

ORIGINAL COPY

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 **IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON**
8 **FOR KING COUNTY**

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

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

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

18 Defendants.
19

Case No. 25-2-15986-8 SEA

**ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS'
JOINT MOTION TO STAY
PROCEEDINGS**

1 This matter came before the Court on Defendants' Joint Motion to Stay Proceedings ("Motion").

2 The Court considered the following documents when reaching its decision:

- 3 1. Defendants' Motion;
- 4 2. Plaintiff's Opposition to the Motion;
- 5 3. Declaration of Alizabeth Bronsdon in support of Plaintiff's Opposition to the Motion;
- 6 4. Reply in support of Defendants' Motion; and
- 7 5. Other relevant court documents.

8
9 The Court considered the factors set out in *King v. Olympic Pipeline Co.*, 104 Wn. App.
10 338, 16 P.3d 45 (2000). The Court also considered the specific following findings:

- 11 1. The Court finds that the outcome of the proceedings before the United States Supreme
12 Court is far from certain. There are too many variables for this Court to find that the
13 Supreme Court will issue a substantive ruling. Further, it is speculative as to whether
14 the Supreme Court will resolve all of the issues in this case, particularly Count Two
15 of the Amended Complaint for Failure to Warn under the Washington Product
16 Liability Act.
- 17 2. The Court finds that the length of the requested stay of potentially 14 months could
18 prejudice the Plaintiff in her ability to conduct discovery and that evidence and or
19 witness testimony could be lost.
- 20 3. The Court finds that the public interest in this case weighs against granting a stay.
- 21 4. The Court finds that since this type of litigation, as was cited by the Defendants in
22 their motion, has been going on in other jurisdictions for some time, that documents
23 have already been preserved and some discovery has already been conducted in those

1 cases mitigates against any potential prejudice to the Defendants in terms of costs to
2 produce relevant documents in this case.

- 3 5. The Court also considered that there are pending motions to dismiss, which this Court
4 may determine to be dispositive. If this Court were to grant any of the motions to
5 dismiss, the Plaintiff would then be able to begin the appellate process in a timely
6 manner.

7
8 The Court hereby orders that Defendants' Joint Motion to Stay Proceedings is DENIED.

9
10 It is so ORDERED this April 9, 2026.

11
12 
13 Judge Matthew Lapin