1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
2	FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON		
3	LEIF HANSEN, on behalf of) himself and all others)		
4	similarly situated,		
5	Plaintiff,)	Case No. 3:17-cv-01986-MO	
6	v.)		
7 8	GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES INSURANCE) COMPANY, a Maryland) corporation,)	April 5, 2018	
9	Defendant.)	Portland, Oregon	
10)	_	
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16	Oral A	rgument	
17	TRANSCRIPT O	F PROCEEDINGS	
18	BEFORE THE HONORABI	LE MICHAEL W. MOSMAN	
19	UNITED STATES DISTR	ICT COURT CHIEF JUDGE	
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

1		
2		APPEARANCES
3		
4	FOR THE PLAINTIFF:	
5		Mr. Steven D. Olson Tonkon Torp LLP
6		888 S.W. Fifth Avenue, Suite 1600 Portland, OR 97204
7		
8		
9	FOR THE DEFENDANT:	Mr. Dan W. Goldfine Mr. Ian M. Fisher
10		Lewis Roca Rothgerber Christie LLP 201 East Washington Street, Suite 1200
11		Phoenix, AZ 85004
12		
13		Mr. Scott A. Brooksby Olson Brooksby PC
14		1020 S.W. Taylor Street, Suite 400 Portland, OR 97205
15		
16		
17		
18	COURT REPORTER:	Bonita J. Shumway, CSR, RMR, CRR United States District Courthouse
19		1000 S.W. Third Ave., Room 301 Portland, OR 97204
20		(503) 326-8188
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 (PROCEEDINGS) 2 (April 5, 2018) THE CLERK: 3 Your Honor, this is the time set for oral argument in Case No. 3:17-cv-1986-MO, Hansen v. Government 4 5 Employees Insurance Company. Counsel, can you please state your name for the 6 7 record. MR. BROOKSBY: Your Honor, Scott Brooksby for the 8 9 defendant. 10 MR. GOLDFINE: Dan Goldfine for the defendant, 11 Government Employees Insurance Company. 12 MR. FISHER: Ian Fisher for the defendant. 13 MR. CONABLE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 14 Conable for plaintiff. 15 MR. OLSON: Steve Olson for the plaintiff, Your 16 Honor. Thank you all for being here. 17 THE COURT: I'd like to focus on the defense argument about 18 failure to state a claim, for the moment stay away from 19 20 standing and justiciability or redressability. 21 And so that principal theory, as you've all seen from 22 the briefing, is that if a breach of a contract is 23 fundamentally a broken promise, that the specific promise here 24 to pay for direct and accidental loss or damage to the car 25 hasn't been broken because there's been no identified loss or

1 damage to the car that wasn't paid for. 2 Fairly simple argument, mercifully put forth 3 initially, at least, in a fairly brief pleading. So, Mr. Conable, are you going to start out on that? 4 5 MR. CONABLE: I'd be happy to, Your Honor. you. 6 7 THE COURT: So help me understand better than I now do what it is, in terms of what the contract promises, that 8 9 your opponent didn't do. MR. CONABLE: They didn't agree to pay for mandatory 10 11 pre- and post-accident electronic scanning, and that scanning 12 is part and parcel of the repair. The contract requires them 13 to perform a complete repair and to return the vehicle to 14 pre-loss condition. 15 I want to start, before we move to the THE COURT: 16 idea of repairs, I want to start specifically with the contract 17 language and then work our way there. 18 So when I ask what part of the contract wasn't met 19 here, we're referring, aren't we, to the idea that it's not so 20 much that they agree to repair, they agree to pay for all loss from -- loss or damage to the car, right? 21 22 MR. CONABLE: Correct, Your Honor. The language is 23 set out, the pertinent language is set out in paragraph 10 of

THE COURT: So you're saying that there is a loss or

our complaint.

24

25

1 damage to the vehicle that wasn't paid for? 2 MR. CONABLE: That's correct, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: And the scan becomes a loss or damage how? 4 5 MR. CONABLE: Part and parcel of repairing a car to pre-loss condition is ascertaining what's wrong with the car. 6 7 We wouldn't be here if the question was whether, for example, GEICO had to pay for the amount of labor required for a 8 technician to lift the hood or to pull off a fender to look and 9 see or to measure. There's something about -- they focus their 10 11 argument on the possibility that a scan won't reveal damage. 12 But when a manufacturer says that part of repairing a car, a 13 mandatory part of repairing the car is to conduct these scans, 14 that is part and parcel. It's like saying you don't have any 15 damage for your broken leg, for the x-ray for your broken leg 16 because the x-ray might have ended up not showing anything. 17 The scan is indivisibly part of the repair. 18 THE COURT: Why in the contract is ascertaining the 19 amount of damage on the insurer? If I'm an insurer and I say, 20 whatever you tell me that I agree to is the damage, fine, then 21 why isn't it on the insured to say, okay, well, here's the 22 amount of damage to my car? 23 MR. CONABLE: Why isn't it on the insured? THE COURT: Your argument is that it's sort of on the 24 insurance company, on GEICO here to go and figure out the 25

amount of loss. Why isn't that on the insured to say, well, here, I'm presenting to you the amount of loss? I mean, we'd have a different case, wouldn't we, if your client had done a scan and then said, here's more loss than you knew of, and the insurance company would then, assuming it was legit, would have to pay it, right?

MR. CONABLE: We're not attempting to shift to the insurance company the duty to perform the scan, just to pay for the diagnostic elements of a repair. So you're correct. I would agree with Your Honor that it's the insured and really the insured's body shop that is going to do the work of saying here are the things that we did, these are the elements that are necessary for this full repair. And then the insurer's duty is to pay for it under the contract.

What the insurer is doing here is saying categorically, we will not pay for this part of that repair process. So the part of the repair process that is following the manufacturer's requirements, following the ASA recommendations for how you repair a car, for how you figure out what's wrong with a car, we're not going to pay for that part.

So it's difficult from our perspective to say, on the one hand, it is the responsibility of the insured and his or her body shop to determine what needs to be fixed in this car, but then to say --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

gone.

THE COURT: Well, so you agree with that much? the insured's ultimate obligation to present to the insurer here the damage? MR. CONABLE: Yes. And it is the insurer's obligation to pay for the diagnostics necessary for the insured to be able to make that presentation. THE COURT: And that's why? I mean, contractually speaking. MR. CONABLE: Because the contract requires GEICO to restore the car to pre-loss conditions. It's the manufacturers of the cars we're talking about saying it is a mandatory part of the repair to conduct these scans. And so to say --THE COURT: That's just your part and parcel argument. It's not textual, right? There's nothing in the text that says we'll pay for damage and we'll pay for diagnostics to determine damage. It says we'll pay for loss. MR. CONABLE: We'll pay for loss. There's nothing in the contract that says we'll pay for tires. There's nothing in the contract that says that we'll pay for paint. If you lose a tire, then you don't need THE COURT: the contract to say we'll pay for tires because it's part of the loss. MR. CONABLE: And you'll be able to tell you lost a tire because anybody can look at the car and see that a tire is

But what if you've lost something else?

THE COURT: I'm just asking right now about text.

I'll get to other arguments.

But you'll have to agree, won't you, that the text doesn't say we commit to pay for diagnostics?

MR. CONABLE: The text does not use the word "diagnostic" or "scan." The text uses the word "repair to pre-loss condition."

When a manufacturer says part of repairing to pre-loss condition is conducting pre- and post-repair scans, that is part of repairing a car to pre-loss condition.

THE COURT: What if it's not the manufacturer saying so? What if it's just an insured saying, well, I really think this is important, and so I think you ought to do this?

MR. CONABLE: Regardless of any -- for example, if I have a 1980 Dodge Aries, and I come in and say, Your Honor, I -- or excuse me, Your Honor.

GEICO, I'd like to have these scans, and GEICO says, no, your car is not on a computer system, we're not going to do that, and then I say, well, I'd like it anyway, that's not what we've alleged in this case. Our allegations in this case have to do with vehicles like Mr. Hansen's vehicle.

THE COURT: So it has to do with being ASA required?

MR. CONABLE: It has to do with being mandatorily required by the manufacturer of this vehicle as part of the repair of the vehicle. The ASA is the cherry on top.

1 THE COURT: I don't know what you mean first by 2 mandatorily required. I mean, how does a manufacturer tell 3 GEICO what they must do? The manufacturer is not telling GEICO 4 MR. CONABLE: what they must do. The manufacturer is telling repair shops 5 6 what they must do. 7 THE COURT: Must do or what? You'll go to jail? 8 MR. CONABLE: No. If the question is what is a 9 repair of a GM vehicle, and GM says --10 THE COURT: Well, I guess what I'm getting at by 11 these questions, I'm trying to get at what the point -- the 12 principle is that divides your Dodge Aries from your GMC 13 Sierra, you know. 14 MR. CONABLE: Because no manufacturer --15 THE COURT: Is it manufacturers that divide it? Like 16 if the manufacturer says this is necessary, then that's what 17 makes it necessary to do the diagnostic test? 18 MR. CONABLE: At least, yes. I mean, we can argue 19 about whether with respect to a car -- we don't have an 20 allegation in this case because Mr. Hansen's vehicle -- we 21 don't have an allegation in this case that applies to -- there 22 may be a group of cars that fall within this class as to which 23 the ASA says you need to do these diagnostics and the manufacturer doesn't, and that to me is a question of --24 25 THE COURT: Mr. Conable, the reason I'm pressing you

on this is that although I'm not sure I got you to agree, I think it's true that this is something that has to be sort of read in between the lines here of the text of this contract.

The contract doesn't promise to do anything other than pay for loss. And you're saying part and parcel, which is sort of, to coin a phrase, a penumbra argument that it's necessary. Although not promised, it's necessary to do this.

And I'm trying to figure out what makes it necessary in what cases, because ultimately I'm not just going to announce a rule that will decide this case, it will be talked about by other people in other cases, and they're going to say, well, what is the principle here? Is it necessary in ASA cases, where ASA rules say it should be done? Is it necessary when the insured puts an expert on the stand and says that the industry standard is this, or is it necessary when you have declarations from ten thousand people that they think it's important to do it? I mean, you know, you've used an external source -- manufacturers and ASA -- to import into the contract something that the contract doesn't expressly say.

I'm not suggesting that's not legit, I'm just saying how far does that principle go?

MR. CONABLE: Well, I'm -- let me start by taking slight issue with a remark you made a moment ago, which is that this is penumbral and not promised. They promised to return the vehicle to pre-loss condition. If the manufacturer says

that, and the ASA says that in order to determine what condition the vehicle is in you must conduct these pre and post electronic scans at least with respect to certain enumerated vehicles, then part of determining whether they kept their promise to pay for restoring the car to pre-loss condition is to allow the body shop --

THE COURT: Sure. That doesn't change the concern I raised a moment ago at all. That just means if the same thing is true but not expressed by manufacturers now but expressed by a plaintiff's expert or expressed by 10,000 declarations or four trade journal articles or newspaper articles, I mean, you know, you're still referring to external sources to create this expectation that return to pre-loss condition requires X.

So today you want to rely on what you might sort of refer to as the pinnacle of this pyramid of possibilities, but it won't end today if I say that this is what's required.

So what's not the facts but the principle that you're relying on to say that this is part of what's necessary to return to pre-loss condition?

MR. CONABLE: Your Honor articulated it, and it's industry standard. And we're here on a motion to dismiss, and there are going to be fact questions inherent in determining whether with respect to a particular vehicle, my 1980 Dodge Aries K or, as you said, the pinnacle vehicle, where the manufacturer and the ASA say these scans are required. There's

a fact issue, and I'm not -- I wouldn't dispute with you that if I were in here talking about a '57 Chevy, it doesn't have a computer system in it. There's a point beyond which you can't extend this.

I don't believe that to deny this motion to dismiss the class certification at summary judgment is still in this case. I don't believe that to deny this motion to dismiss, Your Honor is required to issue a ruling that says yes with respect to these cars and no with these.

Mr. Hansen's car is a pinnacle. Mr. Hansen's car is a car as to which the manufacturer and the ASA say these scans are required as part of the process of determining whether the car is in pre-loss condition. So for purposes of the motion to dismiss, I would confidently expect that on class certification, summary judgment, and at trial, if any of those occur, GEICO will make strong efforts to cabin the expanse of potential vehicles and claimants as to whom this can apply and its standards will have to be applied.

All I'm saying is that in a motion to dismiss that asks this Court to say that as a matter of law, this contract doesn't require GEICO to pay for pre and post scans even for car's like Mr. Hansen's, as to which the manufacturer says those scans are required.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MR. GOLDFINE: Your Honor, thank you for your time.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

language of the contract.

Let me try to attempt to articulate. We have an agreement in place, as the Court identified. It turns on specific words, which is "damage to the vehicle." That's the operative word. It's not repair, it's not anything else. Ιt turns on damage to the vehicle. And there's a disconnect between the absence of allegations of damage to the bumper that hasn't been compensated by GEICO and the diagnostic scans, as alleged here. THE COURT: Does the contract talk about pre-loss condition? MR. GOLDFINE: The contract, in fact, does not discuss pre-loss condition, but the contract says damage -- in this case damage to the bumper. We have to compensate for damage to the bumper. But they've alleged --THE COURT: Well, if we're going to be precise, then the contract doesn't talk about damage to the bumper. MR. GOLDFINE: It talks damage to the vehicle, is the operative language. THE COURT: So you promise to pay for any loss from damage to the vehicle? MR. GOLDFINE: I mean, there could be other vehicle -- it could be a total loss, for example, but for this particular case, it would be we have promised to pay for damage to the vehicle caused by a collision. That's the operative

THE COURT: All right.

MR. GOLDFINE: And there's a disconnect between the demand for scans in their allegations and the damage as set forth in the contract, which is their breach of contract claim. And, you know, their opportunity to have a preferred set of diagnostic tools is not set forth in the contract. We are obligated, as the Court identified -- Let me take a step back. Plaintiff is obligated to tell us what the damage is --

THE COURT: Is a plaintiff obligated to pay on their own for any -- any, not just these, in this case, but any diagnostic tools it uses to learn the extent of damage?

MR. GOLDFINE: As alleged in this particular item, they have not identified any damage that hasn't been compensated, so I can't -- there's going to be all sorts of different circumstances.

THE COURT: I don't think my question is quite as tricky as you must think it is. I'm just asking in a typical case, under a contract like this one, if the insured had to go to diagnostic steps -- not scans but other less expensive, more quotidian diagnostic steps -- does the insurance company pay for those or not?

MR. GOLDFINE: It really depends on the circumstances.

So typically there's a diagnostic step of doing the estimate. It doesn't pay for the cost of doing the estimate.

THE COURT: The reason I'm asking this question is there's sort of two ways to think about what the insurance company has promised, and it may be a function of practice more than promise, but, you know, you can draw that very severely. You can say, we only promise to pay for loss, we never promise to pay for diagnostic steps. Whether that's, you know, paying someone to take photos or paying someone to take a look at it or paying someone to open the hood up or whatever it might be, we don't pay for diagnostics, just damage.

And the others say, well, we sometimes pay because it's essential to learn loss, but we don't pay for weird ones that we've never heard of before.

Now, I don't know which one you're talking about here.

MR. GOLDFINE: Well, I think there's -unfortunately, as to the hypothetical examples that are outside
this four square, there's a whole -- maybe 100 different
scenarios that could occur.

THE COURT: What I'm asking, then, is this contract language that we're focusing on here, does it in any measure promise to pay for diagnostic steps?

MR. GOLDFINE: No, it doesn't promise -- the language promises to pay for the damage to compensate -- minus the deductible, to compensate for the damage that's occurred that's presented and that exists on the car.

THE COURT: And so you reject the idea that even if manufacturers say that you must take certain diagnostic steps to repair the damage, that that's part and parcel of paying for damage?

MR. GOLDFINE: Yes, absolutely.

THE COURT: Because you just didn't promise to do that?

MR. GOLDFINE: Not only didn't promise to do that, but, one, the manufacturers can't bind GEICO under the contract; and two, there are a -- to use your word -- a penumbra of different reasons and explanations and, in fact, different statements, policy statements as to -- or position statements as to what should take place with respect to scans or other diagnostic tools.

You know, it would be like Ford saying you have to use a Ford-branded screwdriver to repair the car, and plaintiff coming back and saying, well, you didn't use Ford-branded screwdriver, so redo it, even if the repair had been done properly with a regular screwdriver.

So what the manufacturer says, of course, it plays into, you know, into everything that takes place, but what a manufacturer says doesn't dictate the terms of the contract and why they might be saying a particular diagnostic test and who pays for a particular diagnostic test is not part of the agreement here. The agreement says damage, damage from a

1 covered collision. 2 THE COURT: So whose obligation between the insurance 3 company and the customer, whose obligation is it to figure out what the damage is? 4 5 MR. GOLDFINE: Well, the obligation in the first part 6 is that the customer can present the damage to the vehicle, 7 but, you know, they will obtain the assistance of a body shop to figure out what the damage is, and they'll present the 8 9 It's not a one-time shot. I mean, there's different 10 steps that take place in a typical claim. But if they don't 11 present any damage, there's no obligation for GEICO to pay or 12 to do its own investigation. 13 THE COURT: Thank you. 14 Could we turn to the good faith and fair dealing 15 argument, Mr. Conable. 16 MR. CONABLE: Yes, Your Honor. 17 THE COURT: So that can hinge on an agreed common 18 purpose or justified expectation, right? 19 MR. CONABLE: Yes, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: And you, I assume, by virtue of us being 21 here litigating this, agree that there's no agreed common 22 purpose? GEICO doesn't agree, right? So you're relying on a 23 justified expectation?

THE COURT: So do you agree that the justified

MR. CONABLE: Yes, Your Honor.

24

25

1 expectation can't actually add a term to the contract? 2 MR. CONABLE: Yes. Add or alter terms, explicit 3 terms of the contract. THE COURT: So to have this be satisfactory as a good 4 faith and fair dealing claim, it has to be a justified 5 expectation that is, as you say, part and parcel of or a part 6 7 of the promise that's already in the contract? MR. CONABLE: We say not inconsistent with the 8 promise that's already in the contract. I don't read the good 9 10 faith and fair dealing cases quite as strongly as to say that 11 you have -- it's a term that exists within the contract that 12 can't be inconsistent with the other terms in the contract. 13 THE COURT: And that's how you read good faith and 14 fair dealing? 15 MR. CONABLE: It is, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: All right. And so here I don't want to 17 put words in your mouth, but I guess your argument is that this 18 is not inconsistent with anything they've already promised to 19 do, and here we come back perhaps to this industry standard 20 idea? 21 MR. CONABLE: Yes, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: That it's an expectation that's justified 23 for at least, at a minimum, owners of cars like your client's? 24 MR. CONABLE: Yes, Your Honor. And it's a little bit 25 in the nature of an alternative argument in this case, in that

we anticipated that they would say, aha, you know, our contract doesn't say the words "diagnostic scan," it just says we'll pay you for your loss. And so as a matter of good faith and fair dealing, as a matter of the insured's reasonable expectations of the contract, it is reasonable for an insured to assume that or to conclude from looking at this contract that the insurer will be responsible for paying for the necessary steps to determine what the loss is, and then to repair the loss. It is not reasonable to look at this agreement and to say we are required to compensate you for loss but not for the process of figuring out what the loss is.

And GEICO's lawyer said, as I think he has to, that in some cases they do read this contract to require them to pay for scans. They do not draw the line --

THE COURT: Actually, that's not what your opponent said. Your opponent said that sometimes they do pay for diagnostics, but he specifically denied that they did so because the contract required them to do so.

MR. CONABLE: Well, then the implication of that is that in some cases they make gratuitous diagnostic payments for some reason specific to GEICO, not having to do with their understanding of what the contract means. I would suggest --

THE COURT: Why is that? Why is that troubling in any way, they sometimes pay diagnostics?

MR. CONABLE: Because it's factless. Because their

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

argument here has to be that as a matter of law, we don't pay for this. As Your Honor suggested, it's because this contract doesn't say we pay for diagnostics, GEICO doesn't pay for diagnostics, except we know sometimes GEICO does pay for diagnostics. It creates two possibilities: One, that in some cases GEICO believes that -- possibility one, that GEICO believes, and I think correctly, that in some circumstances the time and labor necessary to figure out what the loss is and how to fix it is part and parcel of covering the loss under this contract; or the second possibility, as you've suggested, that notwithstanding their belief that they're not required to pay this, to pay for these -- to pay for any scanning under the contract, nevertheless, sometimes they do it anyway. Those are two possibilities. One, if GEICO as a matter of fact --THE COURT: So you're suggesting the second one is fabulous? I am, Your Honor. But it's also MR. CONABLE: factual. THE COURT: Why wouldn't it be perfectly -- if you have a \$30 diagnostic test, then, you know, the insurance company could easily just assume it's not worth the beef. MR. CONABLE: And perhaps the insurance company will come forward with evidence at trial where they point to some policy that they have that they don't sweat the details or

they're not worried about squeezing a nickel or they're motivated in some cases by something other than profit.

But again, the argument here has to be that the plain language of this contract doesn't require them to pay for any scans, even scans that are necessary to ascertain the amount of damage, to allow for damage to occur.

All I'm suggesting, Your Honor, is that once GEICO admits, as it must, that it sometimes pays for scans, including sometimes paying for electronic scans, it either has to embrace the idea that sometimes this contract does provide for coverage in those circumstances or make the factual argument that we're wrong on the facts when we say they have a policy of paying for some scans and not paying for others. And that's -- this is a motion to dismiss. That's a factual question.

Back to good faith and fair dealing. I got off of it there for a minute. Our point is that it is within the reasonable expectations of the party that contracts with someone who agrees to pay for loss to their vehicle following a collision, that part of paying for that is paying for figuring out what the loss is.

THE COURT: Why?

MR. CONABLE: Because it is -- because there's no division in that process from the perspective of the customer. Because when you take your car --

THE COURT: Why isn't it perfectly reasonable to

contract with someone to pay for your loss, understanding that it's on you to determine the loss?

MR. CONABLE: Because there is no process, in everyone's ordinary understanding of getting a car fixed, the process of determining what's wrong with the car and the process of fixing the car are not disparate, divisible events. There is no circumstance in which someone who has had a serious collision to a car ever believed that they have some responsibility independent of the body shop doing their repair to figure out what's wrong with the car. It is -- fixing the car and figuring out what's wrong with the car are not --

THE COURT: Well, but that doesn't help much. I mean, sure, the person may think they've got to take it to a body shop to figure out what's wrong and not figure it out themselves. They may take photos or whatever, but they understand they probably got to take it to the body shop to figure out what's wrong.

MR. CONABLE: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: But why would it be irrational to assume that one could contract for protection against loss, understanding that that whole process, including taking it to a body shop, is on the client, and then the insurance company pays for the loss?

MR. CONABLE: Well, the question is whether -respectfully, I think the question is not whether it might be

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

rational for someone in some circumstance to form that belief, but whether at the motion to dismiss stage, as a matter of law, we can conclude that no reasonable person could have the expectation, Mr. Hansen or anyone else would have the expectation that fixing the car includes figuring out what's wrong with the car. THE COURT: Well, I guess what I have right now is your say-so, that it's a justified expectation if you buy a GMC like this one that you would get your scans paid for. MR. CONABLE: We have our allegation to that effect in the complaint. So in the sense that that's my say-so at the motion to dismiss stage, yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: The complaint alleges that it's a justified expectation? MR. CONABLE: Paragraph 47 in the second claim for relief: "GEICO's policyholders have a reasonable expectation" --Slow down, please. THE COURT: MR. CONABLE: Sorry. "GEICO's policyholders have a reasonable expectation, rooted in the plain language of the policy, that GEICO will compensate them in an amount sufficient to obtain complete and safe repairs. However, GEICO's policy of denying pre- and post-repair scans, in direct opposition to manufacturer and industry recommendations, frustrates this reasonable

expectation."

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. GOLDFINE: I'll be very short here. I mean, I think the operative language there that reflects the test in Oregon, which is rooted in the plain language, and so the idea that we're going to disregard the -- you know, the plain language "damage," and the express limitation in "damage" to read, candidly, a bunch of third parties' documents as to what the terms are is inconsistent with the plain meaning.

THE COURT: We're not relying on third parties to tell us what the terms are, consistent or not with plain meaning. We're looking to third parties to decide what a justified expectation is in terms of the good faith and fair dealing theory.

MR. GOLDFINE: But it still has to, as I understand
Oregon law -- and it's not inconsistent with other states'
law -- it has to be consistent with the language of the policy.
The operative language of the policy still is "damage to the vehicle."

THE COURT: How is paying for diagnostic tools to determine damage inconsistent with the policy?

MR. GOLDFINE: Because that's a choice of diagnostic tools as opposed to just compensating for the damage itself.

And so --

THE COURT: So you're saying if it imposes a new

1 financial obligation on the insurance company, it's 2 inconsistent with the express terms of the policy? 3 MR. GOLDFINE: I would agree with that proposition. THE COURT: That wasn't a proposition, it was a 4 5 question. I was asking if that's what you're saying. 6 MR. GOLDFINE: I would agree with that. I think 7 there's other -- I mean, I don't want to limit it simply to that, but yes, I would agree with that. 8 THE COURT: Assuming that's wrong, by what method do 9 I determine what a customer's justified expectations are? 10 11 MR. GOLDFINE: Well, I think you have to start with, even as alleged here, you have to start with the language of 12 13 the contract. If the language of the contract uses a term, as 14 it does, "damage to the vehicle," you know, the justified 15 expectations are not going to be how you get the fix of the 16 vehicle, the techniques, the particular diagnostic tools. The 17 insured has agreed and the insurer has agreed to pay for, 18 compensate for the damage minus the deductible. 19 THE COURT: So you heard argument that the cat's out 20 of the bag, so to speak, and if GEICO -- if GEICO has, in fact, 21 acknowledged that it sometimes pays for diagnostic tools, it's 22 tough to say when it should or shouldn't, you know. We at 23 least now have to litigate what is reasonable expectation and what isn't. 24

MR. GOLDFINE: Well, I guess I would take a step back

25

and, you know, assuming the truth of that allegation, just for purposes of this argument here, the idea that we just pay for a diagnostic tool, as the Court noted, could be gratuitous, it could be for a variety of reasons, and it could be set on the particular circumstances of a particular car. But the idea here that a plaintiff can come to court and say, "Well, there was damage to my rear bumper, I accidentally bumped into something at the supermarket," but not allege that that damage hasn't been compensated -- which is not in their complaint -- is not, you know, a justification for opening up a whole panoply of particular circumstances.

The contract says, the policy says compensation for damage to the vehicle caused by a covered collision. There's not an allegation here that --

THE COURT: Sure. We're not talking about the contract. We're talking about good faith and fair dealing. So that's why I'm not focusing directly on the terms of the contract except to the degree you suggest that this good faith and fair dealing theory contravenes the terms of the contract. I get that point.

MR. GOLDFINE: And it stems beyond the -- the term "damage to the vehicle," it extends substantially beyond that.

THE COURT: Thank you.

I'll take a brief recess.

THE CLERK: Court is in recess.

(A recess is then taken.)

THE COURT: All right. Thank you for your briefing and oral argument in this case.

I do find that the complaint in this case fails to state a claim. For breach of contract, I think it's a fairly straightforward analysis. Some loss or damage that wasn't paid for has to be alleged. And the contract does not on its express terms promise any more than that. It doesn't promise to pay for diagnostics, and external events such as manufacturer's requirements can't really plug much into the contractual analysis.

Certainly, in context, the terms itself in context I don't think mean much different than they do just on their simple expression of the words. It doesn't really, as I look at it in context, mean anything other than to pay for the loss or damages. And so without that, I don't believe that a claim is properly stated.

Most of the argument I heard today really gets at the reasonable expectations of the parties for a good faith and fair dealing claim. I mean, the manufacturer's requirements or ASA requirements, for example, might go a long way towards establishing the reasonable expectations of the parties. But that's actually not really necessary here because I find that the complaint itself at the motion to dismiss stage adequately states that it's the reasonable expectations of the parties in

this kind of case to get this kind of diagnostic tool. You don't really need much more than that at this stage.

But what you also need for good faith and fair dealing is the violation you allege, the fair dealing that you say did not take place is essentially a performance that you think good faith and fair dealing requires, but it has to be a performative act that's not inconsistent with the terms of the contract. Even if it is a reasonable expectation of the parties, it still has to not add a term to the contract.

And, of course, one good way to think of that is does it require in a contract like this one to pay for something that the contract never promised to pay for. And here I think it is a new term, inconsistent with the express terms of the contract. I think read as a whole, when you promise to pay for certain things, then good faith and fair dealing can't get you to promise to pay for more than the things you said you'd pay for. That's an inconsistency when the nature of the contract is fundamentally a promise to pay.

And so, for that reason, I find that there is also no claim stated on good faith and fair dealing, and neither of those, I think, are curable. I mean, if a complaint alleged a loss that wasn't paid for, we'd have an entirely different case, and one that probably would have to be, under the contract itself -- some other steps would have to take place before we could even be in court. And certainly the reasonable

expectation of the party prong of good faith and fair dealing could be cured, but I've already said it doesn't need to be There's enough there. cured. And the adding -- the problem that it adds a new term, required payment adds a new term isn't curable, in my view, so I grant the motion here for failure to state a claim on both theories with prejudice. Thank you all. We'll be in recess. THE CLERK: This court is in recess. (Proceedings concluded.)

--000--I certify, by signing below, that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the record of proceedings in the above-entitled cause. A transcript without an original signature or conformed signature is not certified. /s/Bonita J. Shumway April 9, 2018 BONITA J. SHUMWAY, CSR, RMR, CRR DATE Official Court Reporter

MR. BROOKSBY: [1] 3/7 MR. CONABLE: [40] MR. FISHER: [1] 3/11 MR. GOLDFINE: [21] 3/9 12/24 13/10 13/16 13/20 14/1 14/11 14/21 15/14 15/21 16/4 16/7 17/4 24/2 24/14 24/21 25/2 25/5 25/10 25/24 26/20 MR. OLSON: [1] 3/14 THE CLERK: [3] 3/2 26/24 29/8 THE COURT: [61] Solution 13/1 Filed 04/20/18 adding [1] 29/4 adds [2] 29/4 29/5 adequately [1] 27/24 admits [1] 21/8 afternoon [1] 3/13 again [1] 21/3 against [1] 21/3 against [1] 22/20 ago [2] 10/23 11/8 agree [14] 4/10 4/20 4/20 5/20 6/10 7/1 8/3 10/1 17/21 17/22 17/25 25/3 25/6 25/8 agreed [4] 17/17 17/21 25/17 agreement [4] 13/2 16/25 16/25 19/9 agrees [1] 21/18
MR. CONABLE: [40] MR. FISHER: [1] 3/11 MR. GOLDFINE: [21] 3/9 12/24 13/10 13/16 13/20 14/1 14/11 14/21 15/14 15/21 16/4 16/7 17/4 24/2 24/14 24/21 25/2 25/5 25/10 25/24 26/20 MR. OLSON: [1] 3/14 THE CLERK: [3] 3/2 26/24 29/8 THE COURT: [61] 326-8188 [1] 2/20 3:17-cv-01986-MO [1] 1/5 3:17-cv-1986-MO [1] 3/4 4 4 400 [1] 2/14 47 [1] 23/15 5 5 5 503 [1] 2/20 8 8188 [1] 2/20
MR. CONABLE: [40] MR. FISHER: [1] 3/11 MR. GOLDFINE: [21] 3/9 12/24 13/10 13/16 13/20 14/1 14/11 14/21 15/14 15/21 16/4 16/7 17/4 24/2 24/14 24/21 25/2 25/5 25/10 25/24 26/20 MR. OLSON: [1] 3/14 THE CLERK: [3] 3/2 26/24 29/8 THE COURT: [61] 3:17-cv-01986-MO [1] 1/5 3:17-cv-1986-MO [1] 3/4 4 4 4 400 [1] 2/14 4/20 5/20 6/10 7/1 8/3 10/1 17/21 17/22 17/25 25/3 25/6 25/8 agreed [4] 17/17 17/21 25/17 25/17 agreement [4] 13/2 16/25 16/25 19/9 agrees [1] 21/18
MR. FISHER: [1] 3/11 MR. GOLDFINE: [21] 3/9 12/24 13/10 13/16 13/20 14/1 14/11 14/21 15/14 15/21 16/4 16/7 17/4 24/2 24/14 24/21 25/2 25/5 25/10 25/24 26/20 MR. OLSON: [1] 3/14 THE CLERK: [3] 3/2 26/24 29/8 THE COURT: [61] 1/5 3:17-cv-1986-MO [1] 3/4 4 4 4 400 [1] 2/14 47 [1] 23/15 5 5 503 [1] 2/20 8 8188 [1] 2/20 85004 [1] 2/11
MR. GOLDFINE: [21] 3/9 12/24 13/10 13/16 13/20 14/1 14/11 14/21 15/14 15/21 16/4 16/7 17/4 24/2 24/14 24/21 25/2 25/5 25/10 25/24 26/20 MR. OLSON: [1] 3/14 THE CLERK: [3] 3/2 26/24 29/8 THE COURT: [61] 3:17-cv-1986-MO [1] 3/4 4 4 400 [1] 2/14 4/20 5/20 6/10 7/1 8/3 10/1 17/21 17/22 17/25 25/3 25/6 25/8 agreed [4] 17/17 17/21 25/17 25/17 agreement [4] 13/2 16/25 16/25 19/9 agrees [1] 21/18
3/9 12/24 13/10 13/16 13/20 14/1 14/11 14/21 15/14 15/21 16/4 16/7 17/4 24/2 24/14 24/21 25/2 25/5 25/10 25/24 26/20 MR. OLSON: [1] 3/14 THE CLERK: [3] 3/2 26/24 29/8 THE COURT: [61] 3/4 4 400 [1] 2/14 47 [1] 23/15 5 503 [1] 2/20 8 8188 [1] 2/20 85004 [11 2/11
13/20 14/1 14/11 14/21 15/14 15/21 16/4 16/7 17/4 24/2 24/14 24/21 25/2 25/5 25/10 25/24 26/20 MR. OLSON: [1] 3/14 THE CLERK: [3] 3/2 26/24 29/8 THE COURT: [61] 8
15/14 15/21 16/4 16/7 17/4 24/2 24/14 24/21 25/2 25/5 25/10 25/24 26/20 MR. OLSON: [1] 3/14 THE CLERK: [3] 3/2 26/24 29/8 THE COURT: [61] A 400 [1] 2/14 47 [1] 23/15 5 5 5 8 8188 [1] 2/20 85004 [11 2/11
77/4 24/2 24/14 24/21 25/2 25/5 25/10 25/24 26/20 MR. OLSON: [1] 3/14 THE CLERK: [3] 3/2 26/24 29/8 THE COURT: [61] 8 188 [1] 2/20 25/3 25/6 25/8 agreed [4] 17/17 17/21 25/17 25/17 agreement [4] 13/2 16/25 16/25 19/9 agrees [1] 21/18
25/2 25/5 25/10 25/24 26/20 MR. OLSON: [1] 3/14 THE CLERK: [3] 3/2 26/24 29/8 THE COURT: [61] 8 188 [1] 2/20 8 25/3 25/6 25/8 agreed [4] 17/17 17/21 25/17 25/17 agreement [4] 13/2 16/25 16/25 19/9 agrees [1] 21/18
MR. OLSON: [1] 3/14 THE CLERK: [3] 3/2 26/24 29/8 THE COURT: [61] 8 8188 [1] 2/20 85004 [11 2/11
MR. OLSON: [1] 3/14 THE CLERK: [3] 3/2 26/24 29/8 THE COURT: [61] 8 8188 [1] 2/20 85004 [11 2/11
THE CLERK: [3] 3/2 26/24 29/8 THE COURT: [61] 8 8188 [1] 2/20 85004 [11 2/11
THE COURT: [61] 8188 [1] 2/20 85004 [1] 2/11 agrees [1] 21/18
8188 [1] 2/20 agrees [1] 21/18
Δ Δ Δ Δ Δ Δ Δ Δ Δ Δ
\$30 [1] 20/21 9 all [13] 1/3 3/17 3/21 4/20 11/8 12/19 12/24
14/4 44/4 40/40 04/7
97204 [2] 2/6 2/19
allegation [5] 9/20 9/21
000 [1] 30/2
7/11 9/1 0/10 10/11
/5/Dointa [1] 50/9
12/2 13/9 13/16 15/2 alleged [7] 8/20 13/8 15/13 21/1 26/15 26/16 13/14 14/12 25/12 27/7
10 [1] 4/23 above [1] 30/6 28/21
10,000 [1] 11/10 above-entitled [1] 30/6 alleges [1] 23/13
100 [1] 15/17 absence [1] 13/6 allow [2] 11/6 21/6
1000 [1] 2/19 absolutely [1] 16/5 already [4] 18/7 18/9
1020 [1] 2/14 accident [1] 4/11 18/18 29/2
1200 [1] 2/10
1600 [1] 2/5 accidentally [1] 26/7 28/19
1980 [2] 8/15 11/23 acknowledged [1] alter [1] 18/2
25/21 alternative [1] 18/25
act [1] 28/7 although [2] 10/1 10/7
2018 [3] 1/7 3/2 30/9 actually [3] 10/1 13/13 am [1] 20/18
add [3] 18/1 18/2 28/9 5/22 6/1 6/2 21/5 23/22

A Case 3:17-cv-01986-MC	8/25 49/23 340/ F2 40/4/30/1	⁸ 1 4 7 1% 16/918 26/9
analysis [2] 27/6 27/11	10/18 11/1 11/25 12/11	before [4] 1/18 4/15
announce [1] 10/10	27/21	15/12 28/25
anticipated [1] 19/1	ascertain [1] 21/5	behalf [1] 1/3
any [14] 5/14 8/14	ascertaining [2] 5/6	being [4] 3/17 8/22
12/15 13/19 14/10	5/18	8/23 17/20
14/10 14/10 14/13	ask [1] 4/18	belief [2] 20/11 23/1
15/20 17/11 19/24	asking [5] 8/1 14/17	believe [3] 12/5 12/7
20/12 21/4 27/8	15/1 15/19 25/5	27/16
anybody [1] 7/24	asks [1] 12/20	believed [1] 22/8
anyone [1] 23/4	assistance [1] 17/7	believes [2] 20/6 20/7
anything [5] 5/16 10/4	assume [4] 17/20 19/5	below [1] 30/4
13/4 18/18 27/15	20/22 22/19	better [1] 4/7
anyway [2] 8/19 20/13	assuming [3] 6/5 25/9	between [4] 10/3 13/6
APPEARANCES [1]	26/1	14/2 17/2
2/2	at [23] 4/3 7/24 9/10	beyond [3] 12/3 26/21
applied [1] 12/18	9/11 9/18 11/3 11/8	26/22
applies [1] 9/21	12/6 12/15 15/7 18/23 18/23 19/6 19/9 20/24	bind [1] 16/9
apply [1] 12/17	23/2 23/11 25/22 26/8	bit [1] 18/24
April [3] 1/7 3/2 30/9	27/15 27/18 27/24 28/2	body [8] 6/11 6/24 11/6 17/7 22/9 22/14 22/16
are [21] 4/4 6/12 6/12	attempt [1] 13/1	22/22
6/13 11/22 11/25 12/12	attempting [1] 6/7	Bonita [3] 2/18 30/9
12/23 14/6 15/16 16/10	Ave [1] 2/19	30/10
19/9 20/14 21/5 22/6	Avenue [1] 2/5	both [1] 29/7
22/11 24/9 24/11 25/10	away [1] 3/19	branded [2] 16/16
25/15 28/21	AZ [1] 2/11	16/17
aren't [1] 4/19		breach [3] 3/22 14/4
argue [1] 9/18	В	27/5
argument [18] 1/16 3/4 3/18 4/2 5/11 5/24 7/14		brief [2] 4/3 26/24
10/6 17/15 18/17 18/25	18/19 21/15 25/25	briefing [2] 3/22 27/2
20/1 21/3 21/11 25/19	bag [1] 25/20	broken [4] 3/23 3/25
26/2 27/3 27/18	be [42]	5/15 5/15
arguments [1] 8/2	because [20] 3/25 5/16	Brooksby [3] 2/13 2/13
Aries [3] 8/15 9/12	7/9 7/21 7/24 9/14 9/20	3/8
11/24	10/9 15/10 16/6 19/18	bumped [1] 26/7
articles [2] 11/11 11/11	19/25 19/25 20/2 21/22	bumper [5] 13/6 13/13
articulate [1] 13/1	21/22 21/24 22/3 24/22 27/23	13/14 13/16 26/7
articulated [1] 11/20		bunch [1] 24/8
as [42]	becomes [1] 5/3 beef [1] 20/22	but [36]
ASA [11] 6/18 8/22	been [6] 3/25 3/25 13/7	buy [1] 23/8
• •	Decit [0] 0/20 0/20 10//	
	l	L

Case 3:17-cv-01986-MC	149955 4 25 25 20 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	conclude (2) 19/6 23/3
can [10] 3/6 7/24 9/18	26/5 26/11	concluded [1] 29/10
12/17 15/4 15/5 17/6	claim [11] 3/19 14/4	condition [13] 4/14 5/6
17/17 23/3 26/6	17/9 17/10 18/5 23/15	8/7 8/9 8/10 10/25 11/2
can't [7] 12/3 14/14	27/5 27/16 27/20 28/20	11/5 11/13 11/19 12/13
16/9 18/1 18/12 27/10	29/6	13/10 13/12
28/15	claimants [1] 12/17	conditions [1] 7/10
	class [3] 9/22 12/6	conduct [3] 5/13 7/12
candidly [1] 24/8	12/14	11/2
car [34]	client [2] 6/3 22/22	conducting [1] 8/9
car's [1] 12/22	client's [1] 18/23	confidently [1] 12/14
cars [4] 7/11 9/22 12/9	coin [1] 10/6	conformed [1] 30/7
18/23	collision [5] 13/24 17/1	consistent [2] 24/11
case [18] 1/5 3/4 6/3	21/19 22/8 26/13	24/17
8/20 8/20 9/20 9/21	come [4] 8/15 18/19	context [3] 27/12 27/12
10/10 12/7 13/13 13/23	20/24 26/6	27/15
14/10 14/18 18/25 27/3	coming [1] 16/17	contract [62]
27/4 28/1 28/23	commit [1] 8/4	contracts [1] 21/17
cases [8] 10/9 10/11	common [2] 17/17	contractual [1] 27/11
10/13 18/10 19/13	17/21	contractually [1] 7/7
19/20 20/6 21/2	company [13] 1/7 3/5	contravenes [1] 26/19
cat's [1] 25/19	3/11 5/25 6/5 6/8 14/20	corporation [1] 1/8
categorically [1] 6/16	15/3 17/3 20/22 20/23	correct [4] 4/22 5/2 6/9
cause [1] 30/6	22/22 25/1	30/5
caused [2] 13/24 26/13		correctly [1] 20/7
certain [3] 11/3 16/2	15/23 15/24 19/10	cost [1] 14/25
28/15	23/22 25/18	could [12] 13/21 13/22
certainly [2] 27/12	compensated [3] 13/7	15/18 17/14 20/22
28/25	14/14 26/9	22/20 23/3 26/3 26/4
certification [2] 12/6	compensating [1]	26/4 28/25 29/2
12/15	24/23	Counsel [1] 3/6
certified [1] 30/7	compensation [1]	course [2] 16/20 28/10
certify [1] 30/4	26/12	court [12] 1/1 1/19 2/18
change [1] 11/7	complaint [7] 4/24	12/20 13/2 14/7 26/3
cherry [1] 8/25	23/11 23/13 26/9 27/4	26/6 26/25 28/25 29/9
Chevy [1] 12/2	27/24 28/21	30/11
CHIEF [1] 1/19	complete [2] 4/13	Courthouse [1] 2/18
choice [1] 24/22	23/22	coverage [1] 21/10
Christie [1] 2/10	computer [2] 8/18 12/3	
circumstance [2] 22/7	Conable [5] 2/4 3/14	covering [1] 20/9
23/1	4/4 9/25 17/15	create [1] 11/12
circumstances [6]	concern [1] 11/7	creates [1] 20/5
		Cicates [1] 20/0

9Ppgungnt 344/6File4/94/20/18287age 34 of 44 Case 3:17-cv-01986-MO doesn't [20] 8/4 9/24 14/19 14/20 14/24 15/6 **CRR [2]** 2/18 30/10 15/21 16/2 16/14 16/23 10/4 10/19 11/7 12/2 **CSR [2]** 2/18 30/10 16/24 19/2 19/20 20/21 12/21 13/16 14/25 **curable [2]** 28/21 29/5 24/20 24/22 25/16 15/22 16/22 17/22 19/2 **cured [2]** 29/2 29/3 25/21 26/3 28/1 20/3 20/3 21/4 22/12 **customer** [3] 17/3 17/6 diagnostics [11] 7/5 27/8 27/14 29/2 21/23 7/16 8/4 9/23 15/9 doing [4] 6/15 14/24 **customer's [1]** 25/10 19/17 19/24 20/3 20/4 14/25 22/9 cv [2] 1/5 3/4 don't [20] 5/14 7/20 9/1 20/5 27/9 D dictate [1] 16/22 9/19 9/21 12/5 12/7 did [3] 6/12 19/17 28/5 14/16 15/9 15/11 15/13 damage [52] 17/10 18/9 18/16 20/1 didn't [5] 4/9 4/10 16/6 damages [1] 27/16 20/25 25/7 27/13 27/16 **Dan [2]** 2/9 3/10 16/8 16/17 different [8] 6/3 14/15 **DATE [1]** 30/10 28/2 **done [3]** 6/3 10/13 15/17 16/11 16/12 17/9 dealing [16] 17/14 18/5 27/13 28/22 16/18 18/10 18/14 19/4 21/15 difficult [1] 6/22 down [1] 23/18 24/14 26/16 26/19 direct [2] 3/24 23/24 draw [2] 15/4 19/14 27/20 28/4 28/4 28/6 directly [1] 26/17 duty [2] 6/8 6/14 28/15 28/20 29/1 decide [2] 10/10 24/12 disconnect [2] 13/5 E declarations [2] 10/16 14/2 easily [1] 20/22 discuss [1] 13/12 11/10 East [1] 2/10 dismiss [9] 11/21 12/5 **deductible [2]** 15/24 effect [1] 23/10 12/7 12/14 12/19 21/14 25/18 efforts [1] 12/16 23/2 23/12 27/24 defendant [5] 1/9 2/9 either [1] 21/9 **disparate** [1] 22/6 3/9 3/10 3/12 electronic [3] 4/11 11/3 dispute [1] 12/1 **defense** [1] 3/18 21/9 disregard [1] 24/6 degree [1] 26/18 **elements [2]** 6/9 6/12 demand [1] 14/3 **DISTRICT [4]** 1/1 1/2 else [3] 7/25 13/4 23/4 1/19 2/18 **denied [1]** 19/17 **embrace** [1] 21/9 divide [1] 9/15 deny [2] 12/5 12/7 EMPLOYEES [3] 1/7 divides [1] 9/12 denying [1] 23/23 3/5 3/11 divisible [1] 22/6 depends [1] 14/22 end [1] 11/16 division [1] 21/23 details [1] 20/25 **ended [1]** 5/16 do [31] **determine** [7] 6/24 enough [1] 29/3 documents [1] 24/8 7/16 11/1 19/8 22/2 entirely [1] 28/22 **Dodge [3]** 8/15 9/12 24/21 25/10 entitled [1] 30/6 11/23 determining [4] 11/4 **enumerated** [1] 11/3 does [12] 8/5 9/2 10/21 11/22 12/12 22/5 **essential** [1] 15/11 13/9 13/11 14/20 15/20 diagnostic [24] 6/9 8/6 essentially [1] 28/5 20/4 21/10 25/14 27/7

Case 3:17-cv-01986-MO E establishing [1] 27/22 **estimate** [2] 14/25 14/25 even [7] 12/21 16/1 16/18 21/5 25/12 28/8 28/25 events [2] 22/6 27/9 ever [1] 22/8 everyone's [1] 22/4 **everything [1]** 16/21 evidence [1] 20/24 **example [4]** 5/7 8/14 13/22 27/21 **examples** [1] 15/16 except [2] 20/4 26/18 **excuse** [1] 8/16 exists [2] 15/25 18/11 **expanse [1]** 12/16 **expect [1]** 12/14 **expectation** [17] 11/13 17/18 17/23 18/1 18/6 18/22 23/4 23/5 23/8 23/14 23/17 23/20 24/1 24/13 25/23 28/8 29/1 expectations [7] 19/4 21/17 25/10 25/15 27/19 27/22 27/25 **expensive** [1] 14/19 **expert [2]** 10/14 11/10 explanations [1] 16/11 **explicit** [1] 18/2 express [4] 24/7 25/2 27/8 28/13 **expressed** [3] 11/9 11/9 11/10 **expression** [1] 27/14 **expressly [1]** 10/19 extend [1] 12/4 **extends** [1] 26/22 extent [1] 14/11

externant31 15/90704/20/1 fix Edut 21/9 6/24 22/4 11/12 27/9

F

fabulous [1] 20/17 fact [6] 11/22 12/1 13/11 16/11 20/15 25/20 factless [1] 19/25 facts [2] 11/17 21/12 factual [3] 20/19 21/11 21/14 fails [1] 27/4 failure [2] 3/19 29/6 fair [16] 17/14 18/5 18/10 18/14 19/3 21/15 24/13 26/16 26/19 27/20 28/3 28/4 28/6 28/15 28/20 29/1 fairly [3] 4/2 4/3 27/5 faith [15] 17/14 18/5 18/10 18/13 19/3 21/15 24/13 26/16 26/18 27/19 28/3 28/6 28/15 28/20 29/1 fall [1] 9/22 far [1] 10/21 fender [1] 5/9 Fifth [1] 2/5 figure [10] 5/25 6/19 10/8 17/3 17/8 20/8 22/10 22/14 22/14 22/17 figuring [4] 19/11 21/19 22/11 23/5 financial [1] 25/1 find [3] 27/4 27/23 28/19 fine [1] 5/20 first [2] 9/1 17/5 Fisher [2] 2/9 3/12 fix [2] 20/9 25/15

fixing [3] 22/6 22/10 23/5 focus [2] 3/18 5/10 focusing [2] 15/20 26/17 following [3] 6/17 6/18 21/18 Ford [3] 16/15 16/16 16/17 Ford-branded [2] 16/16 16/17 foregoing [1] 30/4 form [1] 23/1 forth [3] 4/2 14/4 14/6 forward [1] 20/24 four [2] 11/11 15/17 frustrates [1] 23/25 full [1] 6/13 function [1] 15/3 fundamentally [2] 3/23 28/18

G

GEICO [23] 5/8 5/25 7/9 8/17 8/17 9/3 9/4 12/16 12/21 13/7 16/9 17/11 17/22 19/21 20/3 20/4 20/6 20/6 20/14 21/7 23/21 25/20 25/20 **GEICO's [4]** 19/12 23/16 23/20 23/23 **get [7]** 8/2 9/11 23/9 25/15 26/20 28/1 28/15 gets [1] 27/18 getting [2] 9/10 22/4 **GM [2]** 9/9 9/9 **GMC [2]** 9/12 23/8 **go [5]** 5/25 9/7 10/21 14/18 27/21 going [11] 4/4 6/11 6/20 8/18 10/9 10/11

27978 Filed 04/20/18 1872 26/9 6424/5 26/2 Case 3:17-cv-01986-MO help [2] 4/7 22/12 26/5 going... [5] 11/22 13/15 her [1] 6/24 identified [4] 3/25 13/2 14/14 24/6 25/15 14/7 14/13 here [30] 3/17 3/23 Goldfine [2] 2/9 3/10 4/19 5/7 5/25 6/2 6/12 if [31] gone [1] 7/25 6/15 7/3 10/3 10/12 **implication** [1] 19/19 **good [17]** 3/13 17/14 11/21 12/2 13/8 15/14 import [1] 10/18 18/4 18/9 18/13 19/3 **important** [2] 8/13 15/20 16/25 17/21 21/15 24/13 26/16 18/16 18/19 20/1 21/3 10/17 26/18 27/19 28/3 28/6 24/3 25/12 26/2 26/6 imposes [1] 24/25 28/10 28/15 28/20 29/1 26/14 27/23 28/12 29/6 in [83] qot [4] 10/1 21/15 here's [2] 5/21 6/4 includes [1] 23/5 22/13 22/16 himself [1] 1/3 including [2] 21/8 GOVERNMENT [3] 1/7 hinge [1] 17/17 22/21 3/4 3/11 inconsistency [1] his [1] 6/23 grant [1] 29/6 **Honor [24]** 3/3 3/8 3/13 28/17 **gratuitous** [2] 19/20 3/16 4/5 4/22 5/2 6/10 inconsistent [9] 18/8 26/3 8/15 8/16 11/20 12/8 18/12 18/18 24/9 24/16 group [1] 9/22 12/25 17/16 17/19 24/21 25/2 28/7 28/13 quess [4] 9/10 18/17 17/24 18/15 18/21 independent [1] 22/9 23/7 25/25 **indivisibly [1]** 5/17 18/24 20/2 20/18 21/7 Н 22/18 23/12 industry [4] 10/15 **HONORABLE [1]** 1/18 11/21 18/19 23/25 had [5] 5/8 6/3 14/18 hood [2] 5/9 15/8 inherent [1] 11/22 16/18 22/7 how [9] 5/4 6/19 6/19 **initially [1]** 4/3 hand [1] 6/23 9/2 10/21 18/13 20/8 insurance [13] 1/7 3/5 **HANSEN [3]** 1/3 3/4 24/20 25/15 3/11 5/25 6/5 6/8 14/20 23/4 However [1] 23/23 15/2 17/2 20/21 20/23 Hansen's [5] 8/21 9/20 hypothetical [1] 15/16 22/22 25/1 12/10 12/10 12/22 insured [11] 5/21 5/23 happy [1] 4/5 6/1 6/10 6/23 7/5 8/12 has [18] 8/22 8/23 10/2 **I'd [4]** 3/18 4/5 8/17 10/14 14/18 19/5 25/17 15/3 18/5 19/12 20/1 8/19 insured's [3] 6/11 7/2 21/3 21/9 22/7 24/15 **I'II [3]** 8/2 24/3 26/24 19/4 24/17 25/17 25/17 **I'm [19]** 5/19 6/2 8/1 25/20 27/7 28/6 28/9 insurer [6] 5/19 5/19 9/10 9/11 9/25 10/1 6/15 7/2 19/6 25/17 hasn't [4] 3/25 13/7 10/8 10/9 10/20 10/20 insurer's [2] 6/13 7/4 14/13 26/9 10/22 12/1 12/19 14/17 into [5] 10/18 16/21 have [37] 15/1 15/19 21/7 26/17 16/21 26/7 27/10 having [1] 19/21 l've [1] 29/2 investigation [1] 17/12 **he [2]** 19/12 19/17 lan [2] 2/9 3/12 irrational [1] 22/19 heard [3] 15/12 25/19 idea [8] 4/16 4/19 16/1 is [124]

Document 34 Filed 04/20/18 Page 37 of 44 Case 3:17-cv-01986-MO **made [1]** 10/23 isn't [6] 5/21 5/23 6/1 **labor [2]** 5/8 20/8 make [4] 7/6 12/16 21/25 25/24 29/5 language [16] 4/17 4/22 4/23 13/18 13/25 19/20 21/11 issue [3] 10/23 12/1 12/8 15/20 15/22 21/4 23/21 makes [2] 9/17 10/8 24/4 24/5 24/7 24/17 it [91] mandatorily [2] 8/23 24/18 25/12 25/13 9/2 it's [34] item [1] 14/12 law [5] 12/20 20/1 23/2 **mandatory** [3] 4/10 24/16 24/17 its [3] 12/18 17/12 27/7 5/13 7/11 itself [4] 24/23 27/12 lawyer [1] 19/12 manufacturer [17] 5/12 27/24 28/24 learn [2] 14/11 15/11 8/8 8/11 8/24 9/2 9/4 least [5] 4/3 9/18 11/3 9/5 9/14 9/16 9/24 J 18/23 25/23 10/25 11/25 12/11 **jail [1]** 9/7 leg [2] 5/15 5/15 12/22 16/20 16/22 journal [1] 11/11 legit [2] 6/5 10/20 23/24 **JUDGE [1]** 1/19 **LEIF [1]** 1/3 manufacturer's [3] judgment [2] 12/6 less [1] 14/19 6/18 27/10 27/20 12/15 **let [3]** 10/22 13/1 14/7 manufacturers [6] 7/10 iust [17] 6/8 7/13 8/1 **Lewis [1]** 2/10 9/15 10/18 11/9 16/2 8/12 10/9 10/20 11/8 16/9 lift [1] 5/9 14/10 14/17 15/9 16/6 like [12] 3/18 5/14 8/17 **Maryland** [1] 1/7 19/2 20/22 24/23 26/1 8/19 8/21 9/15 12/22 matter [6] 12/20 19/3 26/2 27/13 14/18 16/15 18/23 23/9 19/4 20/1 20/15 23/2 justiciability [1] 3/20 28/11 may [4] 9/22 15/3 justification [1] 26/10 limit [1] 25/7 22/13 22/15 iustified [10] 17/18 **limitation** [1] 24/7 **maybe** [1] 15/17 17/23 17/25 18/5 18/22 **me [7]** 4/7 5/20 8/16 line [1] 19/14 23/8 23/14 24/13 25/10 **lines [1]** 10/3 9/24 10/22 13/1 14/7 25/14 litigate [1] 25/23 mean [16] 6/2 7/7 9/1 K **litigating [1]** 17/21 9/2 9/18 10/17 11/11 13/21 17/9 22/13 24/3 little [1] 18/24 kept [1] 11/4 **LLP [2]** 2/5 2/10 25/7 27/13 27/15 27/20 kind [2] 28/1 28/1 long [1] 27/21 28/21 knew [1] 6/4 **look [5]** 5/9 7/24 15/7 meaning [2] 24/9 24/12 know [19] 9/1 9/13 19/9 27/14 means [2] 11/8 19/22 10/17 11/12 14/5 15/4 looking [2] 19/6 24/12 measure [2] 5/10 15/20 15/6 15/13 16/15 16/21 lose [1] 7/20 mercifully [1] 4/2 17/7 19/1 20/4 20/21 loss [46] met [1] 4/18 24/6 25/14 25/22 26/1 lost [2] 7/23 7/25 method [1] 25/9 26/10 **MICHAEL [1]** 1/18 might [6] 5/16 11/14

M Case 3:17-cv-01986-MC	1/5 9/10 9/17 10/7 10/7	
might [4] 15/8 16/23	10/8 10/12 10/13 10/15	Olson [3] 2/4 2/13 3/15
22/25 27/21	11/18 19/7 20/8 21/5	on [38]
minimum [1] 18/23	27/23	once [1] 21/7
minus [2] 15/23 25/18	need [5] 7/20 9/23 28/2	one [14] 6/23 14/18
minute [1] 21/16	28/3 29/2	15/13 16/9 17/9 20/5
MO [2] 1/5 3/4	needs [1] 6/24	20/6 20/14 20/16 22/20
moment [3] 3/19 10/23	neither [1] 28/20	23/9 28/10 28/11 28/23
11/8	never [3] 15/5 15/12	one-time [1] 17/9
more [6] 6/4 14/19 15/3	28/12	ones [1] 15/11
27/8 28/2 28/16	nevertheless [1] 20/13	only [2] 15/5 16/8
MOSMAN [1] 1/18	new [4] 24/25 28/13	open [1] 15/8
Most [1] 27/18	29/4 29/5	opening [1] 26/10
motion [10] 11/21 12/5	newspaper [1] 11/11	operative [5] 13/4
12/7 12/13 12/19 21/14	nickel [1] 21/1	13/18 13/24 24/4 24/18
23/2 23/12 27/24 29/6	no [16] 1/5 3/4 3/25	opponent [3] 4/9 19/15
motivated [1] 21/2	5/17 8/18 9/8 9/14 12/9	19/16
mouth [1] 18/17	15/22 17/11 17/21	opportunity [1] 14/5
move [1] 4/15	21/22 22/3 22/7 23/3	opposed [1] 24/23
Mr [6] 2/4 2/4 2/9 2/9	28/19	opposition [1] 23/24
2/13 4/4	not [63]	or [43]
Mr. [8] 8/21 9/20 9/25	noted [1] 26/3	oral [3] 1/16 3/3 27/3
12/10 12/10 12/22	nothing [3] 7/14 7/17	order [1] 11/1
17/15 23/4	7/18	ordinary [1] 22/4
Mr. Conable [2] 9/25	notwithstanding [1]	OREGON [4] 1/2 1/9
17/15	20/11	24/5 24/16
Mr. Hansen [1] 23/4	now [6] 4/7 8/1 11/9	original [1] 30/6
Mr. Hansen's [5] 8/21	15/13 23/7 25/23	other [13] 8/2 10/4
9/20 12/10 12/10 12/22	0	10/11 10/11 13/21
much [6] 4/20 7/1		14/19 16/14 18/12 21/2
22/12 27/10 27/13 28/2	o0o [1] 30/2	24/16 25/7 27/15 28/24
must [8] 9/3 9/5 9/6 9/7	obligated [3] 14/7 14/8 14/9	others [3] 1/3 15/10
11/2 14/17 16/2 21/8		21/13
must conduct [1] 11/2	obligation [7] 7/2 7/5	ought [1] 8/13
my [6] 5/22 11/23	25/1	our [7] 4/17 4/24 6/22
14/16 23/11 26/7 29/5		8/20 19/1 21/16 23/10
	obtain [2] 17/7 23/22	Our allegations [1]
N	occur [3] 12/16 15/18 21/6	8/20
name [1] 3/6		out [18] 4/4 4/23 4/23
nature [2] 18/25 28/17	occurred [1] 15/24 off [2] 5/9 21/15	5/25 6/20 10/8 17/3
necessary [15] 6/13	Official [1] 30/11	17/8 19/11 20/8 21/20
		22/10 22/11 22/14

Case 3:17-cv-01986-MC	22/23/25/24 Filed 04/20/1	Portland [4] 41/9 2/6
out [4] 22/14 22/17	PC [1] 2/13	2/14 2/19
23/5 25/19	penumbra [2] 10/6	position [1] 16/12
outside [1] 15/16	16/11	possibilities [3] 11/15
own [2] 14/10 17/12	penumbral [1] 10/24	20/5 20/14
owners [1] 18/23	people [2] 10/11 10/16	possibility [3] 5/11
	perfectly [2] 20/20	20/6 20/10
<u>P</u>	21/25	post [5] 4/11 8/9 11/2
paid [5] 4/1 5/1 23/9	perform [2] 4/13 6/8	12/21 23/24
27/6 28/22	performance [1] 28/5	post-accident [1] 4/11
paint [1] 7/19	performative [1] 28/7	post-repair [2] 8/9
panoply [1] 26/11	perhaps [2] 18/19	23/24
paragraph [2] 4/23	20/23	potential [1] 12/17
23/15	person [2] 22/13 23/3	practice [1] 15/3
parcel [8] 4/12 5/5 5/14		pre [18] 4/11 4/14 5/6
7/13 10/5 16/3 18/6	21/23	7/10 8/7 8/9 8/9 8/10
20/9	pertinent [1] 4/23	10/25 11/2 11/5 11/13
part [27] 4/12 4/18 5/5	Phoenix [1] 2/11	11/19 12/13 12/21 13/9
5/12 5/13 5/14 5/17	photos [2] 15/7 22/15	13/12 23/23
6/16 6/17 6/21 7/11	phrase [1] 10/6	pre-loss [13] 4/14 5/6
7/13 7/21 8/8 8/10 8/24	pinnacle [3] 11/15	7/10 8/7 8/9 8/10 10/25
10/5 11/4 11/18 12/12	11/24 12/10	11/5 11/13 11/19 12/13
16/3 16/24 17/5 18/6	place [6] 13/2 16/13	13/9 13/12
18/6 20/9 21/19	16/21 17/10 28/5 28/24	precise [1] 13/15
particular [9] 11/23	plain [6] 21/3 23/21	preferred [1] 14/5
13/23 14/12 16/23	24/5 24/6 24/9 24/11	prejudice [1] 29/7
16/24 25/16 26/5 26/5	plaintiff [8] 1/5 2/4 3/14	
26/11	3/15 14/8 14/9 16/16	17/8 17/11
parties [6] 24/10 24/12	_	presentation [1] 7/6
27/19 27/22 27/25 28/9	plaintiff's [1] 11/10	presented [1] 15/25
parties' [1] 24/8	plays [1] 16/20	presenting [1] 6/2
party [2] 21/17 29/1	pleading [1] 4/3	pressing [1] 9/25
Paul [2] 2/4 3/13	please [2] 3/6 23/18	principal [1] 3/21
pay [58]	plug [1] 27/10	principle [4] 9/12 10/12 10/21 11/17
paying [11] 15/6 15/7	point [5] 9/11 12/3 20/24 21/16 26/20	
15/8 16/3 19/7 21/9		probably [2] 22/16
21/12 21/13 21/19	policy [10] 16/12 20/25 21/12 23/21 23/23	
21/19 24/20		problem [1] 29/4
payment [1] 29/5	24/17 24/18 24/21 25/2 26/12	proceedings [3] 1/17 29/10 30/5
payments [1] 19/20	policyholders [2]	process [9] 6/17 6/17
pays [4] 16/24 21/8	23/16 23/20	12/12 19/10 21/23 22/3
	20/10 20/20	12/12/13/10/21/20/22/3

P Case 3:17-cv-01986-MC	ray [2] 195/195 5/160 04/20/1	REPORTER (2) 2/18
process [3] 22/5 22/6	wood [C] 10/0 10/0	30/11
22/21 22/3	18/13 19/13 24/8 28/14	require [4] 12/21 19/13
	really [8] 6/10 8/12	21/4 28/11
profit [1] 21/2	14/22 27/10 27/14	required [13] 5/8 8/22
promise [19] 3/23 3/23	27/18 27/23 28/2	8/24 9/2 11/16 11/25
10/4 11/5 13/19 15/4	rear [1] 26/7	12/8 12/12 12/23 19/10
15/5 15/5 15/21 15/22	reason [4] 9/25 15/1	19/18 20/11 29/5
16/6 16/8 18/7 18/9	19/21 28/19	requirements [4] 6/18
27/8 27/8 28/14 28/16	reasonable [15] 19/4	27/10 27/20 27/21
28/18	19/5 19/9 21/17 21/25	requires [4] 4/12 7/9
promised [7] 10/7	23/3 23/16 23/20 23/25	11/13 28/6
10/24 10/24 13/23 15/3	25/23 27/19 27/22	respect [5] 9/19 11/3
18/18 28/12	27/25 28/8 28/25	11/23 12/9 16/13
promises [2] 4/8 15/23		
prong [1] 29/1	reasons [2] 16/11 26/4	respectfully [1] 22/25
properly [2] 16/19	recess [5] 26/24 26/25	responsibility [2] 6/23
27/17	27/1 29/8 29/9	22/9
proposition [2] 25/3	recommendations [2]	responsible [1] 19/7
25/4	6/19 23/25	restore [1] 7/10
protection [1] 22/20	record [2] 3/7 30/5	restoring [1] 11/5
provide [1] 21/10	redo [1] 16/18	return [4] 4/13 10/24
pull [1] 5/9	redressability [1] 3/20	11/13 11/19
purpose [2] 17/18	refer [1] 11/15	reveal [1] 5/11
17/22	<u> </u>	right [11] 4/21 6/6 7/14
purposes [2] 12/13	reflects [1] 24/4	8/1 12/24 14/1 17/18
26/2	Regardless [1] 8/14	17/22 18/16 23/7 27/2
put [2] 4/2 18/17	regular [1] 16/19	RMR [2] 2/18 30/10
puts [1] 10/14	reject [1] 16/1	Roca [1] 2/10
pyramid [1] 11/15	relief [1] 23/16	Room [1] 2/19
	rely [1] 11/14	rooted [2] 23/21 24/5
Q	relying [3] 11/18 17/22	Rothgerber [1] 2/10
question [9] 5/7 9/8	24/10	rule [1] 10/10
9/24 14/16 15/1 21/14	remark [1] 10/23	rules [1] 10/13
22/24 22/25 25/5	repair [22] 4/12 4/13	ruling [1] 12/8
questions [2] 9/11	4/20 5/17 6/9 6/13 6/16	S
11/22	6/17 6/19 7/12 8/6 8/9	
quite [2] 14/16 18/10	8/25 9/5 9/9 13/4 16/3	S.W [3] 2/5 2/14 2/19
quotidian [1] 14/20	16/16 16/18 19/8 22/9	safe [1] 23/23
D	23/24	said [7] 6/4 11/24
R	repairing [5] 5/5 5/12	19/12 19/16 19/16
raised [1] 11/8	5/13 8/8 8/10	28/16 29/2
rational [1] 23/1	repairs [2] 4/16 23/23	same [1] 11/8

Case 3:17-cv-01986-MO 250 sument 34 Filed 04/20/18 1 9739e 41 of 44 **shops** [1] 9/5 specifically [2] 4/16 satisfactory [1] 18/4 **short [1]** 24/3 19/17 say [34] **shot [1]** 17/9 **square [1]** 15/17 say-so [2] 23/8 23/11 **should [3]** 10/13 16/13 squeezing [1] 21/1 saving [15] 4/25 5/14 25/22 stage [4] 23/2 23/12 6/11 6/15 7/11 8/11 shouldn't [1] 25/22 27/24 28/2 8/12 10/5 10/20 12/19 **showing [1]** 5/16 stand [1] 10/14 16/15 16/17 16/23 **Shumway [3]** 2/18 30/9 standard [3] 10/15 24/25 25/5 30/10 11/21 18/19 says [22] 5/12 7/15 **Sierra [1]** 9/13 **standards** [1] 12/18 7/16 7/18 7/19 8/8 8/17 **standing [1]** 3/20 signature [2] 30/7 30/7 9/9 9/16 9/23 10/14 start [6] 4/4 4/15 4/16 signing [1] 30/4 10/25 11/1 12/8 12/22 **similarly** [1] 1/4 10/22 25/11 25/12 13/12 16/20 16/22 state [4] 3/6 3/19 27/5 simple [2] 4/2 27/14 16/25 19/2 26/12 26/12 simply [1] 25/7 29/6 scan [7] 5/3 5/11 5/17 situated [1] 1/4 **stated [2]** 27/17 28/20 6/4 6/8 8/6 19/2 slight [1] 10/23 **statements** [3] 16/12 scanning [3] 4/11 4/11 **Slow [1]** 23/18 16/12 16/13 20/12 so [45] states [4] 1/1 1/19 2/18 scans [21] 5/13 7/12 **some [12]** 19/13 19/20 27/25 8/9 8/17 11/3 11/25 19/21 20/5 20/7 20/24 states' [1] 24/16 12/11 12/21 12/23 13/7 21/2 21/13 22/8 23/1 **stay [1]** 3/19 14/3 14/19 16/13 19/14 27/6 28/24 stems [1] 26/21 21/5 21/5 21/8 21/9 **someone [7]** 15/7 15/7 step [3] 14/7 14/24 21/13 23/9 23/24 15/8 21/18 22/1 22/7 25/25 **scenarios** [1] 15/18 steps [8] 14/19 14/20 23/1 **Scott [2]** 2/13 3/8 15/6 15/21 16/2 17/10 **something [7]** 5/10 **screwdriver [3]** 16/16 7/25 10/2 10/19 21/2 19/7 28/24 16/18 16/19 **Steve [1]** 3/15 26/8 28/11 second [3] 20/10 20/16 **sometimes [9]** 15/10 Steven [1] 2/4 23/15 **still [5]** 11/12 12/6 19/16 19/24 20/4 20/13 **see [2]** 5/10 7/24 21/8 21/9 21/10 25/21 24/15 24/18 28/9 seen [1] 3/21 **Sorry [1]** 23/19 straightforward [1] sense [1] 23/11 **sort [5]** 5/24 10/2 10/6 27/6 serious [1] 22/7 **Street [2]** 2/10 2/14 11/14 15/2 set [7] 3/3 4/23 4/23 sorts [1] 14/14 **strong [1]** 12/16 14/3 14/5 14/6 26/4 **strongly [1]** 18/10 **source [1]** 10/18 **severely [1]** 15/4 **sources [1]** 11/12 substantially [1] 26/22 **shift** [1] 6/7 such [1] 27/9 speak [1] 25/20 **shop [8]** 6/11 6/24 11/6 **speaking [1]** 7/8 **sufficient [1]** 23/22 17/7 22/9 22/14 22/16 **specific [3]** 3/23 13/3 **suggest [2]** 19/22

Ones 0:17 av 01000 MO	Decree and 04 File of 04/00/4	O Design 40 of 44
S Case 3:17-cv-01986-MO	24/11/24/13/23/2/20/17	
suggest [1] 26/18	26/19 27/8 27/12 28/7	7/14 7/17 7/18 11/25
	28/13	12/3 13/5 14/2 14/14
suggested [2] 20/2	test [5] 9/17 16/23	14/24 15/2 15/15 15/17
20/10	16/24 20/21 24/4	17/9 17/11 17/21 21/22
suggesting [3] 10/20	text [6] 7/15 8/1 8/3 8/5	
20/16 21/7	8/6 10/3	these [13] 5/13 6/12
Suite [3] 2/5 2/10 2/14	textual [1] 7/14	7/12 8/17 9/11 9/23
summary [2] 12/6	than [10] 4/7 6/4 10/5	11/2 11/25 12/9 12/9
12/15	15/4 21/2 27/8 27/13	12/11 14/10 20/12
supermarket [1] 26/8	27/15 28/2 28/16	
sure [4] 10/1 11/7		they [31]
22/13 26/15	thank [9] 3/17 4/5	they'll [1] 17/8
sweat [1] 20/25	12/24 12/25 17/13 24/2	they're [4] 10/11 20/11
system [2] 8/18 12/3	26/23 27/2 29/8	21/1 21/1
	that [172]	they've [3] 13/14 18/18
<u> </u>	that's [27] 5/2 7/7 7/13	22/13
take [14] 14/7 15/7	8/19 9/16 10/20 13/3	thing [1] 11/8
15/7 16/2 16/13 17/10	13/24 15/6 15/24 15/24	things [3] 6/12 28/15
21/24 22/13 22/15	16/3 18/7 18/9 18/13	28/16
22/16 25/25 26/24 28/5	18/22 19/15 21/13	think [22] 8/12 8/13
28/24	21/14 23/11 24/22 25/5	10/2 10/16 14/16 14/17
taken [1] 27/1	25/9 26/17 27/23 28/7	15/2 15/15 19/12 20/7
takes [1] 16/21	28/17	22/13 22/25 24/4 25/6
taking [2] 10/22 22/21	their [13] 5/10 11/4	25/11 27/5 27/13 28/6
talk [2] 13/9 13/16	14/3 14/4 14/5 14/9	28/10 28/12 28/14
talked [1] 10/10	19/21 19/25 20/11	28/21
talking [5] 7/11 12/2	21/18 22/9 26/9 27/13	third [4] 2/19 24/8
15/13 26/15 26/16	them [5] 4/12 19/13	24/10 24/12
talks [1] 13/17	19/18 21/4 23/22	this [65]
Taylor [1] 2/14	themselves [1] 22/15	those [6] 12/15 12/23
technician [1] 5/9	then [18] 4/17 5/20 6/4	14/21 20/14 21/11
techniques [1] 25/16		
	9/16 11/4 13/15 15/19	thousand [1] 10/16
tell [5] 5/20 7/23 9/2	19/8 19/19 20/21 22/22	time [4] 3/3 12/25 17/9
14/8 24/11	27/1 28/15	20/8
telling [2] 9/4 9/5		
ten [1] 10/16	theories [1] 29/7	tire [3] 7/20 7/24 7/24
term [8] 18/1 18/11	theory [3] 3/21 24/14	tires [2] 7/18 7/21
25/13 26/21 28/9 28/13	26/19	today [3] 11/14 11/16
29/5 29/5	there [13] 4/17 4/25	27/18
terms [15] 4/8 16/22	9/21 11/22 13/21 16/10	Tonkon [1] 2/5
18/2 18/3 18/12 24/9	21/16 22/3 22/7 24/4	tool [2] 26/3 28/1
	26/6 28/19 29/3	tools [7] 14/6 14/11

Casa 2:17 ov 01096 MC	Document 24 . Filed 04/20/1	0 Dago-12 of 44
T Case 3.17-cv-01986-WC	used [ngnt 26/17iled 04/20/1	l
tools [5] 16/14 24/20	uses [3] 8/6 14/11	well [20] 5/21 6/1 7/1
24/23 25/16 25/21	25/13	8/12 8/19 9/10 10/12
top [1] 8/25	V	10/22 13/15 15/10
Torp [1] 2/5		15/15 16/17 17/5 19/19
total [1] 13/22	variety [1] 26/4	22/12 22/24 23/7 25/11
tough [1] 25/22	vehicle [24] 4/13 5/1 8/21 8/24 8/25 9/9 9/20	25/25 26/6
towards [1] 27/21		were [1] 12/2
trade [1] 11/11	10/25 11/2 11/23 11/24	what [47]
transcript [3] 1/17 30/5	13/3 13/5 13/17 13/20 13/22 13/24 17/6 21/18	what's [11] 5/6 6/20
30/6	24/19 25/14 25/16	11/16 11/17 11/18 22/5
trial [2] 12/15 20/24	26/13 26/22	22/10 22/11 22/14
tricky [1] 14/17		22/17 23/5
troubling [1] 19/23	vehicles [3] 8/21 11/4	whatever [3] 5/20 15/8
true [2] 10/2 11/9	12/17	22/15
truth [1] 26/1	very [2] 15/4 24/3	when [10] 4/18 5/12
try [1] 13/1	view [1] 29/6	8/8 10/14 10/15 21/12
trying [2] 9/11 10/8	violation [1] 28/4	21/24 25/22 28/14
turn [1] 17/14	virtue [1] 17/20	28/17
turns [2] 13/2 13/5	W	where [3] 10/13 11/24
two [4] 15/2 16/10 20/5	want [5] 4/15 4/16	20/24
20/14	11/14 18/16 25/7	whether [9] 5/7 9/19
20/14 typical [2] 14/17 17/10	11/14 18/16 25/7 was [5] 5/7 6/5 25/4	Whether [9] 5/7 9/19 11/4 11/23 12/12 15/6
typical [2] 14/17 17/10	was [5] 5/7 6/5 25/4	11/4 11/23 12/12 15/6 22/24 22/25 23/2
typical [2] 14/17 17/10 typically [1] 14/24	was [5] 5/7 6/5 25/4 25/5 26/7	11/4 11/23 12/12 15/6 22/24 22/25 23/2 which [12] 9/22 10/5
typical [2] 14/17 17/10	was [5] 5/7 6/5 25/4 25/5 26/7 Washington [1] 2/10	11/4 11/23 12/12 15/6 22/24 22/25 23/2
typical [2] 14/17 17/10 typically [1] 14/24	was [5] 5/7 6/5 25/4 25/5 26/7 Washington [1] 2/10 wasn't [6] 4/1 4/18 5/1	11/4 11/23 12/12 15/6 22/24 22/25 23/2 which [12] 9/22 10/5
typical [2] 14/17 17/10 typically [1] 14/24 U	was [5] 5/7 6/5 25/4 25/5 26/7 Washington [1] 2/10 wasn't [6] 4/1 4/18 5/1 25/4 27/6 28/22	11/4 11/23 12/12 15/6 22/24 22/25 23/2 which [12] 9/22 10/5 10/23 12/3 12/11 12/22
typical [2] 14/17 17/10 typically [1] 14/24 U ultimate [1] 7/2	was [5] 5/7 6/5 25/4 25/5 26/7 Washington [1] 2/10 wasn't [6] 4/1 4/18 5/1 25/4 27/6 28/22 way [4] 4/17 19/24	11/4 11/23 12/12 15/6 22/24 22/25 23/2 which [12] 9/22 10/5 10/23 12/3 12/11 12/22 13/3 14/4 15/13 22/7
typical [2] 14/17 17/10 typically [1] 14/24 U ultimate [1] 7/2 ultimately [1] 10/9	was [5] 5/7 6/5 25/4 25/5 26/7 Washington [1] 2/10 wasn't [6] 4/1 4/18 5/1 25/4 27/6 28/22 way [4] 4/17 19/24 27/21 28/10	11/4 11/23 12/12 15/6 22/24 22/25 23/2 which [12] 9/22 10/5 10/23 12/3 12/11 12/22 13/3 14/4 15/13 22/7 24/5 26/9
typical [2] 14/17 17/10 typically [1] 14/24 U ultimate [1] 7/2 ultimately [1] 10/9 under [6] 6/14 14/18	was [5] 5/7 6/5 25/4 25/5 26/7 Washington [1] 2/10 wasn't [6] 4/1 4/18 5/1 25/4 27/6 28/22 way [4] 4/17 19/24 27/21 28/10 ways [1] 15/2	11/4 11/23 12/12 15/6 22/24 22/25 23/2 which [12] 9/22 10/5 10/23 12/3 12/11 12/22 13/3 14/4 15/13 22/7 24/5 26/9 who [3] 16/23 21/18
typical [2] 14/17 17/10 typically [1] 14/24 U ultimate [1] 7/2 ultimately [1] 10/9 under [6] 6/14 14/18 16/9 20/9 20/12 28/23	was [5] 5/7 6/5 25/4 25/5 26/7 Washington [1] 2/10 wasn't [6] 4/1 4/18 5/1 25/4 27/6 28/22 way [4] 4/17 19/24 27/21 28/10 ways [1] 15/2 we [33]	11/4 11/23 12/12 15/6 22/24 22/25 23/2 which [12] 9/22 10/5 10/23 12/3 12/11 12/22 13/3 14/4 15/13 22/7 24/5 26/9 who [3] 16/23 21/18 22/7
typical [2] 14/17 17/10 typically [1] 14/24 U ultimate [1] 7/2 ultimately [1] 10/9 under [6] 6/14 14/18 16/9 20/9 20/12 28/23 understand [3] 4/7	was [5] 5/7 6/5 25/4 25/5 26/7 Washington [1] 2/10 wasn't [6] 4/1 4/18 5/1 25/4 27/6 28/22 way [4] 4/17 19/24 27/21 28/10 ways [1] 15/2 we [33] we'd [2] 6/2 28/22	11/4 11/23 12/12 15/6 22/24 22/25 23/2 which [12] 9/22 10/5 10/23 12/3 12/11 12/22 13/3 14/4 15/13 22/7 24/5 26/9 who [3] 16/23 21/18 22/7 whole [4] 15/17 22/21
typical [2] 14/17 17/10 typically [1] 14/24 U ultimate [1] 7/2 ultimately [1] 10/9 under [6] 6/14 14/18 16/9 20/9 20/12 28/23 understand [3] 4/7 22/16 24/15	was [5] 5/7 6/5 25/4 25/5 26/7 Washington [1] 2/10 wasn't [6] 4/1 4/18 5/1 25/4 27/6 28/22 way [4] 4/17 19/24 27/21 28/10 ways [1] 15/2 we [33] we'd [2] 6/2 28/22 we'll [9] 7/15 7/15 7/16	11/4 11/23 12/12 15/6 22/24 22/25 23/2 which [12] 9/22 10/5 10/23 12/3 12/11 12/22 13/3 14/4 15/13 22/7 24/5 26/9 who [3] 16/23 21/18 22/7 whole [4] 15/17 22/21 26/10 28/14
typical [2] 14/17 17/10 typically [1] 14/24 U ultimate [1] 7/2 ultimately [1] 10/9 under [6] 6/14 14/18 16/9 20/9 20/12 28/23 understand [3] 4/7 22/16 24/15 understanding [4]	was [5] 5/7 6/5 25/4 25/5 26/7 Washington [1] 2/10 wasn't [6] 4/1 4/18 5/1 25/4 27/6 28/22 way [4] 4/17 19/24 27/21 28/10 ways [1] 15/2 we [33] we'd [2] 6/2 28/22 we'll [9] 7/15 7/15 7/16 7/17 7/18 7/19 7/21	11/4 11/23 12/12 15/6 22/24 22/25 23/2 which [12] 9/22 10/5 10/23 12/3 12/11 12/22 13/3 14/4 15/13 22/7 24/5 26/9 who [3] 16/23 21/18 22/7 whole [4] 15/17 22/21 26/10 28/14 whom [1] 12/17 whose [2] 17/2 17/3
typical [2] 14/17 17/10 typically [1] 14/24 U ultimate [1] 7/2 ultimately [1] 10/9 under [6] 6/14 14/18 16/9 20/9 20/12 28/23 understand [3] 4/7 22/16 24/15 understanding [4] 19/22 22/1 22/4 22/21	was [5] 5/7 6/5 25/4 25/5 26/7 Washington [1] 2/10 wasn't [6] 4/1 4/18 5/1 25/4 27/6 28/22 way [4] 4/17 19/24 27/21 28/10 ways [1] 15/2 we [33] we'd [2] 6/2 28/22 we'll [9] 7/15 7/15 7/16 7/17 7/18 7/19 7/21 19/2 29/8	11/4 11/23 12/12 15/6 22/24 22/25 23/2 which [12] 9/22 10/5 10/23 12/3 12/11 12/22 13/3 14/4 15/13 22/7 24/5 26/9 who [3] 16/23 21/18 22/7 whole [4] 15/17 22/21 26/10 28/14 whom [1] 12/17 whose [2] 17/2 17/3
typical [2] 14/17 17/10 typically [1] 14/24 U ultimate [1] 7/2 ultimately [1] 10/9 under [6] 6/14 14/18 16/9 20/9 20/12 28/23 understand [3] 4/7 22/16 24/15 understanding [4] 19/22 22/1 22/4 22/21 unfortunately [1] 15/16	was [5] 5/7 6/5 25/4 25/5 26/7 Washington [1] 2/10 wasn't [6] 4/1 4/18 5/1 25/4 27/6 28/22 way [4] 4/17 19/24 27/21 28/10 ways [1] 15/2 we [33] we'd [2] 6/2 28/22 we'll [9] 7/15 7/15 7/16 7/17 7/18 7/19 7/21 19/2 29/8 we're [14] 4/19 6/7	11/4 11/23 12/12 15/6 22/24 22/25 23/2 which [12] 9/22 10/5 10/23 12/3 12/11 12/22 13/3 14/4 15/13 22/7 24/5 26/9 who [3] 16/23 21/18 22/7 whole [4] 15/17 22/21 26/10 28/14 whom [1] 12/17 whose [2] 17/2 17/3 why [13] 5/18 5/21 5/23
typical [2] 14/17 17/10 typically [1] 14/24 U ultimate [1] 7/2 ultimately [1] 10/9 under [6] 6/14 14/18 16/9 20/9 20/12 28/23 understand [3] 4/7 22/16 24/15 understanding [4] 19/22 22/1 22/4 22/21 unfortunately [1] 15/16 UNITED [3] 1/1 1/19	was [5] 5/7 6/5 25/4 25/5 26/7 Washington [1] 2/10 wasn't [6] 4/1 4/18 5/1 25/4 27/6 28/22 way [4] 4/17 19/24 27/21 28/10 ways [1] 15/2 we [33] we'd [2] 6/2 28/22 we'll [9] 7/15 7/15 7/16 7/17 7/18 7/19 7/21 19/2 29/8 we're [14] 4/19 6/7 6/20 7/11 8/18 11/21	11/4 11/23 12/12 15/6 22/24 22/25 23/2 which [12] 9/22 10/5 10/23 12/3 12/11 12/22 13/3 14/4 15/13 22/7 24/5 26/9 who [3] 16/23 21/18 22/7 whole [4] 15/17 22/21 26/10 28/14 whom [1] 12/17 whose [2] 17/2 17/3 why [13] 5/18 5/21 5/23 6/1 7/7 16/23 19/23
typical [2] 14/17 17/10 typically [1] 14/24 U ultimate [1] 7/2 ultimately [1] 10/9 under [6] 6/14 14/18 16/9 20/9 20/12 28/23 understand [3] 4/7 22/16 24/15 understanding [4] 19/22 22/1 22/4 22/21 unfortunately [1] 15/16 UNITED [3] 1/1 1/19 2/18 up [3] 5/16 15/8 26/10	was [5] 5/7 6/5 25/4 25/5 26/7 Washington [1] 2/10 wasn't [6] 4/1 4/18 5/1 25/4 27/6 28/22 way [4] 4/17 19/24 27/21 28/10 ways [1] 15/2 we [33] we'd [2] 6/2 28/22 we'll [9] 7/15 7/15 7/16 7/17 7/18 7/19 7/21 19/2 29/8 we're [14] 4/19 6/7 6/20 7/11 8/18 11/21 13/15 15/20 21/11 24/6	11/4 11/23 12/12 15/6 22/24 22/25 23/2 which [12] 9/22 10/5 10/23 12/3 12/11 12/22 13/3 14/4 15/13 22/7 24/5 26/9 who [3] 16/23 21/18 22/7 whole [4] 15/17 22/21 26/10 28/14 whom [1] 12/17 whose [2] 17/2 17/3 why [13] 5/18 5/21 5/23 6/1 7/7 16/23 19/23 19/23 20/20 21/21
typical [2] 14/17 17/10 typically [1] 14/24 U ultimate [1] 7/2 ultimately [1] 10/9 under [6] 6/14 14/18 16/9 20/9 20/12 28/23 understand [3] 4/7 22/16 24/15 understanding [4] 19/22 22/1 22/4 22/21 unfortunately [1] 15/16 UNITED [3] 1/1 1/19 2/18 up [3] 5/16 15/8 26/10 us [3] 14/8 17/20 24/11	was [5] 5/7 6/5 25/4 25/5 26/7 Washington [1] 2/10 wasn't [6] 4/1 4/18 5/1 25/4 27/6 28/22 way [4] 4/17 19/24 27/21 28/10 ways [1] 15/2 we [33] we'd [2] 6/2 28/22 we'll [9] 7/15 7/15 7/16 7/17 7/18 7/19 7/21 19/2 29/8 we're [14] 4/19 6/7 6/20 7/11 8/18 11/21 13/15 15/20 21/11 24/6 24/10 24/12 26/15	11/4 11/23 12/12 15/6 22/24 22/25 23/2 which [12] 9/22 10/5 10/23 12/3 12/11 12/22 13/3 14/4 15/13 22/7 24/5 26/9 who [3] 16/23 21/18 22/7 whole [4] 15/17 22/21 26/10 28/14 whom [1] 12/17 whose [2] 17/2 17/3 why [13] 5/18 5/21 5/23 6/1 7/7 16/23 19/23 19/23 20/20 21/21 21/25 22/19 26/17
typical [2] 14/17 17/10 typically [1] 14/24 U ultimate [1] 7/2 ultimately [1] 10/9 under [6] 6/14 14/18 16/9 20/9 20/12 28/23 understand [3] 4/7 22/16 24/15 understanding [4] 19/22 22/1 22/4 22/21 unfortunately [1] 15/16 UNITED [3] 1/1 1/19 2/18 up [3] 5/16 15/8 26/10	was [5] 5/7 6/5 25/4 25/5 26/7 Washington [1] 2/10 wasn't [6] 4/1 4/18 5/1 25/4 27/6 28/22 way [4] 4/17 19/24 27/21 28/10 ways [1] 15/2 we [33] we'd [2] 6/2 28/22 we'll [9] 7/15 7/15 7/16 7/17 7/18 7/19 7/21 19/2 29/8 we're [14] 4/19 6/7 6/20 7/11 8/18 11/21 13/15 15/20 21/11 24/6 24/10 24/12 26/15 26/16	11/4 11/23 12/12 15/6 22/24 22/25 23/2 which [12] 9/22 10/5 10/23 12/3 12/11 12/22 13/3 14/4 15/13 22/7 24/5 26/9 who [3] 16/23 21/18 22/7 whole [4] 15/17 22/21 26/10 28/14 whom [1] 12/17 whose [2] 17/2 17/3 why [13] 5/18 5/21 5/23 6/1 7/7 16/23 19/23 19/23 20/20 21/21 21/25 22/19 26/17 will [9] 6/16 10/10
typical [2] 14/17 17/10 typically [1] 14/24 U ultimate [1] 7/2 ultimately [1] 10/9 under [6] 6/14 14/18 16/9 20/9 20/12 28/23 understand [3] 4/7 22/16 24/15 understanding [4] 19/22 22/1 22/4 22/21 unfortunately [1] 15/16 UNITED [3] 1/1 1/19 2/18 up [3] 5/16 15/8 26/10 us [3] 14/8 17/20 24/11 use [4] 8/5 16/10 16/16	was [5] 5/7 6/5 25/4 25/5 26/7 Washington [1] 2/10 wasn't [6] 4/1 4/18 5/1 25/4 27/6 28/22 way [4] 4/17 19/24 27/21 28/10 ways [1] 15/2 we [33] we'd [2] 6/2 28/22 we'll [9] 7/15 7/15 7/16 7/17 7/18 7/19 7/21 19/2 29/8 we're [14] 4/19 6/7 6/20 7/11 8/18 11/21 13/15 15/20 21/11 24/6 24/10 24/12 26/15	11/4 11/23 12/12 15/6 22/24 22/25 23/2 which [12] 9/22 10/5 10/23 12/3 12/11 12/22 13/3 14/4 15/13 22/7 24/5 26/9 who [3] 16/23 21/18 22/7 whole [4] 15/17 22/21 26/10 28/14 whom [1] 12/17 whose [2] 17/2 17/3 why [13] 5/18 5/21 5/23 6/1 7/7 16/23 19/23 19/23 20/20 21/21 21/25 22/19 26/17 will [9] 6/16 10/10 10/10 12/16 12/18 17/7

W Case 3:17-cv-01986-MO	Document 34	Filed 04/20/18	Page 44 of 44
within [1] 21/16			
without [2] 27/16 30/6			
won't [3] 5/11 8/3			
11/16			
word [4] 8/5 8/6 13/4			
16/10			
words [4] 13/3 18/17			
19/2 27/14			
work [2] 4/17 6/11			
worried [1] 21/1			
worth [1] 20/22			
would [17] 6/5 6/5 6/10			
12/14 13/23 16/15 19/1			
19/22 22/19 23/4 23/9			
25/3 25/6 25/8 25/25			
28/23 28/24			
wouldn't [4] 5/7 6/3			
12/1 20/20			
wrong [10] 5/6 6/20			
21/12 22/5 22/10 22/11			
22/14 22/17 23/6 25/9			
X			
x-ray [2] 5/15 5/16			
Υ			
yes [13] 7/4 9/18 12/8			
16/5 17/16 17/19 17/24			
18/2 18/21 18/24 22/18			
23/12 25/8			
you [85]			
you'd [1] 28/16			
you'll [3] 7/23 8/3 9/7			
you're [10] 4/25 6/9			
10/5 11/12 11/17 15/13			
17/22 20/16 24/25 25/5			
you've [4] 3/21 7/25 10/17 20/10			
your [47]			
your [#/]			