

63111-0-I

COURT OF APPEALS, DIVISION I
OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Respondent,

v.

JOSEPH KAISER and HEIDI M. KAISER, husband and wife, G. HOBUS
INVESTMENTS, LLC; BOBO BUYS REAL ESTATE, LLC; PRE FLOP
LLC; and UNCLAIMED FUNDS, INC., a Washington Corporation,

Appellants.

OPENING BRIEF OF APPELLANTS

DAVID CORBETT PLLC

David J. Corbett, WSBA #30895
2106 N. Steele Street
Tacoma, Washington 98406
Telephone: (253) 414-5235
david@davidcorbettlaw.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Table of Authorities	iv
I. ASSIGNMENTS OF ERROR	1
II. ISSUES PERTAINING TO ASSIGNMENTS OF ERROR	2
A. Issues Pertaining to Order Granting Summary Judgment	2
B. Issues Pertaining to Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law	4
III. STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4
1. General background on Kaiser and his business activities	4
2. The origins of this lawsuit	6
3. Additional claims arising during litigation	8
4. Decisions in the trial court	9
IV. SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT	10
V. ARGUMENT	11
1. The State Must Show Three Essential Elements for Each Consumer Protection Act (“CPA”) Violation	11
2. The Standard of Review	12

3. As a matter of law, Kaiser’s overage transactions did not violate RCW 84.64.080, and even if they had, this would not constitute a <i>per se</i> violation of the CPA	13
4. There are genuine issues of material fact concerning whether Kaiser’s overage transactions were deceptive, unfair, or unconscionable under the CPA	15
5. The trial court erred both in the manner and substance of its holding that Kaiser’s partial interest transactions do not result in homeowners keeping their homes	29
6. There are at least genuine issues of material fact as to whether Kaiser’s advertisements and solicitations were deceptive under the CPA	31
7. Kaiser’s use of limited powers of attorney in connection with the overage transactions did not violate the CPA	36
8. Kaiser’s use of attorneys in connection with the overage transactions did not violate the CPA	37
9. Kaiser’s restitution fund solicitations lacked the capacity to deceive the public	38
10. Kaiser’s manner of executing real estate excise tax forms also lacked the capacity to deceive the public	40
11. The trial court erred as a matter of law when it concluded that Kaiser violated the CPA simply by <i>being</i> both the trustee and a beneficiary of the partial interest trusts	41
12. The trial court erred as a matter of law when allowing participants in partial interest deals to repudiate their signatures on written deeds and disclaimers	43
13. The trial court erred as a matter of law in concluding that the partial interest deals were unfair	45

14. The trial court failed to make findings regarding the public interest element in connection with the “four other deals” discussed in the Findings and Conclusions	47
15. Errors in the trial court’s determinations on summary judgment and in its Findings and Conclusions require vacation or revision of the remedies imposed	48
16. Kaiser requests his attorney’s fees on appeal pursuant to RAP 18.1(b) and RCW 19.86.080(1)	49
VI. CONCLUSION	50

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Adler v. Fred Lind Manor</i> , 153 Wn.2d 331, 103 P.3d 773 (2005).....	25, 26, 27
<i>Carlstrom v. Hanline</i> , 98 Wn. App. 780, 990 P.2d 986 (2000).....	44
<i>Charvat v. Farmers Insurance Columbus, Inc.</i> , 178 Ohio App.3d 118, 897 N.E.2d 167 (2008).....	36
<i>Com. By Corbett v. People’s Benefit Services, Inc.</i> , 923 A.2d 1230, (Pa. 2007).....	32
<i>Com. By Packel v. Tolleson</i> , 14 Pa.Cmwlt. 72, 321 A.2d 664 (Pa.1974).....	35
<i>Edmonds v. John L. Scott Real Estate, Inc.</i> , 87 Wn. App. 834, 942 P.2d 1072 (1997).....	42
<i>Fisher v. World Wide Trophy Outfitters, Ltd.</i> , 15 Wn. App. 742, 551 P.2d 1398 (1976).....	31
<i>Floorsheim v. FTC</i> , 411 F.2d 874 (9 th Cir. 1969).....	35
<i>FTC v. Sperry & Hutchinson Co.</i> , 405 U.S. 233, 92 S.Ct. 898, 31 L.Ed.2d 170 (1972)).....	22
<i>Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. v. Whiteman Tire, Inc.</i> , 86 Wn. App. 732, 935 P.2d 628 (1997).....	22
<i>Gossett v. Farmers Ins. Co. of Washington</i> , 133 Wn.2d 954, 948 P.2d 1264 (1997).....	43
<i>Gray v. Reeves</i> , 69 Wash. 374, 125 P. 162 (1912)	21
<i>Hangman Ridge Training Stables, Inc. v. Safeco Title Ins. Co.</i> , 105 Wn.2d 778, 719 P.2d 531 (1986).....	13, 15, 34, 41

