July 18 2024 2:06 PM

The Honorable STANLEY J. RUMBAUGH CONSTANCE R. WHITE

COUNTY CLERK NO: 22-2-10005-8

3

1

2

4

5

6 7

8

9 10

11 12

13

VS.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

HANSEN DECL ISO PRELIMINARY APPROVAL. - 1

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF PIERCE

LEE ANNE REDMOND, individually, and on behalf of those similarly situated, and DENNIS DOWDS, individually, and on behalf of those similarly situation,

Plaintiffs,

LIBERTY MUTUAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY and LM GENERAL INSURANCE COMPANY,

Defendants.

NO. 22-2-10005-8

SECOND CORRECTED DECLARATION OF STEPHEN M. HANSEN ISO PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT

(REPLACES DECLARATION OF STEPHEN M. HANSEN DATED & **FILED ON JULY 3, 2024)**

HEARING DATE: July 19, 2024

I, STEPHEN M. HANSEN, HEREBY DECLARE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY AS FOLLOWS:

- I am one of the attorneys for the above-named Plaintiff. I submit this declaration 1. based upon personal knowledge and in support of the motion for certification of this case as a settlement class and preliminary approval of a class-wide settlement.
- 2. On November 7, 2022 Plaintiff Lee Anne Redmond filed a Class Action Complaint in the above-entitled matter against Liberty Mutual alleging causes of action for breach of contract based upon Liberty Mutual's alleged failure to properly and fairly assess

Law Offices of STEPHEN M. HANSEN, P.S. 3800 Bridgeport Way W, Suite A, PMB 5 University Place, Washington 98466 (253) 302-5955; (253) 301-1147 Fax

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25 26

claims for diminished value and to pay her and Class Members (as hereinafter defined) for the amount that their vehicles' decreased in value as a result of property damage to their vehicles under the statutorily mandated wording of the Underinsured Motorist Property Damage (UMPD) coverage.

- 3. Ms. Redmond is a first-party insured who alleges that she purchased UMPD coverage with Liberty Mutual. Ms. Redmond's Complaint alleged that her insuring agreement, and the insuring agreement for the putative Class Members, is the statutorily mandated UMPD language, and that this language has been held to cover the loss of market value of her vehicles after repair consistent with WPI 30.12, and that as such she, and members of the proposed Class, are entitled to recover any loss in value of their vehicles as of the time of their accidents.
- 4. The initial Complaint was filed in this Court on November 7, 2022, but the attempted service "bounced back" from the Washington Office of Insurance Commissioner because "Liberty Mutual General Insurance Company" was not a listed company (the correct defendant was "LM General Insurance Company"). Meanwhile, Defense Counsel filed a notice of appearance on November 17, 2022 on behalf of the same (misnamed) entity "Liberty Mutual General Insurance Company."
- 5. Ms. Redmond subsequently filed a First Amended Complaint on March 16, 2023, with Defense Counsel accepting service for both entities; the now correctly named LM General Insurance Company and Liberty Mutual Fire Insurance Company. Both Liberty Mutual entities appeared through counsel and then moved for summary judgment against Ms. Redmond on May 18, 2023. Plaintiff served discovery to be taken prior to resolution of the 30(b)(6) and documents. Documents were provided, and a 30(b)(6) designee, Mr. LaValle, was provided by Liberty Mutual.

- 6. Plaintiff filed her opposition on September 5, 2023, and Liberty Mutual their reply on September 11, 2023. On September 15, 2023, after oral argument this Court denied Liberty Mutual's MSJ. Liberty Mutual then filed a Motion for Discretionary Review, which was fully briefed.
- 7. While Liberty Mutual's Motion for Discretionary Review was pending, a motion for leave to file a Second Amended Complaint was filed, adding Dennis Dowds, an insured of LM General Insurance Company, as an additional proposed Class Representative. The Motion was granted on November 27, 2023. Oral argument before Division II occurred on December 13, 2024, and on January 3,2024 Division II rejected discretionary review.
- 8. While the Motion for Discretionary Review was pending, Plaintiffs served additional class certification discovery on Liberty Mutual.
- 9. In conjunction with Liberty Mutual's Motion for Discretionary review, the parties discussed the possibility of some type of resolution for the proposed Class, the available data, and exchanges regarding the legal issues involving Liberty Mutual's policy language and claims practices. Upon the rejection of Liberty Mutual's Motion for Discretionary Review, the parties renewed their discussions, and Liberty Mutual having preliminary determined in response to Plaintiff's discovery request for a class list that the proposed Settlement Class will contain approximately 600 claims, the parties agreed upon resolution at the same per claim figure (\$800 per claims) and applicable terms as in prior similar settlements with insurers in Washington. This results in a settlement fund of roughly \$480,000 (a figure to be updated given the number of claims on the final class list to be provided if preliminary approval is granted) for disbursement to eligible Class Members who present a timely claim. The amount of this settlement fund was based on settlement amounts and methodology used in or arising out of mediated class action

9.