

The Honorable Barbara J. Rothstein

David J. Groesbeck
WSBA No. 24749
David J. Groesbeck, P.S.
1333 E. Johns Prairie Rd.
Shelton, WA 98584
Tel.: 509-747-2800
Fax: 509-747-2828
Email: david@groesbecklaw.com

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON**

AT SEATTLE

PARLER LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

AMAZON WEB SERVICES, INC.,

Defendant

No. 2:21-cv-00031-BJR

**PLAINTIFF PARLER LLC'S
REPLY TO DEFENDANT'S
RESPONSE**

REPLY - 1



David J. Groesbeck, P.S.
Attorney and Counselor
1333 E. Johns Prairie Rd.
Shelton, Washington 98584
(509) 747-2800

INTRODUCTION

As with its “suspension” of service to Parler, AWS’s opposition to Parler’s TRO motion depends on speculation and falsehood. For example, to avoid a clear 30-day notice requirement for terminating its contract, AWS claims its action against Parler was a “suspension,” not a termination. But the indisputable facts show that AWS’s action was termination: During the final call between Parler and AWS before the latter pulled the plug, AWS officials told Parler’s officials that there was nothing Parler could do to get its service back. *See infra* 2–6.

Even more perniciously, AWS’s opposition relies heavily on the assertion (at 7) that “Parler was used to incite, organize, and coordinate the January 6 attack on the U.S. Capitol.” But AWS offers no evidence to support that assertion, only unsupported speculation from reporters. And AWS has confirmed that none of the arrested participants in that unconscionable attack (who had been publicly identified as of the filing of this action) even had a Parler account, much less used it to “incite, organize or coordinate” the attack. *See infra* 5.

For these and other reasons, AWS’s attempt to defeat Parler’s TRO motion must fail: Parler has a high likelihood of prevailing on at least one of its claims; it has established irreparable injury in the form of a high likelihood of being forced out of business forever; and it has shown that the equities and the public interest all weigh in favor of a TRO. At a minimum, Parler has established the requisite “serious questions” going to the merits.

A. For each claim, Parler has demonstrated a likelihood of success.

1. AWS, not Parler, breached the parties’ agreement.

AWS claims (at 7) that Parler failed to identify the specific term of the contract that AWS breached. Yet Parler quoted from the specific term of the contract: Section 7.2(b). Compl., ¶ 39.



1 And that section, entitled “Termination for Cause,” only allows for termination for a “material
2 breach” of the Agreement if that “material breach *remains uncured for a period of 30 days from*
3 *receipt of notice* by the other party.” Compl., Ex. B, at 6. AWS cannot satisfy the contract
4 because it terminated the contract just over 24 hours after giving notice of what it deemed a
5 material breach. *See infra*.

6
7
8 At no time before January 9, 2021, did AWS notify Parler that Parler was in material
9 breach of the Agreement, thus blindsiding Parler. Matze Dec. ¶ 10. And in the period up until
10 then, AWS implicitly assured Parler that the two companies had a positive relationship that
11 would continue into 2021. Matze Dec., ¶¶ 7–10.

12
13 For example, from the beginning of the contractual relationship and repeatedly
14 throughout, AWS was aware of Parler’s reactive rather than prospective content moderation
15 policies, using a jury system. Matze Dec., ¶ 6; Peikoff Dec., ¶ 5. And never before January 8,
16 2021, did AWS express any concerns with that system. Peikoff Dec., ¶ 10; Matze Dec., ¶ 6.

17
18
19 In November, when AWS knew that President Trump would likely begin using a Parler
20 account, Parler and AWS discussed Parler switching to AWS’s proprietary databases and
21 software—a move that would mean Parler could not easily leave AWS. Matze Dec., ¶ 8, 11.
22 AWS again attempted in mid-December 2020 to sell Parler proprietary software that would
23 permanently attach Parler to Amazon’s hip. Matze Dec., ¶ 7.

24
25
26 Also in November, AWS flagged some content for Parler, but any content that
27 encouraged violence Parler promptly investigated and removed. Peikoff Dec., ¶ 6. For the next
28 month, AWS occasionally sent similar material to Parler, which Parler investigated and removed.
29 *Id.* Not once during this time did AWS inform Parler that Parler’s system of handling this

30
31
32
REPLY - 3



David J. Groesbeck, P.S.
Attorney and Counselor
1333 E. Johns Prairie Rd.
Shelton, Washington 98584
(509) 747-2800

1 material was inadequate or that Parler was in breach of its contract. Peikoff Dec., ¶ 8. Neither
 2 did AWS flag any specific content from December 19, 2020 until January 8, 2021. Peikoff Dec.,
 3 ¶ 7. And in mid-December, AWS pledged that it was “definitely in this journey with” Parler
 4 regarding abuse reports; and AWS conceded that other customers experienced similar problems
 5 with abuse reports and that it expected Twitter would experience “more abuse” reports now that
 6 AWS was handling its “timeline workload.” Peikoff Dec., ¶ 11; Ex. A. And on January 6, after
 7 forwarding a generic complaint to Parler about problematic content, and after Parler informed
 8 AWS of its new escalation procedure to further address content moderation issues, AWS
 9 responded that Parler should consider the matter “resolved.” Peikoff Dec., ¶¶ 9–10; Ex. G.

13 Likewise, between January 6 and 8, 2021, in texts between an AWS representative and
 14 Parler’s CEO, AWS expressed no concerns with Parler’s content moderation. Matze Dec., ¶ 9;
 15 Ex. F. But this same AWS representative repeatedly asked whether the President had joined or
 16 would join Parler now that he was blocked by Twitter and Facebook. Ex. F; Matze Dec., ¶ 11.

19 After Twitter banned President Trump on January 8, the increased new users and activity
 20 caused Parler to go down for seven hours, resulting in a backlog of 26,000 instances of content
 21 that potentially encouraged violence. Peikoff Dec., ¶ 13; Matze Dec., ¶ 9. However, over the
 22 next two days, Parler was able to systematically remove almost all of this content, which progress
 23 was reported to AWS, and within 48 hours by the end of Sunday—when AWS shut Parler
 24 down—Parler had removed all but some 1,000 problematic posts. Peikoff Dec., ¶ 14.

27 Parler also identified additional steps it was taking to quickly identify and remove
 28 problematic content. Peikoff Dec., ¶ 15. Indeed, AWS had known since mid-December that
 29 Parler would be adopting in 2021 an Artificial Intelligence (“AI”) system that would *pre-screen*
 30



1 inappropriate content, which had shown promising initial results, and there was discussion of
2 Parler adopting AWS's own AI system. Peikoff Dec., ¶ 4–5; Ex. A. But in the end, none of this
3 seemed to matter to AWS.
4

5 Furthermore, despite media attempts to tie Parler to the Capitol Riot, not one person that
6 the news media has reported so far (as of the filing of this suit) was arrested for the riot has a
7 Parler account. Matze Dec., ¶ 5. The woman killed by law enforcement when she forced her way
8 into the Capitol Building, Ashli Babbitt, did have a Parler account, but it had not been used since
9 November. *Id.* She also had a Twitter account that *was* in use the day of the riot, January 6, 2020.
10 Ex. D. Even the government claims that the attack was coordinated in part by Twitter.¹ And
11 claims reportedly showing Parler users being involved in the Capitol Riot because the metadata
12 on videos uploaded to Parler reveal the location where they were recorded misunderstand the
13 evidence: Videos recorded by others, shared, and then uploaded by a separate Parler user will
14 still show the original video location, even if the Parler user wasn't there and didn't record the
15 video. Matze Dec., ¶ 4.
16
17
18
19

20 Additionally, AWS claims it “suspended and did not terminate the account.” Resp., at 7.
21 It is true that in its email to Parler, AWS used the term “suspend.” *See* Compl., Ex. A, at 2.
22 However, the Agreement only authorizes a “temporary suspension,” Compl., Ex. B, at 5, and
23 two things make clear that there was nothing temporary about AWS's actions. First, the very
24 next sentence in the email after notifying Parler that AWS would “suspend Parler's account” was
25 this: “We will ensure that all of your data is preserved for you to migrate to your own servers,
26
27
28

29
30 ¹ Michael Balsamo & Erick Tucker, *FBI says it warned about prospect of violence ahead of US Capitol riot*, Navy
31 Times (Jan. 12, 2021), [https://www.navytimes.com/news/your-military/2021/01/13/fbi-says-it-warned-about-](https://www.navytimes.com/news/your-military/2021/01/13/fbi-says-it-warned-about-prospect-of-violence-ahead-of-us-capitol-riot/)
32 prospect-of-violence-ahead-of-us-capitol-riot/.



and will work with you as best as we can to help your migration.” Compl., Ex. A, at 2. It makes no sense for AWS to migrate all of Parler’s data off of AWS’s servers for a temporary suspension. Second, after the email notifying Parler that its account would be “suspend[ed],” in conversations with Parler, AWS made it clear that there was nothing Parler could do to continue its relationship with AWS and that this was no mere temporary suspension. *See* Matze Dec., ¶¶ 12–13.

Thus, by its words and actions, AWS evidenced that whatever it wanted to call it, AWS was permanently terminating its Agreement with Parler for Parler’s alleged breach of the Agreement. And according to the Agreement’s plain terms, a termination for a material breach required 30 days’ notice. *See* Compl., Ex. B, at 6. Which notice AWS did not provide, thus clearly breaching the contract.

Why would AWS so willfully breach its contract with Parler? First, Amazon was getting pressure from its progressive employees to use the Capitol riot as an opportunity to suppress conservative voices, and Amazon succumbed to that pressure the same day it was applied.² Second, Amazon apparently wanted to support the effort in some circles to deny any meaningful social-media platform to Trump, while at the same time protecting its major client, Twitter, from the economic fallout of Trump’s moving from Twitter to a competitor. Compl. ¶¶ 14–20, 22–23;

² Annie Palmer, *Amazon Employees Call for Company to Cut Ties with Parler after Deadly U.S. Capitol Riot*, CNBC (Jan. 9, 2021), <https://www.cnbc.com/2021/01/09/amazon-employees-demand-company-drop-parler-after-capitol-riot.html>. *See also* Catherine Ross, *Amazon Employees Demand Company Stop Providing Cloud Services to Parler*, Yahoo! News (Jan. 9, 2021), <https://news.yahoo.com/amazon-employees-demand-company-stop-215308868.html> (reporting that “[a]n employee advocacy group, Amazon Employees for Climate Justice” are “demanding that the company stop providing services to conservative social media platform Parler, popular among supporters of Donald Trump”).



Matze Dec., ¶ 10.³ Of course, without discovery, Parler doesn't know for sure at this point why AWS chose to breach its contract. But it doesn't have to establish a motive for the breach. It is clear that a breach occurred.

2. AWS tortiously interfered with Parler's business expectations.

AWS contends that Parler cannot meet several elements necessary for a claim of tortious interference. *See* Resp., at 9. First, AWS argues that it was merely asserting its right to "suspend" Parler, and therefore Parler lacked a "reasonable expectancy" and cannot assert an interference claim. As noted above, however, this argument collapses in the face of the fact that AWS (a) in substance did not suspend but rather terminated Parler's service, and (b) did so immediately without waiting the required 30 days. *See supra* at I.a.

AWS further posits that "Parler has not alleged any interference was for an improper purpose or done through improper means." Resp., at 9. Yet Parler's Complaint clearly alleges that AWS terminated Parler's account for "political animus" and "to reduce competition in the microblogging services market to the benefit of Twitter," a much larger customer of AWS than Parler. Compl., ¶ 4. And Parler documented the rising threat that Parler was to Twitter, Compl. ¶ 17–19, 22; and how AWS ignored more egregious behavior on the other side of the political spectrum by Twitter, Compl. ¶ 28. Thus, Parler has patently alleged that AWS interfered with the contracts Parler had with its 15 million users, as well as the millions it was expecting to gain in the next short while, out of "greed, retaliation, or hostility." *Elcon Const., Inc. v. E. Wash. Univ.*, 174 Wash.2d 157, 169 (2012).

³ *See also* Felix Salmon, *How CEOs Became the 4th Branch of Government*, Axios (Jan. 12, 2021), <https://www.axios.com/ceos-fourth-branch-government-trump-7eee851f-0027-4bfa-a2c0-58ec254e2dbe.html> ("Tech giants including Facebook, Google, Amazon and Twitter have moved to quiet Trump and the far right.").



3. AWS violated Section 1 of the Sherman Act.

As to the Sherman Act claim: Contrary to AWS's suggestion (at 10), Parler never argued that AWS's contract or any other written agreement with Twitter contemplated harming it *expressly*. The complaint focused not on the AWS contract with Twitter, but rather on the timing of Parler's removal, AWS's lack of concern with Twitter's equally egregious violations, its close business relationship with Twitter, and the harm to Twitter if Parler continued operating after Twitter ejected President Trump. Thus, AWS's decision to pull the plug on Parler after months of mutual cooperation, *see* Section A.1, as soon as it became clear that Twitter—unquestionably the wealthier client—risked losing a substantial share of its base is powerful *circumstantial* evidence of an agreement or conspiracy to restrain trade in violation of Section 1. *See Souza v. Estate of Bishop*, 821 F.2d 1332, 1335 (9th Cir. 1987) (“[A]n antitrust plaintiff may rely upon circumstantial evidence from which a violation may be inferred.”); *see* Compl., ¶¶ 19–20.

Next, AWS lacked a legitimate business reason to terminate. Resp., at 10–11. As addressed in Section A.1, AWS at no point expressed any concern with Parler's reactive moderation system despite being aware of it throughout the course of the relationship. *See also* Peikoff Dec. ¶ 7. Indeed, as late as January 8, 2021, Parler and AWS were in regular communication regarding Parler's attempts to better moderate its content following the events at the Capitol and Parler's unprecedented surge in size. Matze Decl. ¶ 7. Communications between Parler and AWS continued until—and stopped almost immediately after—Trump was kicked off of Twitter. Matze Decl. ¶ 7. AWS's willingness to work with Parler until nearly the second it would hurt Twitter—regardless whether AWS currently hosts the Twitter feed or will do so in the future, Amazon



Executive 1 Decl. ¶ 6—undermines its attempt to cast its decision as a legitimate business decision. Compl., ¶¶ 26, 51.

Finally, AWS claims that Parler failed to explain how competition was harmed—despite Parler’s repeated emphasis on how Parler usage had exploded in the weeks before AWS pulled it down, demonstrating a real market need for the more open microblogging platform that Parler can no longer meet. Compl., ¶¶ 17–19, 34. Indeed, Amazon and Twitter, as two of the largest tech companies in the world, with a mutually beneficial contractual relationship, had a clear interest in eliminating an up-and-coming service like Parler with such a demonstrable market. *See Matze Decl. ¶¶ 10, 13–14*. This is a quintessential § 1 claim, and Parler is thus likely to prevail on the merits.

4. Section 230 does not bar Parler’s interference or antitrust claims.

AWS’s immunity defenses under § 230(c)(1) and (c)(2) of the Communications Decency Act—which AWS correctly does *not* assert against Parler’s breach of contract claim—also fail. AWS’s § 230 claim fails on a plain reading of the statute: 47 U.S.C. § 230(c)(1) simply forbids any “provider or user of an interactive computer service” from being “treated as the *publisher or speaker* of any information provided by another information content provider.” Here, Parler does not attempt to treat AWS as a publisher or speaker, nor could it. Under § 230(f)(2), AWS is an interactive computer service, as is Parler. Thus, § 230(c)(1) by its terms shields AWS from liability only for actions or statements “authored by someone else,” *Ricci v. Teamsters Union Local 456*, 781 F.3d 25, 27 (2d Cir. 2015), but it is not a complete bar to liability for all wrongdoing. Indeed, because antitrust claims do not treat interactive computer services as content providers, at least one court in the Ninth Circuit has held that § 230 does not bar antitrust claims against media



companies. *Brittain v. Twitter, Inc.*, 2019 WL 2423375, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Jun. 10, 2019). The same logic applies to Parler’s interference claim: Where, as here, a party is attempting to hold an interactive computer service liable for its own unlawful conduct, and not for the conduct or speech of others, § 230 poses no bar.⁴

B. By establishing a likely threat of extinction if the TRO is not granted, Parler has demonstrated that it will suffer irreparable harm.

Although, prior to termination, Parler had some hope that it could quickly procure another online host and begin to recover from the effects of AWS’s sudden and highly publicized break, the effects of AWS’s actions have proven much more catastrophic. The notoriety and fallout from the break-up have driven away current and potential business partners, utterly frustrating Parler’s pre-termination plans to quickly replace and recover from AWS. Matze Decl. ¶ 15. Even AWS’s own cherry-picked exhibits admit that its actions have left Parler “suddenly fighting for its life” and “all but killed.” Doran Decl. Ex. N. Entirely unable to operate its online business or generate revenue, *id.* ¶¶ 13, 18, Parler now faces a real, non-speculative threat of “extinction” which, as the Ninth Circuit has repeatedly affirmed, “is enough to establish irreparable harm, even when damages may be available and the amount of direct financial harm is ascertainable.” *hiQ Labs v. LinkedIn Corp.*, 938 F.3d 985, 993 (9th Cir. 2019).

⁴ Further, § 230(c)(2) only shields interactive computer services from liability for “action[s] voluntarily taken in good faith” to remove, as alleged here, “excessively violent” and “harassing” content. 47 U.S.C. § 230(c)(2). AWS did much more than remove “excessively violent” and “harassing” content—it removed all of Parler. AWS does not—and cannot—claim that the entire Parler service was “excessively violent” and “harassing” content, and the plain language of § 230(c)(2) therefore cannot shield it from liability. Instead, AWS’s decision to fully remove Parler, despite its millions of accounts fully compliant with AWS’s terms of service, undermines any claim that it approached this decision with the clean hands necessary for §230(c)(2) immunity.



In completely shutting down Parler’s ability to retain its millions of users, attract advertisers, or generate any revenue, AWS has knowingly inflicted lasting damage to what was, until very recently, a thriving business. Matze Decl. ¶ 3. Parler agrees with AWS (at 13) that much of that harm “would be compensable by damages.” But because the severing of Parler from other prospective online hosts has been so pervasive, and because the fallout from AWS’s mishandling of the entire break-up has been so toxic to Parler’s ability to find other business partners, a TRO restoring AWS’s services is necessary to avoid the irreparable harm of Parler’s extinction. Matze Decl. ¶¶ 14–16, 18.

C. The balance of equities and public interest weigh in Parler’s favor.

AWS does not deny that, under the sliding-scale approach of *Alliance for the Wild Rockies v. Cottrell*, a strong showing on one TRO element, particularly balance of the equities, can offset a weaker showing in another. 632 F.3d 1127, 1131 (9th Cir. 2011). And AWS tacitly admits that the balance of equities sharply favors Parler. Although AWS briefly speculates, against logic, that it will risk greater pro-Parler outrage if ordered to *reverse* course, it otherwise fails to deny that AWS itself would suffer little to no inconvenience if enjoined from abandoning the bargain into which it knowingly entered. *See* Matze Decl. ¶¶ 6–8, 10. Weighed against that nominal burden, AWS cannot credibly negate the existential threat its actions pose to Parler’s entire business. AWS simply cannot prevail in a balance of equities analysis against the company on which it has inflicted the “very real and immediate prospect of permanent destruction.” Matze Decl. ¶ 18.

Rather than fight on properly framed but unavailing terms, AWS tries (at 12) to eliminate the sliding scale altogether by hammering the balance-of-equities and public-interest elements



1 into one factor, thereby co-opting the public's interest as its own. But even properly viewed as a
 2 separate element, this claimed risk to the public interest is a mirage. First, AWS is fully aware
 3 that Parler's content moderation issues that arose in the wake of last week's violence at the
 4 Capitol were attributable to exceptionally acute infrastructure stresses precipitated by an
 5 unprecedented spike in new Parler users and exacerbated by AWS's eventual inability or
 6 unwillingness to help their own client "cope with these technological problems." Matze Decl. ¶
 7
 8 9. Second, contrary to AWS's claimed worries that hosting Parler will pose future public risk,
 9 including at the presidential inauguration, AWS was aware that, at the time it elected to terminate
 10 services to Parler, the latter was already taking steps—including discussions to use Amazon's
 11 own AI software—precisely to avert such risk. Matze Decl. ¶ 12. Amazon's desire to escape a
 12 contractual obligation, and thereby crush a much smaller company, with minimal inconvenience
 13 to itself, does not implicate a substantial risk to the public interest, but weighs decisively against
 14 that interest. The TRO is more than warranted.

18 CONCLUSION

19 For the foregoing reasons, Parler's TRO motion should be granted.

20 Dated: January 13, 2021.

21 Respectfully submitted,
 22 /s David J. Groesbeck
 23 WSBA No. 24749
 24 DAVID J. GROESBECK, P.S.
 25 1333 E. Johns Prairie Rd.
 26 Shelton, WA 98584
 27 (509) 747-2800
 28 david@groesbecklaw.com

29 *Counsel for Plaintiff*

30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525
 526
 527
 528
 529
 530
 531
 532
 533
 534
 535
 536
 537
 538
 539
 540
 541
 542
 543
 544
 545
 546
 547
 548
 549
 550
 551
 552
 553
 554
 555
 556
 557
 558
 559
 560
 561
 562
 563
 564
 565
 566
 567
 568
 569
 570
 571
 572
 573
 574
 575
 576
 577
 578
 579
 580
 581
 582
 583
 584
 585
 586
 587
 588
 589
 590
 591
 592
 593
 594
 595
 596
 597
 598
 599
 600
 601
 602
 603
 604
 605
 606
 607
 608
 609
 610
 611
 612
 613
 614
 615
 616
 617
 618
 619
 620
 621
 622
 623
 624
 625
 626
 627
 628
 629
 630
 631
 632
 633
 634
 635
 636
 637
 638
 639
 640
 641
 642
 643
 644
 645
 646
 647
 648
 649
 650
 651
 652
 653
 654
 655
 656
 657
 658
 659
 660
 661
 662
 663
 664
 665
 666
 667
 668
 669
 670
 671
 672
 673
 674
 675
 676
 677
 678
 679
 680
 681
 682
 683
 684
 685
 686
 687
 688
 689
 690
 691
 692
 693
 694
 695
 696
 697
 698
 699
 700
 701
 702
 703
 704
 705
 706
 707
 708
 709
 710
 711
 712
 713
 714
 715
 716
 717
 718
 719
 720
 721
 722
 723
 724
 725
 726
 727
 728
 729
 730
 731
 732
 733
 734
 735
 736
 737
 738
 739
 740
 741
 742
 743
 744
 745
 746
 747
 748
 749
 750
 751
 752
 753
 754
 755
 756
 757
 758
 759
 760
 761
 762
 763
 764
 765
 766
 767
 768
 769
 770
 771
 772
 773
 774
 775
 776
 777
 778
 779
 780
 781
 782
 783
 784
 785
 786
 787
 788
 789
 790
 791
 792
 793
 794
 795
 796
 797
 798
 799
 800
 801
 802
 803
 804
 805
 806
 807
 808
 809
 810
 811
 812
 813
 814
 815
 816
 817
 818
 819
 820
 821
 822
 823
 824
 825
 826
 827
 828
 829
 830
 831
 832
 833
 834
 835
 836
 837
 838
 839
 840
 841
 842
 843
 844
 845
 846
 847
 848
 849
 850
 851
 852
 853
 854
 855
 856
 857
 858
 859
 860
 861
 862
 863
 864
 865
 866
 867
 868
 869
 870
 871
 872
 873
 874
 875
 876
 877
 878
 879
 880
 881
 882
 883
 884
 885
 886
 887
 888
 889
 890
 891
 892
 893
 894
 895
 896
 897
 898
 899
 900
 901
 902
 903
 904
 905
 906
 907
 908
 909
 910
 911
 912
 913
 914
 915
 916
 917
 918
 919
 920
 921
 922
 923
 924
 925
 926
 927
 928
 929
 930
 931
 932
 933
 934
 935
 936
 937
 938
 939
 940
 941
 942
 943
 944
 945
 946
 947
 948
 949
 950
 951
 952
 953
 954
 955
 956
 957
 958
 959
 960
 961
 962
 963
 964
 965
 966
 967
 968
 969
 970
 971
 972
 973
 974
 975
 976
 977
 978
 979
 980
 981
 982
 983
 984
 985
 986
 987
 988
 989
 990
 991
 992
 993
 994
 995
 996
 997
 998
 999
 1000



David J. Groesbeck, P.S.
 Attorney and Counselor
 1333 E. Johns Prairie Rd.
 Shelton, Washington 98584
 (509) 747-2800