

**FILED**  
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON

JUL 08 2026

SUPERIOR COURT CLERK  
BY ~~Irina Poliansky~~  
N. Mesker DEPUTY

**ORIGINAL**

**IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON  
FOR KING COUNTY**

MISTI LEON, as personal representative of the  
ESTATE OF JULIANA LEON, a deceased  
individual,

Plaintiff,

v.

EXXON MOBIL CORPORATION;  
EXXONMOBIL OIL CORPORATION; BP  
P.L.C.; BP AMERICA INC.; OLYMPIC PIPE  
LINE COMPANY LLC; CHEVRON  
CORPORATION; CHEVRON U.S.A., INC.;  
SHELL PLC; SHELL USA, INC.;  
CONOCOPHILLIPS; CONOCOPHILLIPS  
COMPANY; PHILLIPS 66; PHILLIPS 66  
COMPANY; and TRANSMONTAIGNE  
PARTNERS LLC,

Defendants.

Case No. 25-2-15986-8 SEA

**ORDER DENYING OUT-OF-STATE  
DEFENDANTS' JOINT MOTION  
TO DISMISS COMPLAINT FOR  
LACK OF PERSONAL  
JURISDICTION [12(b)(2)]**

1 This matter came before the Court on Out-of-State Defendants' Joint Motion to Dismiss  
2 Complaint for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction [12(b)(2)] ("12(b)(2) Motion"). The Court considered  
3 the following documents when reaching its decision:

- 4 1. Out-of-State Defendants' 12(b)(2) Motion;
- 5 2. Plaintiff's Opposition to Out-of-State Defendants' (b)(2) Motions;
- 6 3. Out-of-State Defendants' Reply in support of Out-of-State Defendants' 12(b)(2)  
7 Motion; and
- 8 4. Other relevant court documents.

9  
10 The Court having been fully informed, hereby finds as follows:

11  
12 1. The Plaintiff has established sufficient minimum contacts with Washington State  
13 to sustain personal jurisdiction over the Defendants.

14 2. The Defendants have purposefully availed themselves of Washington State by their  
15 marketing, advertising, selling, and providing their products to Washington consumers.

16 3. The Plaintiff's claims arise out of and relate to the Defendant's contacts with  
17 Washington State through their sales of products to consumers and through their advertising and  
18 marketing.

19 4. Personal jurisdiction over the Defendants in connection with the Plaintiff's  
20 Complaint comports with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice. The Defendants  
21 had fair notice that their conduct could subject them to suit in Washington State.

22 5. The inconvenience to the Defendants having to defend this suit in Washington does  
23 not outweigh the strong interest in ensuring Washington citizens receive the protection of the  
24 Washington Product Liability Act and redress for public nuisances created with the State.

1           The Court hereby orders that Out-of-State Defendants' Joint Motion to Dismiss Complaint  
2 for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction [12(b)(2)] is DENIED.

3  
4 It is so ORDERED this 8<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2026.

5  
6   
7 \_\_\_\_\_  
8 Judge Matthew Lapin