

# Statement for 11:00 AM Hearing on Friday, December 8, 2017 in Room 863, King County Superior Court

---

Pursuant to Phillip Hennings two emails from Friday, August 18, 2017 and Thursday, October 5, 2017 I am here to discuss the Plaintiffs two motions to

1. DISSOLVE his MOTION FOR INJUNCTION WITH NOTICE submitted and served on Tuesday, September 12, 2017, and to
2. IDENTIFY PROPERLY THE LEGAL NATURE OF THE DEFENDANTS submitted and served on Tuesday, September 19, 2017

Firstly, I would like to apologize to the court on behalf of the PLAINTIFF for having necessitated a rescheduling of the first hearing. The Plaintiff misunderstood the requirement of *working copies* and promises not to repeat this misunderstanding.

---

## SUMMARY OF EVENTS

On Friday, July 14, 2017, while seated at his desk, the Plaintiff was approached by the building management of the Wells Fargo Center, told to gather up his immediate belongings, and exit the building. Although under contract with the Defendants, SURF Incubator, L.L.C., the Plaintiff was a guest in the Wells Fargo Building and complied with the management's demand under threat of prosecution for trespassing. The Plaintiff's expulsion was presumably initiated at the behest of Seaton Gras, agent for, and listed owner and member of SURF Incubator, L.L.C.

In order to regain access to his work station, prevent any further removal of his belongings, and reestablish his normal work flow the Plaintiff appeared before Commissioner Velategui on Monday, July 17, 2017 and requested a restraining order. The order was not granted, as the Commissioner reasoned that there was insufficient urgency to grant such a request. Whereupon the Plaintiff filed his request for an injunction with notice on Tuesday, July 18, 2017 and served his summons to the Defendants, Seaton Gras and his wife Candice on the same day.

Rather than taking heed of the Plaintiff's resolve and good will, the Defendants proceeded with the Plaintiff's unlawful eviction and exhausted the entirety of the time allowed them by the Court before officially responding to the Plaintiff's summons. It was at this point that the Plaintiff moved the Court to dissolve his MOTION FOR INJUNCTION WITH NOTICE and replace it with his COMPLAINT AGAINST THE

DEFENDANTS FOR BREACH OF CONTRACT AND NEGLIGENCE and his REQUEST FOR RELIEF on Monday, September 11, 2017.

In the Defendants' reply to the Plaintiff's complaint and request for relief the Plaintiff learned that he had sued the wrong legal entity, and promptly sought to rectify the matter in his MOTION TO IDENTIFY PROPERLY THE LEGAL NATURE OF THE DEFENDANTS on Tuesday, September 19, 2017.

Upon realizing that it is the Plaintiff's responsibility to properly identify the Defendants, and that he should not rely on the Defendants' statement alone, the Plaintiff submitted his DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO IDENTIFY PROPERLY THE LEGAL NATURE OF THE DEFENDANTS on Friday, November 17, 2017.

#### REQUEST

As the Court has agreed to hear the Plaintiff's motion to dissolve the intended injunction and identify properly the legal nature of the Defendants, the Plaintiff requests that the Court allow the Plaintiff to amend the nature of his cause, properly identify the Defendants, and proceed with the Court schedule established at the time that the initial injunction was filed.

Galvanize, Tuesday, December 5, 2017  
Roddy A. Stegemann