	Case 2:20-cv-00193 Docum	nent 1 Filed 02/07/20 Page 1 of 5			
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6		S DISTRICT COURT			
7	WESTERN DISTRICT OF	WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE			
8	CLAIRE DOUGLAS, et al.,	Case No.:			
9 10	Plaintiffs, v.	(King County Superior Court Case No. 19-2-31028-6 SEA)			
10	BANK OF AMERICA, N.A., U.S. BANK	DEFENDANT KEY CORP.'S NOTICE OF			
12	NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, and KEYCORP, national banking associations,	REMOVAL TO FEDERAL COURT			
12	Defendants.				
14	Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332, 144	1, et. seq., and Local Civil Rule 101 Defendant			
15	KeyCorp. hereby removes this action to the U	United States District Court for the Western District			
16	of Washington from the Superior Court for t	the State of Washington in and for the County of			
17	King, where the action is now pending, and in	n support thereof state as follows:			
18	I. State Court Ac	ction Being Removed			
19	1. KeyCorp. is named as a Defen	dant in a civil action filed in the Superior Court of			
20	Washington, in and for King County, styled as Claire Douglas, et. al. v. Bank of America, N.A.,				
21	U.S. Bank National Association, and KeyCo	rp., national banking associations, Case No. 19-2-			
22	31028-6 SEA ("State Court Action").				
23	2. A Complaint was filed in the	State Court Action on November 21, 2019 and a			
24	First Amended Complaint, which named	KeyCorp. a defendant, was filed on or about			
25	December 20, 2019. The FAC names four	individuals – Claire Douglas, Mary Joan Isabell,			
26	Heather Carlon, and Gina Pawolski – as plai	intiffs (the "Plaintiffs"). A true and correct copy of			
	NOTICE OF REMOVAL (U.S. DIST. COURT) – 1	McDougald Law Group P.S. 400 108th Avenue NE, Suite 510			

Bellevue, Washington 98004 425-455-2060 the operative First Amended Complaint is filed contemporaneously with this Notice of Removal and is attached pursuant to Local Civil Rule 101(b)(1) as **Exhibit 1**.

II. Diversity Jurisdiction

3. The State Court Action may be removed to this Court in accordance with 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332 and 1441 because this Court has original jurisdiction over this action between citizens of different states when the amount in controversy is over \$75,000 as presented in Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint.

4. Diversity jurisdiction under § 1332 requires complete diversity of citizenship, each of the plaintiffs must be a citizen of a different state than each of the defendants. (*Morris v. Princess Cruises, Inc.*, 236 F.3d 1061, 1067 (9th Cir.2001).)

5. Plaintiffs are all citizens of Washington State who alleged causes of action against an Ohio national banking association (KeyCorp.), a North Carolina national banking association (Bank of America), as well as a national banking association that is a citizen of the state of Minnesota and Ohio for purposes of diversity jurisdiction (U.S. Bank). Each Plaintiff is a citizen of a different state than each Defendant. Complete diversity exists between the parties. (28 U.S.C. § 1332(c).)

6. As for the amount in controversy, Plaintiffs allege that Defendants are holding funds once deposited with the non-party Rainier Bank and are wrongfully declining to release those deposits, with interest, to Plaintiffs. According to their First Amended Complaint, Plaintiffs seek damages for their alleged loss of principal, loss of interest, attorneys' fees, and related costs of litigation as to 40 currently unidentified individuals.

7. Plaintiffs allege that interest has been accruing on each deposit for each Plaintiff for more than 30 years in an amount that exceeds 9.40 percent. (Exhibit 1 at pp. 20-26.) Also, Plaintiffs allege a cause of action under the Washington Consumer Protection Act, which carries the possibility of treble damages up to \$25,000 per plaintiff. (RCW 19.86.090.)

NOTICE OF REMOVAL (U.S. DIST. COURT) - 2

Multiplied by each named Plaintiff, the amount in controversy is at least \$75,000 as to Plaintiffs' claims. (28 U.S.C. § 1332.)

III. Supplemental Jurisdiction of Other Plaintiffs

8. Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint purports to also allege claims on behalf of 40 currently unnamed individual citizens of the state of Washington. The First Amended Complaint alleges that Defendants are also holding funds once deposited with the non-party Rainier Bank but are declining to release those deposits to the currently unnamed Plaintiffs. Those parties' alleged claims are each related to and arise out of the same common nucleus of operative facts as the claims stated above by Plaintiffs. Therefore, these remaining parties are subject to the supplemental jurisdiction of this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(b), as being part of the same case or controversy.

9. Supplemental jurisdiction over claims by parties joined under FRCP 20 for convenience is allowed. (*Stromberg Metal Works v. Press Mechanical*, 77 F.3d 928, 932 (7th Cr. 1996); *see also In re Abbott Lab.*, 51 F.3d 524 (5th Cir. 1995).)

IV. Timeliness of Removal

10. A notice of removal must be filed within thirty (30) days after receipt of service of the complaint. (28 U.S.C. § 1446(b).) A defendant's window in which to file a Notice of Removal opens, according to 28 U.S. Code § 1446, when the defendant receives the relevant pleading "through service or otherwise." (*See Anderson v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company*, 917 F.3d 1126, 1129 (9th Cir.2019).)

11. KeyCorp. received Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint via email on from Plaintiffs' counsel on January 8, 2020. Accordingly, the removal is timely.

NOTICE OF REMOVAL (U.S. DIST. COURT) - 3

McDougald Law Group P.S. 400 108th Avenue NE, Suite 510 Bellevue, Washington 98004 425-455-2060

V. Consent

12. KeyCorp. has conferred with Defendants and confirms that no Defendants object to removal.

13. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(a), KeyCorp. files this Notice in the District Court of the United States for the district and division within which the State Court Action is pending. A copy of this Notice of Removal will be promptly served upon Plaintiffs and Defendants and filed with the Clerk of the Superior Court of the State of Washington, County of King. (28 U.S.C. § 1446(a) and (d).)

14. By this Notice of Removal and the associated attachments, KeyCorp. does not waive any objections they may have as to service, jurisdiction or venue, or any other defenses or objections they may have to this action. KeyCorp. intends no admission of fact, law, or liability by this Notice, and expressly reserves all defenses, motions, pleas, and challenges.

WHEREFORE, the State Court Action is removed from the State Court to this United States District Court, for the Western District of Washington, and removing Defendants pray that this District Court proceed, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1441, as well as any other relevant and applicable law, as if this Action had been originally filed in this District Court, and that the proceedings in the State Court be stayed in all respects.

Dated this 7th day of February 2020.

MCDOUGALD LAW GROUP P.S.

/s/Shannon L McDougald /s/Trent M Latta Shannon L. McDougald, WSBA No. 24231 Trent M. Latta WSBA No. 42360 *Counsel to KeyCorp*

1

NOTICE OF REMOVAL (U.S. DIST. COURT) - 4

McDougald Law Group P.S. 400 108th Avenue NE, Suite 510 Bellevue, Washington 98004 425-455-2060

	Case 2:20-cv-00193 Docume	nt 1 Filed 02/07/20 Page 5 of 5				
1	CERTIFICATE	E OF SERVICE				
2	I hereby certify under the penalty of perjury under	the laws of the State of Washington that on the				
3	I hereby certify under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that on the date below, I cause a true and correct copy of KEY CORP.'S NOTICE OF REMOVAL TO					
4						
	FEDERAL COURT to be transmitted to the following the follo	lowing parties via email:				
5 6	Eric Harrison	Alexandra P Johnston				
	Attorney West Seattle, P.S.	Shawn J Larsen-Bright				
7	5400 California Ave. SW Ste E	Dorsey & Whitney				
8	Seattle, WA 98136 Tel: 206-745-3738	701 Fifth Avenue Suite 6100				
9	eric@attorneywestseattle.com Richard E. Spoonemore	Suite 0100 Seattle, WA 98104-7043 Tel: 425-736-5573				
10	Chris R. Youtz	Tel: 206-903-8800				
11	Sirianni Youtz Spoonemore Hamburger PLLC 3101 Western Avenue, Suite 350	johnston.alex@dorsey.com Larsen.bright.shawn@dorsey.com				
12	Seattle, WA 98121 Tel: 206-223-0303	<u>Laisen.origin.snawn e dorsey.com</u>				
13	Fax: 206-223-0246					
	<u>cyoutz@sylaw.com</u>					
14	rspoonemore@sylaw.com Attorney for Claimants	Attorneys for Defendant US Bankcorp				
15		Ruomeys for Defendant OS Bankcorp				
16	Kelly D. Folger Garrett Williams					
17	Andrews Lagasse Branch + Bell LLP 601 West 1 st Avenue, Suite 1400					
18	Spokane, WA 99201					
19	Tel: 509-828-4408					
17	Fax: 509-828-4407 kfolger@albblaw.com					
20	gwilliams@albblaw.com					
21	Attorney for Defendant Bank of America					
22	DATED this 7 th day of February, 2020.					
23		CRF				
24		Elena Grout				
25		Elella Olout				
26						
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE – 1	MCDOUGALD LAW GROUP P.S. 400 108th Ave. NE, Suite 510				

Ш

П

Bellevue, Washington 98004 Phone: (425) 455-2060

EXHIBIT 1

Notice of Removal to Federal Court

	Case 2:20-cv-00193 Document 1-1 F	Filed 02/07/20 Page 2 of 27				
1		The Honorable Marshall Ferguson				
2						
3						
4						
5						
6	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF WASHI	NGTON FOR KING COUNTY				
7	CLAIRE DOUGLAS, MARY JOAN ISABELL,					
8	HEATHER CARLON, and GINA PAWOLSKI	NO. 19-2-31028-6 SEA				
9	individually, on behalf of similarly situated individuals,					
10	Plaintiffs,	FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT (CLASS ACTION)				
11	V.					
12	BANK OF AMERICA, N.A., U.S. BANK					
13 14	NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, and KEYCORP, national banking associations					
15	Defendant.					
16	I. PARTIE	S				
17	1. Claire Douglas. Plaintiff Claire	Douglas, formerly known as Claire				
18	Asuncion, is the registered co-owner of a bank	bond issued by Rainier National Bank.				
19	Ms. Douglas is a resident of Snohomish County,	Washington.				
20	2. <i>Mary Joan Isabell.</i> Plaintiff Mary Joan Isabell is the registered owner of a					
21	bank certificate issued by Seattle First National Bank. Ms. Isabell is a resident of King					
22	County, Washington.					
23	3. <i>Heather Carlon.</i> Plaintiff Heather	Carlon, formerly known as Heather				
24	Bruntlett, is the registered owner of a bank be	ond issued by Rainier National Bank.				
25	Ms. Carlon is a resident of Spokane County, Was	shington.				
26						
	FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT (CLASS ACTION) – 1	SIRIANNI YOUTZ SPOONEMORE HAMBURGER PLLC 3101 Western Avenue, Suite 350 Seattle, Washington 98121 Tel. (206) 223-0303 Fax (206) 223-0246				

4. *Gina Pawolski*. Plaintiff Gina Pawolski, formerly known as Gina Mosley,
 is the registered owner of a bond issued by Rainier National Bank. Ms. Pawolski is a
 resident of Spokane County, Washington.

5. 4 Bank of America. Defendant Bank of America, N.A. ("Bank of America"), 5 is a national banking association with its corporate headquarters in Charlotte, North 6 Carolina. Bank of America is regulated by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, 7 an independent bureau of the United States Department of the Treasury. Bank of 8 America holds a successor interest in Rainier National Bank ("Rainier Bank"), including 9 certain of its assets, liabilities and obligations. Bank of America also holds a successor 10 interest in Seattle-First National Bank ("Seattle-First"), including Seattle-First's assets, 11 liabilities and obligations. Bank of America has, at all relevant times, maintained offices 12 and transacted business in Washington State, including King County.

13 6. U.S. Bank National Association. Defendant U.S. Bank National 14 Association ("U.S. Bank"), is a national banking association with its corporate 15 headquarters in Cincinnati, Ohio. U.S. Bank is regulated by the Office of the Comptroller 16 of the Currency, an independent bureau of the United States Department of the Treasury. 17 U.S. Bank holds a successor interest in Rainier National Bank ("Rainier Bank"), including 18 certain of its assets, liabilities and obligations. U.S. Bank also holds a successor interest in Seattle-First National Bank ("Seattle-First"), including certain of its assets, liabilities 19 20 and obligations. U.S. Bank has, at all relevant times, maintained offices and transacted 21 business in Washington State, including King County.

KeyCorp. Defendant KeyCorp ("Key Bank") is a national banking
association with its corporate headquarters in Cleveland, Ohio. Key Bank is regulated
by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, an independent bureau of the United
States Department of the Treasury. Key Bank holds a successor interest in Rainier
National Bank ("Rainier Bank"), including certain of its assets, liabilities and obligations.

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT (CLASS ACTION) - 2

Key Bank also holds a successor interest in Seattle-First National Bank ("Seattle-First"),
 including certain of its assets, liabilities and obligations. Key Bank has, at all relevant
 times, maintained offices and transacted business in Washington State, including King
 County.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

8.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

Jurisdiction of this Court arises pursuant to RCW 2.08.010.

9. Venue is proper under RCW 4.12.025, because Bank of America, U.S. Bank and Key Bank (collectively "Defendant Banks") all reside or may be found in this district, transact business in this district, and a substantial part of the events giving rise to the claim occurred in this district.

III. NATURE OF THE CASE

This case arises out of the failure of the Defendant Banks to honor time 12 10. 13 deposit investments issued by their respective predecessor entities, Rainier Bank (all 14 Defendant Banks) and Seattle-First (Bank of America). Plaintiffs and members of the 15 class sought herein deposited money in exchange for bank bonds, bills, certificates, time 16 deposits, CDs, and multiple maturity non-negotiable time certificate of deposits 17 (together "Bond" or "Bonds") issued by Seattle-First National Bank and Rainier National 18 Bank. The terms on the Bonds require the registered owner to surrender the original 19 Bond to redeem their principal and unpaid interest. Defendant Banks acquired certain 20 assets, liabilities and obligations of Rainier National Bank. Bank of America acquired the 21 assets, liabilities and obligations of Seattle-First National Bank. As part of these 22 acquisitions, Defendant Banks were required to honor the Bonds. Recently, Plaintiffs 23 went to the Defendant Banks to surrender their Bonds and withdraw their money, but 24 the Defendant Banks refused to honor the Bonds. Bank of America has previously been 25 sued multiple times for their failure to redeem Rainier National Bank Bonds. In one case, 26 Poletti v. Bank of America, King County Superior Court Judge Douglas A. North held that

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT (CLASS ACTION) - 3

Bank of America breached their contract and ordered Bank of America to pay the holder
of the Bond. Nevertheless, Bank of America and the other bank defendants continue to
tell Plaintiffs and other members of the class that their Bonds are worthless and that they
have no value. Plaintiffs, and the class they seek to represent, seek remedies for the
Defendant Banks' breaches of contract as well as remedies under the Washington State
Consumer Protection Act.

IV. CLASS ALLEGATIONS

11. *Definition of Class.* Plaintiffs propose certification of the following class:

All individuals who acquired a bank bond, bill, certificate, time deposit, CD, and multiple maturity non-negotiable time certificate of deposit ("Bond") from Seattle-First or Rainer Bank where the following conditions are met: (i) the Bond automatically renews unless redeemed or a notice of nonrenewal is provided by the issuer under the terms of the Bond; (ii) the owner or legal beneficiary has not redeemed the Bond; and (iii) the owner or legal beneficiary received no notification that the Bond was not being renewed, was abandoned, and/or had escheated to the State of Washington.

12. *Size of Class*. The class is expected to exceed 40 individuals and is so large that joinder of all members is impracticable. Based on the serial numbers on the Bonds litigated to date, Rainer Bank and Seattle-First issued thousands of Bonds prior to their acquisition by Defendant Banks. It is not uncommon for Bonds to be lost or misplaced, or to have the owner of the Bond leave the instrument for heirs to redeem. Since 1998, Bank of America has been sued at least five times by 34 individuals for failing to honor similar Bonds. When presented with a demand for payment, and in litigation, the Defendant Banks have consistently and uniformly taken the position that they have no obligation on any of the Bonds issued to Plaintiffs or other holders of similar Bonds issued by Seattle-First or Rainer Bank. In addition, Defendant Banks have taken the additional step of knowingly misrepresenting to Plaintiffs, and other holders of similar

Bonds, that their money had escheated to Washington State's Unclaimed Property 1 2 Division and/or that their Bonds are worthless and that they have no value.

З

7

9

10

11

13. *Class Representative Douglas.* Named Plaintiff Douglas is a member the 4 proposed class. Plaintiff Douglas's claims are typical of the claims of the other members 5 of the class and she will fairly and adequately represent the interests of the class. 6 Specifically, she acquired a Bond from Rainer Bank that automatically renewed, never redeemed the Bond, and never received notification that the Bond was not being 8 renewed, was abandoned, and/or had escheated to the State of Washington. When Plaintiff Douglas attempted to redeem the Bond in the fall of 2018, Bank of America refused to honor the instrument. In addition, Bank of America told Plaintiff Douglas that her money had escheated to Washington State's Unclaimed Property Division.

14. 12 Class Representative Isabell. Named Plaintiff Isabell is a member the 13 proposed class. Plaintiff Isabell's claims are typical of the claims of the other members of 14 the class and she will fairly and adequately represent the interests of the class. 15 Specifically, she acquired a Bond from Seattle-First that automatically renewed, never 16 redeemed the Bond, and never received notification that the Bond was not being 17 renewed, was abandoned, and/or had escheated to the State of Washington. When 18 Plaintiff Isabell attempted to redeem the Bond at the Bank of America branch office near 19 Seward Park, Bank of America refused to honor the instrument. In addition, Bank of 20 America told Plaintiff Isabell that her money had escheated to Washington State's 21 Unclaimed Property Division.

22 15. Class Representative Carlon. Named Plaintiff Carlon is a member the 23 proposed class. Plaintiff Carlon's claims are typical of the claims of the other members 24 of the class and she will fairly and adequately represent the interests of the class. 25 Specifically, she acquired a Bond from Rainier Bank that automatically renewed, never 26 redeemed the Bond, and never received notification that the Bond was not being

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT (CLASS ACTION) - 5

1 renewed, was abandoned, and/or had escheated to the State of Washington. When 2 Plaintiff Carlon attempted to redeem the Bond at the Key Bank branch office in Spokane, З Key Bank refused to honor the instrument.

4 16. *Class Representative Pawolski*. Named Plaintiff Pawolski is a member the proposed class. Plaintiff Pawolski's claims are typical of the claims of the other members 6 of the class and she will fairly and adequately represent the interests of the class. Specifically, she acquired a Bond from Rainier Bank that automatically renewed, never redeemed the Bond, and never received notification that the Bond was not being renewed, was abandoned, and/or had escheated to the State of Washington. When Plaintiff Pawolski attempted to redeem the Bond at the U.S. Bank branch office in Spokane, U.S. Bank refused to honor the instrument.

17. 12 *Common Questions of Law and Fact*. This action requires a determination 13 of whether Defendant Banks' policies and practices with respect to honoring the Bonds 14 issued by Seattle-First and Rainer Bank violates the Bond, and/or are anticipatory 15 breaches of the terms of those contracts. Adjudication of this issue will in turn determine whether the Defendant Banks are liable for their conduct. 16

17 18. Separate suits would create a risk of varying conduct requirements. The 18 prosecution of separate actions by class members against the Defendant Banks would 19 create a risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual class 20 members that would establish incompatible standards of conduct. Certification is 21 therefore proper under Civil Rule 23(b)(1).

22 19. Defendants have acted on grounds generally applicable to the relevant 23 *class.* By failing to provide notice to Plaintiffs and the class, failing to honor demands 24 for payment, failing to escheat funds to the State of Washington and by misrepresenting 25 to Plaintiffs and the class that their money had escheated to Washington State's 26 Unclaimed Property Division and/or that their Bonds are worthless and that they have

5

7

8

9

10

11

no value, Defendant Banks have acted on grounds generally applicable to all class
members. Declaratory and injunctive relief is appropriate to enforce the terms and
conditions of the Bonds, as well as the Defendant Banks' legal obligations under law.
Certification is therefore proper under Civil Rule 23(b)(2).

5 20. Questions of law and fact common to the class predominate over 6 *individual issues.* The claims of the individual class members are more efficiently 7 adjudicated on a class-wide basis. Many Bonds are less than \$1,000, rendering individual 8 actions uneconomical. Any interest that individual members of the classes may have in 9 individually controlling the prosecution of separate actions is outweighed by the efficiency of the class action mechanism. Upon information and belief, there is no 10 11 pending class action suit filed against Bank of America, U.S. Bank or Key Bank for the 12 same relief requested in this action. Issues as to Defendant Banks' conduct in applying 13 standard policies and practices towards all members of each class predominate over 14 questions, if any, unique to members of the class. Certification is therefore additionally 15 proper Civil Rule 23(b)(3).

16 21. Venue. This action can be most efficiently prosecuted as a class action in
 17 King County, Washington, where Defendant Banks do business, the Bonds were issued,
 18 and where several Plaintiffs reside.

19 22. Class Counsel. Plaintiffs have retained experienced and competent class
 20 counsel.

V. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

22 23. In 1983, BankAmerica acquired Seattle-First. The acquisition included
 23 Seattle-First's deposits and obligations on Bonds and certificates issued by Seattle-First
 24 branches, including the branches that issued Bonds to Plaintiff Isabell and certain
 25 members of the class. BankAmerica would later be renamed Bank of America

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT (CLASS ACTION) - 7

21

26

In 1987, Security Pacific Corporation acquired Rainier Bank, including all
 of Rainier Bank's deposits and obligations on Bonds issued by Rainier Bank branches. In
 1992, Security Pacific Corporation merged with BankAmerica to create Bank of America.
 The merger included Rainier Bank deposits and obligations on Bonds issued by certain
 Rainier Bank branches, including the branches that issued Bonds to Plaintiff Douglas
 and certain members of the class.

7 25. As part of the merger between Security Pacific Corporation and
8 BankAmerica, the United States Department of Justice required the newly-formed Bank
9 of America to divest to other banks several former Rainier Bank branches.

26. West One Bankcorp purchased several Rainier Bank branches from Bank
of America. West One Bankcorp's purchase included the branches' deposits and
obligations on Bonds issued by the branches it acquired. In 1995, West One Bankcorp
merged all its assets and liabilities with U.S. Bankcorp of Portland to create Defendant
U.S. Bank. The merger included the deposits and obligations on Bonds issued by the
certain Rainier Bank branches, including the branch that issued a Bond to Plaintiff
Pawolski and certain members of the class.

17 27. Key Bank purchased several Rainier Bank branches from Bank of America.
18 Key Bank's purchase included the branches' deposits and obligations on Bonds issued
19 by the Rainier Bank branches, including the branch that issued a Bond to Plaintiff Carlon
20 and certain members of the class.

21 28. Defendant Banks are successors in interest to the Rainier Bank Bonds held
22 by certain plaintiffs and members of the class. Bank of America is successor in interest to
23 the Seattle-First Bonds held by certain plaintiffs and member of the class.

24 29. Defendant Banks earned interest and received benefits from holding the
assets underlying the Rainier Bank-issued Bonds. Bank of America earned interest and
received benefits from holding the assets underlying the Seattle-First issued Bonds.

1 30. The terms for withdrawing the funds are stated on the face of the 2 instruments in a paragraph titled "Withdrawal." On many of the Rainer Bank Bonds, the 3 paragraph states that the principal amount and any accrued interest will be paid to the 4 owner "upon presentation and surrender of this Rainier BankBond." Likewise, on the 5 Seattle-First Bonds, it provides that "[t]he funds deposited and any unpaid interest will 6 be paid to the registered owner on withdrawal."

7 31. On December 30, 1982, Rainier Bank issued Rainier Bank Bond No. 232598 8 ("Bond No. 232598") to David or Claire Asuncion with right of survivorship ("registered 9 owners") for funds deposited with the bank in the principal amount of \$500.00. Bond 10 No. 232598 was issued by the Totem Lake Branch of Rainier Bank. Plaintiff Claire 11 Douglas's maiden name is Claire Asuncion. Bond No. 232598 is attached to this First 12 Amended Complaint as *Exhibit* 1. Bond 232598 has not been paid or redeemed. Plaintiff 13 Douglas's father David Asuncion, co-owner of the Bond, has continuously resided at the 14 address that appears on the face of the Bond. Plaintiff Douglas has the right to redeem 15 the Bond.

32. Rainier Bank never gave Plaintiff Douglas or her father David Asuncion
notice Bond No. 232598 was not being renewed. Rainier Bank never gave Plaintiff
Douglas or her father David Asuncion notice that it considered Bond No. 232598, or the
funds behind the Bond, to be abandoned. Rainier Bank never escheated Bond
No. 232598, or the funds behind the Bond, to the State of Washington.

33. Defendant Banks never gave Plaintiff Douglas or her father David
Asuncion notice that Bond No. 232598 was not being renewed. Defendant Banks never
gave Plaintiff Douglas or her father David Asuncion notice that they considered Bond
No. 232598, or the funds behind the Bond, to be abandoned. Defendant Banks never
escheated Bond No. 232598, or the funds behind the Bond, to the State of Washington.

26

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT (CLASS ACTION) - 9

Bank of America is still in possession of the principal and interest owed on Bond
 No. 232598.

3 34. In the fall of 2018, Plaintiff Douglas made a demand upon Bank of America
 4 to honor Bond No. 232598. Bank of America refused to honor the Bond. Bank of America
 5 knowingly misrepresented to Plaintiff Douglas that the money was sent to unclaimed
 6 property.

7 35. Plaintiff Douglas spent time and money investigating Bank of America's
8 misrepresentations that her money had been sent to unclaimed property.

36. On December 1, 1983, Seattle-First issued Seattle-First Certificate
No. 00076309 ("Certificate No. 00076309") to Mary Joan Isabell for funds deposited with
the bank in the principal amount of \$200.00. Certificate No. 00076309 was issued by
Seattle First's Head Office. Certificate No. 00076309 is attached to this First Amended
Complaint as *Exhibit 2*. The Bond has not been paid or redeemed. Plaintiff Isabell has
continuously resided at the address that appears on the face of the Bond. Plaintiff Isabell
has the right to redeem the Bond.

37. Seattle-First never gave Plaintiff Isabell notice that Certificate No. 00076309
was not being renewed. Seattle-First never gave Plaintiff Isabell notice that it considered
Certificate No. 00076309, or the funds behind the Bond, to be abandoned. Seattle-First
never escheated Certificate No. 00076309, or the funds behind the Bond, to the State of
Washington.

38. Bank of America never gave Plaintiff Isabell notice that Certificate
No. 00076309 was not being renewed. Bank of America never gave Plaintiff Isabell notice
that it considered Certificate No. 00076309, or the funds behind the Bond, to be
abandoned. Bank of America never escheated Certificate No. 00076309, or the funds
behind the Bond, to the State of Washington. Bank of America is still is possession of the
principal and interest owned on Certificate No. 00076309.

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT (CLASS ACTION) - 10

39. In the summer of 2017, Plaintiff Isabell made a demand upon Bank of
 America to honor Certificate No. 00076309. Bank of America has refused to honor the
 Bond. Bank of America knowingly misrepresented to Plaintiff Isabell that the money was
 sent to unclaimed property.

5

6

40. Plaintiff Isabell spent time and money investigating Bank of America's misrepresentations that her money had been sent to unclaimed property.

7 41. Bank of America knew, or should have known, about Bonds issued by 8 Rainier Bank and Seattle-First bank. Since 1998, it has been sued at least four times for 9 their failure to redeem Bonds issued by Rainier Bank and/or Seattle-First bank. In one 10 case, King County Superior Court Judge Douglas A. North held that the Rainier Bank 11 Bond was valid and ordered Bank of America to pay the beneficiary. Defendant Bank of 12 America knew, or should have known, about the validity of Rainier Bank Bonds and 13 Seattle-First Bonds. After being made aware of their obligation on Bonds issued by 14 Rainier Bank and Seattle-First, Defendant Bank of America continued a policy of 15 misinforming holders that the Bonds had escheated to unclaimed properties and/or were worthless. 16

17 42. On September 12, 1980, Rainier Bank issued Rainier Bank Bond No. 12886 18 ("Bond No. 12886") to Heather Bruntlett with right of survivorship ("registered 19 owners") for funds deposited with the bank in the principal amount of \$138.56. Bond 20 No. 12886 was issued by the Medical Lake Branch of Rainier Bank. Plaintiff Heather 21 Carlon's maiden name is Heather Bruntlett. Bond No. 12886 is attached to this First 22 Amended Complaint as *Exhibit 3*. Bond 12886 has not been paid or redeemed. Plaintiff 23 Carlon's father has continuously resided at the address that appears on the face of the 24 Bond. Plaintiff Carlon has the right to redeem the Bond.

43. Rainier Bank never gave Plaintiff Carlon or her father notice Bond
No. 232598 was not being renewed. Rainier Bank never gave Plaintiff Carlon or her

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT (CLASS ACTION) - 11

father notice that it considered Bond No. 12886, or the funds behind the Bond, to be
abandoned. Rainier Bank never escheated Bond No. 12886, or the funds behind the Bond,
to the State of Washington.

4 44. Defendant Banks never gave Plaintiff Carlon or her father notice that Bond
5 No. 12886 was not being renewed. Defendant Banks never gave Plaintiff Carlon or her
6 father notice that they considered Bond No. 12886, or the funds behind the Bond, to be
7 abandoned. Defendant Banks never escheated Bond No. 12886, or the funds behind the
8 Bond, to the State of Washington. One of the Defendant Banks is still in possession of the
9 principal and interest owed on Bond No. 12886.

45. In September of 2019, Plaintiff Carlon made a demand upon Key Bank to honor Bond No. 12886. Key Bank refused to honor the Bond. Key Bank knowingly misrepresented to Plaintiff Douglas it was not responsible for payment of the Bond.

46. Plaintiff Carlon spent time and money investigating Key Bank's
misrepresentations.

47. Key Bank knew, or should have known, about Bonds issued by Rainier
Bank. In 2018, it was sued by three different bond holders for Key Bank's failure to
redeem Bonds issued by Rainier Bank. Defendant Key Bank knew, or should have
known, about the validity of Rainier Bank Bonds. After being made aware of their
obligation on Bonds issued by Rainier Bank, Defendant Key Bank continued a policy of
misinforming holders that the Bonds had escheated to unclaimed properties and/or
were worthless.

48. On July 14, 1982, Rainier Bank issued Rainier Bank Bond No. 233102
("Bond No. 233102") to Gina Mosley with right of survivorship ("registered owner") for
funds deposited with the bank in the principal amount of \$1,252.94. Bond No. 233102
was issued by the Redmond Branch of Rainier Bank. Plaintiff Gina Pawolski's maiden
name is Gina Mosley. Bond No. 233102 is attached to this First Amended Complaint as

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT (CLASS ACTION) - 12

10

11

12

Exhibit 4. Bond 233102 has not been paid or redeemed. Plaintiff Pawolski has the right to
 redeem the Bond.

49. Rainier Bank never gave Plaintiff Pawolski notice that Bond No. 233102
was not being renewed. Rainier Bank never gave Plaintiff Pawolski notice that it
considered Bond No. 233102, or the funds behind the Bond, to be abandoned. Rainier
Bank never escheated Bond No. 233102, or the funds behind the Bond, to the State of
Washington.

50. Defendant Banks never gave Plaintiff Pawolski notice that Bond
No. 233102 was not being renewed. Defendant Banks never gave Plaintiff Pawolski
notice that it considered Bond No. 233102, or the funds behind the Bond, to be
abandoned. Defendant Banks never escheated Bond No. 233102, or the funds behind the
Bond, to the State of Washington. One of the Defendant Banks is still in possession of the
principal and interest owed on Bond No. 233102.

In the August of 2018, Plaintiff Pawolski made a demand upon U.S. Bank
to honor Bond No. 233102. U.S. Bank refused to honor the Bond. U.S. Bank knowingly
misrepresented to Plaintiff Pawolski that it was not responsible for payment of the Bond.

52. Plaintiff Pawolski spent time and money investigating U.S. Banks'
misrepresentations.

53. U.S. Bank knew, or should have known, about Bonds issued by Rainier
Bank. In January of 2019, it was sued by three different bond holders for U.S. Bank's
failure to redeem Bonds issued by Rainier Bank. Defendant U.S. Bank knew, or should
have known, about the validity of Rainier Bank Bonds. After being made aware of their
obligation on Bonds issued by Rainier Bank, Defendant U.S. Bank continued a policy of
misinforming holders that the Bonds had escheated to unclaimed properties and/or
were worthless. Defendant Banks hold the money deposited by Plaintiffs and the

26

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT (CLASS ACTION) - 13

members of the class by way of merger and purchase of Seattle-First and/or Rainier 2 Bank.

VI. CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

FIRST CLAIM: BREACH OF CONTRACT

54. Plaintiffs re-allege all paragraphs above.

Seattle-First and Rainier Bank entered into valid written contracts with the 55. registered owners of Bonds. As part of those written contracts, Seattle-First and Rainier Bank accepted cash deposits from the registered owners in exchange for instruments issued to the registered owners.

Defendant Banks acquired the liability on certain Bonds, including those 56. of Plaintiffs and the class.

57. Defendant Banks breached the contracts with Plaintiffs and the class by refusing to redeem and pay the balance of the Bonds, plus interest. Defendant Banks and their predecessors have not provided any notices to the registered owners, transferees or their beneficiaries that the Bonds would not be renewed, that they were dormant, or that any funds were being escheated to the State of Washington.

In breaching the contracts with Plaintiffs and the class, Defendant Banks 58. also breached the contractual covenants of good faith and fair dealing that they owed Plaintiffs and the class as a party to the contracts.

59. Defendant Banks are liable to Plaintiffs and the class for the principal amounts of the Bonds as well as all interest accrued since their issuances.

Defendant Banks' breach of the contracts caused Plaintiffs and the class to 60. suffer foreseeable damages. From the outset of the contracts, it was foreseeable that breaches would cause direct and consequential damages to Plaintiffs and the class,

1

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT (CLASS ACTION) - 14

including, but not limited to, loss of principal, loss of interest, attorneys' fees, and related costs of litigation, all in amounts to be proven at trial.

SECOND CLAIM: VIOLATION OF THE WASHINGTON CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

61. Plaintiffs re-allege all the paragraphs above.

62. The actions, practices, and omissions of Defendant Banks constitutes unfair and deceptive acts and/or practices in the conduct of trade and commerce that affects the public interest within the meaning of the Washington Consumer Protection Act, RCW 19.86.

63. Many of the Rainer Bank Bonds state on their face that the funds shall be withdrawn "upon presentation and surrender of this Rainier BankBond." No other terms are stated as an alternative procedure for withdrawing the funds. Likewise, the Seattle-First Bonds provide that "[t]hese funds may be withdrawn by the registered owner by presenting and surrendering this Certificate to the issuing branch...."

64. Plaintiffs have fully complied with all the steps necessary to redeem the Bonds. Defendant Banks have refused to redeem the Bonds of Plaintiffs and the class by making up erroneous theories in the absence of any evidence that one of its predecessors may have followed unwritten and unpublished rules unknown to Plaintiffs by redeeming the Bonds without requiring the surrender of the original certificate.

65. Defendant Banks' adoption of policies and practices to refuse redemption by Washington State holders without investigation into their individual instruments is an unfair business practice.

66. Defendant Banks' conduct of telling Plaintiffs and the class that their instruments have no value is an unfair business practice. Defendant Banks' conduct of telling Plaintiffs and the class that their money from the instruments was sent to Washington State's unclaimed property division is an unfair business practice.

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT (CLASS ACTION) - 15

SIRIANNI YOUTZ SPOONEMORE HAMBURGER PLLC 3101 WESTERN AVENUE, SUITE 350 SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98121 TEL. (206) 223-0303 FAX (206) 223-0246

1

67. Defendant Banks' position that they do not have to fulfill the terms of the
 contracts with Plaintiffs solely because they speculate, without any evidence, that they
 may have followed procedures contrary to the terms printed on the face of the
 instruments certificate is an unfair business practice.

68. Defendant Banks have uniformly refused to pay other substantially similar
bond holders in Washington State. Defendant Banks have no evidence to support their
non-payment position. Their refusal to redeem the instruments based upon an
unpublicized change in the rules from those printed on the face of the instruments is an
unfair business practice. The instruments were purposely structured to renew
automatically, with no termination date so that consumers could leave their money on
deposit with the bank indefinitely.

69. 12 When a consumer has kept their bond funds at a bank for an extended 13 period, just as the terms of the bank bonds and certificates encouraged, but is denied 14 redemption because a bank has not retained the records for that account, the burden for the costs of enforcing the contract should fall on the bank. It would have been a simple 15 16 and inexpensive matter for the Defendant Banks to have retained the records for any 17 bond accounts for which the original bond certificates were not surrendered. For its own 18 reasons Defendant Banks, or their predecessors, apparently chose not to retain those 19 records, or any other records regarding the registered owner's account. The Defendant 20 Banks cannot use their own business decision not to retain records as the basis for 21 denying a valid consumer claim supported by the customers' records that the bank 22 pledged to rely upon. To do so is an unfair business practice.

70. Defendant Banks' responses to Plaintiffs' attempts to redeem their Bonds
 are per se misrepresentations. The Bonds and/or certificates state the rules and process
 for redemption. When Plaintiffs, and other persons similar to them in Washington State,
 complied with those rules, Defendant Banks refused to pay and deceptively and

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT (CLASS ACTION) - 16

Case 2:20-cv-00193 Document 1-1 Filed 02/07/20 Page 18 of 27

wrongfully informed the Plaintiffs and other class members that their instruments had
escheated to unclaimed properties and/or had no value. This type of unfair business
practice toward consumers is exactly what the Washington Consumer Protection Act
was designed to prevent.

71. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant Banks' violations of the
Consumer Protection Act, Plaintiffs and the class have suffered damages, including but
not limited to loss of principal and interest, attorneys' fees, and related costs of litigation,
all in amounts to be proven at trial.

72. These actions by Defendant Banks have affected the public interest. SeattleFirst and Rainier Bank issued thousands of similar other bonds to other people.
Defendant Banks have adopted a uniform policy of refusing to redeem those instruments
when presented with the original bond certificate.

- 13
- 14

VII. DEMAND FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs requests that this Court:

Certify this case as a class action, designate named Plaintiffs Douglas,
 Isabell, Carlon and Pawolski as class representatives, and designate SIRIANNI YOUTZ
 SPOONEMORE HAMBURGER PLLC, Richard E. Spoonemore and Chris R. Youtz, and
 ATTORNEY WEST SEATTLE, Eric J. Harrison as class counsel;

Enter judgment in favor of Plaintiffs and the class and against Defendant
 Banks for their failure to comply with the terms of the bonds or certificates issued by its
 predecessors, Rainer Bank and Seattle-First;

22 3. Enter judgment in favor of Plaintiffs and the class and against Defendant
 23 Banks for their violation of the Washington Consumer Protection Act;

4. Enjoin Defendant Banks from refusing to honor bonds and/or certificates
issued by their predecessors;

26

5. Award Plaintiffs and the class their attorneys' fees and costs; and

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT (CLASS ACTION) - 17

6. Award such other relief as is	just and proper.
----------------------------------	------------------

1

2	DATED: December 20, 2019.		
3		SIRIANNI YOU'	TZ
4		SPOONEMORE	HAMBURGER PLLC
5		By: <u>/s/ Richard I</u>	E. Spoonemore
6		By: <u>/s/ Chris R.</u> Bishard E. Space	
		Chris R. Youtz (nemore (WSBA #21833) WSBA #7786)
7		3101 Western Av	venue, Suite 350
8		Seattle, WA 9812 Tel. (206) 223-03	21 03; Fax (206) 223-0246
9		Email: <u>cyoutz@s</u>	ylaw.com
10		rspoonen	nore@sylaw.com
11		ATTORNEY WE	EST SEATTLE
12		By: <u>/s/ Eric J. H</u> a	arrison
13		Eric J. Harrison 5400 California	
14		Seattle, WA 9813	
15		Tel. (206) 388-80	92
16		Email: <u>eric@atto</u>	rneywestseattle.com
17		Counsel for Plai	ntiffs
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
	FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT (CLASS AC	TION) – 18	SIRIANNI YOUTZ SPOONEMORE HAMBURGER PLLC 3101 Western Avenue, Suite 350 Seattle, Washington 98121 Tel. (206) 223-0303 Fax (206) 223-0246

Exhibit 1

	Issuing Office <u>Totem Lake</u> Date of Deposit <u>December 30, 1982</u> Date of Maturity <u>June 30, 1985</u> Dollars \$***500.00***	State <u>Wa.</u> Zip Code <u>98072</u> Interest r <u>ate</u> <u>9, 45**</u> % per annum	Interest Option	Interest Payment Frequency Monthly Demi-Annually Xox Quarterly Annually -0465	and principal amount, Provided, that it serewal period, offering time deposits serewal period, offering time deposits imme deposits is higher than the rate this imme deposits is higher than the rate this principal amount. NTEREST. No interest will accrue after the day period iolowing such maturity period. DRMMACV: This Parine BankBond wind itst day of any maturity period. DRMMACV: This Parine BankBond wind maturity period in which the Bank lose original be deemed binch the Bank lose daturity period in which the Bank lose daturity period and ing when so sent office. Rainier National Bank Anthorized Signature - Issuing Offic	
* * * * * * * * * * *	Serial NO. 232598 There has been deposited with RAINIER NATIONAL BANK (Bank) ***Five Hundred and no/100*** Payable to the Registered Owner(s): David or Claire Asuncion***	17449 NF 15 I Account Owners		Uniform Gifts to Minors Act For Minor	<text><text><text><text><text><text></text></text></text></text></text></text>	

00193 Document 1-1 Filed 02/07/20

ator 1

to

the de

Pad

1

Source of

Exhibit 2

Case 2:20-cv-00193 Document 1-1		
	/	
Type of Fixed Rate Investment L 1 Yea	r Investment Certifice	ite
Group 03 Type 52	No.	00076309
Seattle-First National Bank accepts for deposit th	he sum of \$ 200.00	as evidenced by this
Certificate issued by the Head Office .		Branch:
The Bank will hold this deposit and pay it to the r	registered owner, subject	to the terms set below.
Tate of Issue December 1, 1983 Re	gistered Owner:	Hard Hora and Andrea
Maturity Date December 1, 1984	MARY JDAN ISABELL 5526 SEWARD PARK	
Interest Rate 9.65 % Per Annum	SEATTLE, WA 981	18
SEATTLE FIRST NA	TONAL BANK	di
 2. EARLY WITHDRAWAL. The registered owner has contracted to keep his/her fur prior to maturity except that the Bank may, at its option, allow a withdrawal provinted by federal regulation or Bank policy. The following penal Maturity of one year or less. If withdrawal takes place prior to the maturity of interest has been earned). Maturity of more than one year. If withdrawal takes place prior to the maturity interest has been earned). Maturity of more than one year. If withdrawal takes place prior to the maturity interest has been earned). Other penalty: 	rior to maturity at some other time su- lty or penalties are applicable: date, three months of interest will be fi	ibject to a penalty on the amount orfeited, (regardless of how much
A deduction for the required penalty may be made from any principal due on er 3. INTEREST. While on deposit, interest will be earned at the rate stated above. I Simple interest. Interest will <i>not</i> be compounded. Paid at maturity. Credited to a checking or savings account at this Bank. Quarterly or D	Interest will be computed and paid or	credited as follows:
 Paid by cashiers check. Quarterly or Monthly Compounded daily. Added to balance quarterly and paid at maturity. Credited to a checking or savings account at this Bank. Quarterly or I 		
□ Paid by cashiers check. □ Quarterly or □ Monthly No interest will be paid after maturity unless this Investment Certificate is a below.	and the second se	the provisions found in item 7,
 4. CALCULATIONS All calculations on the computation of interest will be done using a 360-day 	year.	
Other rate calculations:		
 GOVERNMENT AND BANK RULES AND REGULATIONS. This Certificate is applicable rules and regulations issued by the Bank and by the government agen at the issuing Branch. NON-NEGOTIABLE. This Certificate is non-negotiable. Change of ownership is the change from the issuing Branch and the change is reflected on the records 7. AUTOMATIC RENEWAL. This Certificate will be renewed for successive maturity (1) the funds on deposit are withdrawn at any maturity date or within ten days the that it will not renew. The rate of interest paid for each renewal period will be the preceding maturity period for this type Certificate. However, the Bank may charegistered owner prior to renewal. MAILING ADDRESS AND CORRESPONDENCE. Any notices or payments of preceding to the last address shown on the records of the issuing Branch of the E Certificate must be mailed to the issuing Branch. AMOUNT OF DEPOSIT. The amount shown above does not reflect any withdrate. 	ncies regulating the Bank. The Bank's r only effective when the registered own s of that Branch. r periods of the minimum term then in el reafter, or (2) the Bank at its option give he rate being paid by the Bank on the ange the terms and conditions for an principal or interest which the Bank ma Bank. Any change of address or other	rules and regulations are available er personally or in writing requests ffect for this type Certificate unless es notice prior to any maturity date e maturity date of the immediately y renewal period by notifying the ails to the registered owner will be r correspondence concerning this

NON-NEGOTIABLE · NON-TRANSFERABLE

Exhibit 3

e ce

cto.

Serial Nº 128886		Issuing Office Medical Lake
There has been deposited with RAINIER NATIONAL BANK (Bank)	Bank)	Date of Maturity March 12, 1983
One Hundred Thrity Eight and 56/100		Dollars & *138.56**
Payable to the Registered Owner(s): **Heather Anne Bruntlett or John Bruntlett*Joint With Right of Survivorship** Address 499 Annie Place	ct*Joint With Right of Su city ^{Cheney} State.	Survivorship** te Washington Zip Code 99022
hei	Accol thiy Duarterly Demi-Annually	Account No
	avante	June -
Rainier	- Bank	Bond
TEMMS AND CONDITIONS. This Rainier BankBond is a multiple maturity non- negotiable time certificate of deposit evidencing that the amount indicated above has been deposited by the Registreed Owner with the issuing Office of Rainer National Bank subject to these terms in addition to all present and future applicable rules and regulations tasset to these terms in addition to all present and future applicable rules and regulations of the total present and springer ergolating a such deposite banks any Registreed in form requiring action by more than one Registread Owner syn Registreed Owner and present on assignment and such deposite of the Registreed Owner and transfer to ressignment is not binding upon the Registreed Owner such transfer to ressignment is not binding upon the Bank Bond Owner such that the Registreed Owner such of the Registreed Owner such	C.S. WATIONS	Itsn days after the end of the original period or any successive renewal period or b) the mark afts option gives notice perior to any maturity date that it will not be renewed. The mark afts option gives notice perior to any maturity that the maximum rate then paid by thereas it as often by addition any renewal period for time departs of itse maturity and periorgal amount. Provided that it the Bank is an of the first day during the term of such time departs, the Bank is apoint on such renewal period for the departs. Its option that are then beny futther tales which vary during the term of such time departs, the Bank is apoint on lived rate intra departs for like maturities and amounts porter this factories there paid on lived rate intra departs for like maturities are amounts for the maximum then offset of on lived rate into departs for like maturities are amounts to noter this factor for other departs of the maturity and mitteries (see which) and and with then offset of or time departs of the maturity and
Issuing Office. The Bank makes no representation or warranty as to the legal effect of any designation of an estate of or interest among multiple payees therein a free of any WITHDRAWL . The principal amount and any accrued but unpud interest will be paid to a Registered Owner on or within ten days following any maturity date upon presentation and surrender of this Rainer BankBond to the issuing Office.	NAME SEAL WAR	principal amount principal amount interest payment date in the manner and frequency speciate above interest will accrue from the of deposit or a subsequent interest payment date to the next interest payment date. No interest will accrue after any marking previou on a withdrawalduring the payment date. No interest will accrue after any marking previou on a withdrawalduring the end day period following such marking period on accutating interest for example. Winelise functions is compounded) shall be as determined by the Bank as of the example. Winelise function after any marking be as determined by the Bank as of the example.
943 529	A. HUNGTONN	The start of any majority period of a start of principal or interest mailed by the Bank MAILING ADDRESS, Any notices or payments of principal or interest mailed by the Bank to the Registered Owner will be mailed to the ast address shown on the Issuig Office's correspondence concerning this Rainer BankBond must be given personally or mailed to the issuig Office.
remained on deposit. The original maturity was more than foor year, there shall remained or deposit. The original maturity was more than foor year, there shall be fortested an amount at least equal to say a months of interest amound. In the could have sheen asmed, on the amount withdrawn at the risk-being paid on the deposit. Computed on a simple interest basis, repardiase of the foot paid durids withsheet don a simple interest basis, repardiase of the foot functs withshord to be amended on deposit. If the Bank permits this fainter BankBond to be amended to help inter increases the rate of interest paid or to reduce	MEMBER F.D.I.C.	Redent Trues, Jr., Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
A CONTRACT OF A		Alle. J. Mandal

. లను 🔬 🚣 సంగా 🔬 🔬 🖉 లను 🖉 లను 🖉 లను

exo.

- CX3-

-

c .

3

2

3

3

A CONTRACTOR OF A CONTRACTOR OF

ng Office

rized Sig

subsequent matured for payment w BankBond will automatically renew I

·c×2.

ets.

·cto.

-

.cta.

EWAL This Rai

3

2

SX4

'ex3

Exhibit 4

RAINIBRBANK

6

Issuing Office Redmond Date of Deposit July 14, 1982 Date of Maturity January 14, 1985 Dollars \$ *1,252.94*	State Ma. Zip Code 98056 Interest rate 13.50 % per annum Interest option Moded to Principal Paid by Check Paid by Check Paid to an Account Principal Type Number Interest Payment Frequency Monthly Semi-Annually Bondd Semi-Annually	and principal amount. Provided, that if the Bank is, as of the first day of any subsequent server and period, offering the eternion such that and edeposits the Bank and its coption may. If the rate there paid on such varying are even and edeposits in Bank and its coption may. If the rate there paid on such varying and anticreast rates which is the Bank Bond on the rate there paid on such varying and principal amount. The materine and amounts, convent this Rainier BankBond on the rate theme deposits for line apposit with a arying interest rate which is the maximum then offered for time deposits of the maturity amount. The materine and amount, so the such maturity period and write the maturity and the such amount, the order of the maturity period and maturity and the such amount when write maturity period to the such amount, period following and and of the reasonal Period Stall Bank Bond of the reasonal period to the such at the end of the reasonal period to the such at the end of the reasonal period write the Bank Bood of the reasonal period to the such at the end of the reasonal period write the Bank Bood of the reasonal period write the such as the end of the reasonal period write the Bank Bood of the reasonal period write the such as the end of the reasonal period write the such such as the end of the reasonal period write the Bank Bood of the reasonal period write the such such as the end of the reasonal period write the such such as the end of the reasonal period write the such such as the end of the reasonal period write the such as the end of the reasonal period write the such as the end of the reasonal period write the such as the end of the reasonal period write the such as the end of the reasonal period write the such as the end of the reasonal period to the such as
	Address 201 Union Ave. SE City Renton Personal Account Ownership Designation Single Account City Renton Doint With Right of Survivorship Joint With Right of Survivorship Survivorship Doint With Right of Survivorship P.O.D. (Right of Survivorship P.O.D. (Right of Survivorship P.O.D. (Right of Survivorship P.O.D. (Right of Survivorship P.O.D. (Right of Survivorship P.O.D. (Right of Survivorship P.O.D. (Right of Survivorship P.O.D. (Right of Survivorship P.O.D. (Right of Survivorship P.O.D. (Right of Survivorship P.O.D. (Right of Survivorship P.O.D. (Right of Survivorship P.O.D. (Right of Survivorship P.O.D. (Right of Survivorship P.O.D. (Right of Survivorship P.O.D. (Right of Survivorship P.O.D. (Right of Survivorship P.O.D. (Right of Survivorship P.O.D. (Right of Survivorship P.O.D. (Right of Survivorship P.O.D. (Right of Survivorship P.O.D. (Right of Survivorship P.O.D. (Right of Survivorship P.O.D. (Right of Survivorship P.O.D. (Right of Survivorship P.O.D. (Right of Survivorship P.O.D. (Right of Survivorship P.O.D. (Right of Survivorship P.O.D. (Right of Survivorship P.O.D. (Right of Survivorship P.O.D. (Right of Survivorship P.O.D. (Right of Survivors	TENS AND CONTIONS. This is a multiple maturity non-negotiable time certification of standard and two manual space is a multiple maturity non-negotiable time eaching and two magnitudes and search above absore has basen decosing the owner with the bissing option and standard and two mains maddition of allowing the owner manual and two mains and addition of allowing the owner manual and the data of the data. This standard and the data of the data

JS 44 (Rev. 09/19)

Case 2:20-cv-00193 Decument 12 Filed 02/07/20 Page 1 of 2

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. *(SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)*

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS		ATIONAL ASSOCIATION,
CLAIRE DOUGLAS, MA GINA PAWOLSKI, individ				and KEYCORP, national banking associations,		
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff				County of Residence	of First Listed Defendant	USA
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)		
				NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.		
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Sirianni Youtz Spoonmol Suite 350, Seattle, WA 9 5400 California Ave SW,	re Hamburger PLLC; 3 8121; (206) 223-0303	3101 Western Aven ; Attorney West Se	attle;		arrett Williams; Alexandı annon McDougald; Tren	ra P Johnston; Shawn J t Latta
II. BASIS OF JURISDI				TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff
□ 1 U.S. Government	□ 3 Federal Question			(For Diversity Cases Only)	rf def	and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government)	Not a Party)	Citiz		1 D I Incorporated or Profine of Business In	rincipal Place 🗖 4 🗖 4
□ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	★ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citiz	en of Another State	2 🕱 2 Incorporated and of Business In	
				en or Subject of a preign Country	3 🗖 3 Foreign Nation	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		nly) DRTS	FO	ORFEITURE/PENALTY	Click here for: Nature BANKRUPTCY	of Suit Code Descriptions. OTHER STATUTES
 110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment 	 PERSONAL INJURY □ 310 Airplane □ 315 Airplane Product Liability □ 320 Assault, Libel & 	PERSONAL INJUR 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical		25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 90 Other	 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS 	 375 False Claims Act 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) 400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust
& Enforcement of Judgment		Personal Injury Product Liability			 820 Copyrights 830 Patent 	 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce
 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted 	330 Federal Employers' Liability	□ 368 Asbestos Persona	1		 830 Patent 835 Patent - Abbreviated 	☐ 450 Commerce ☐ 460 Deportation
Student Loans (Excludes Veterans)	340 Marine345 Marine Product	Injury Product Liability			New Drug Application 840 Trademark	470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations
□ 153 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability	PERSONAL PROPEI	RTY	LABOR	SOCIAL SECURITY	□ 480 Consumer Credit
of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 	 350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle 	 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 	0 71	10 Fair Labor Standards Act	 861 HIA (1395ff) 862 Black Lung (923) 	(15 USC 1681 or 1692) □ 485 Telephone Consumer
I 100 Stockholders Suits I 190 Other Contract	Product Liability	□ 380 Other Personal	□ 72	20 Labor/Management	□ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	Protection Act
195 Contract Product Liability	□ 360 Other Personal	Property Damage		Relations	□ 864 SSID Title XVI	□ 490 Cable/Sat TV
□ 196 Franchise	Injury 362 Personal Injury -	385 Property Damage Product Liability		40 Railway Labor Act 51 Family and Medical	□ 865 RSI (405(g))	850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange
DEAL BROBERTY	Medical Malpractice	DDIGONED DETITIO		Leave Act		890 Other Statutory Actions
REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation	CIVIL RIGHTS 440 Other Civil Rights	PRISONER PETITIO Habeas Corpus:		90 Other Labor Litigation 91 Employee Retirement	FEDERAL TAX SUITS 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	 891 Agricultural Acts 893 Environmental Matters
220 Foreclosure	□ 441 Voting	463 Alien Detainee		Income Security Act	or Defendant)	895 Freedom of Information
 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 	442 Employment 443 Housing/	510 Motions to Vacate Sentence	e		871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	Act 896 Arbitration
245 Tort Product Liability		530 General	IMMICDA		20 050 7007	899 Administrative Procedure
290 All Other Real Property	445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment	☐ 535 Death Penalty Other:	□ 46	IMMIGRATION 52 Naturalization Application		Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision
	446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	□ 540 Mandamus & Oth		65 Other Immigration		950 Constitutionality of
	Other □ 448 Education	 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement 		Actions		State Statutes
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in	n One Box Only)	•				<u>.</u>
□ 1 Original 🔀 2 Re	moved from \Box 3 te Court	Remanded from Appellate Court	□ 4 Rein Reoj	1 1141151	r District Litigation	n - Litigation -
VI CAUSE OF ACTU			re filing (I	Do not cite jurisdictional stat		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	Brief description of ca Diversity - Breac	ause: h of Contract				
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS UNDER RULE 2	S IS A CLASS ACTION 23, F.R.Cv.P.	N D	EMAND \$	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND	y if demanded in complaint: D: □ Yes XNo
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE		SIGNATURE OF AT				
02/07/2020		/s/Shannon L.	INICDOU	igaid		
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY						
	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	MAG. JUI	
Print	Save As					Reset

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- **I.(a) Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
- (b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
- (c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".

II. Jurisdiction. The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.

United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here. United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.

Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.

Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; **NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.**)

- **III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties.** This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- IV. Nature of Suit. Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If there are multiple nature of suit codes associated with the case, pick the nature of suit code that is most applicable. Click here for: <u>Nature of Suit Code Descriptions</u>.
- V. Origin. Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.

Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.

Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.

Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date. Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.

Multidistrict Litigation – Transfer. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407.

Multidistrict Litigation – Direct File. (8) Check this box when a multidistrict case is filed in the same district as the Master MDL docket. **PLEASE NOTE THAT THERE IS NOT AN ORIGIN CODE 7.** Origin Code 7 was used for historical records and is no longer relevant due to changes in statue.

- VI. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity. Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service
- VII. Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P. Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction. Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- VIII. Related Cases. This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: <u>Bank of America, U.S. Bank, Key Bank Hit with Lawsuit Over Alleged Refusal to Honor Bonds</u>