Moreover, Plaintiffs have not articulated any prejudice, and have in fact already responded with a Reply in excess of five pages of their own, accompanied by 10 declarations totaling over 40 pages. See Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Reply in Support of Motion for

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24

25

Preliminary injunction. This belies any claim of prejudice. Additionally, Plaintiffs have had Defendants' response since Sunday, yet only raised this concern now, effectively waving any objection to the excess length. See Declaration of Counsel. And any prejudice should have been resolved by the continuance, which Counsel understood to resolve all issues. See id.

Defendants simply wish to have as much probative and relevant information before the court as possible before making a decision of such importance to the future of the Queensryche Entities.

CONCLUSION

Be it the Declaration of former manager Lars Sorenson, or the over length of the Response, Defendants are only trying to offer as much probative and relevant evidence and analysis to the court as it can. Although the Preliminary Injunction Motion is brought according to standard motion timelines, and at the outset of this litigation, granting of this motion will have massive impact on the Queensryche Entities, stopping them dead in their tracks. Therefore, all relevant and probative information should be considered, and Plaintiffs' motion to strike should be DENIED.

SIGNED this 12th day of July, 2012.

OSINSKI LAW OFFICES P.L.L.C.

Thu Thum

Thomas T. Osinski, Jr., Esq. Attorney for Defendants

WSBA #34154