

# MODIFICATION REQUEST COVER SHEET

<b>Name of Filer</b>	<b>LAURA INVEEN</b>
<b>Reporting Period</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Annual report – calendar year 2017 <input type="checkbox"/> Candidate/Appointee report
<b>Type of Request</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> New <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Renewal with No Change – <u>original granted on August 28, 2008</u> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Full Commission Approval – <u>May 28, 2015</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Renewal with Change
<b>Office Held/Sought &amp; Term</b>	Superior Court Judge, King County Current term expires January, 2021
<b>Application Rule(s)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Income & Ownership Interest: WAC 390-28-100(b) <input type="checkbox"/> Personal Residence: WAC 390-28-100(d) <input type="checkbox"/> Attorney: WAC 390-28-100(1)(e)(i) <input type="checkbox"/> Judge / Judicial Candidate: WAC 390-28-100(1)(e)(ii) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Spousal: <a href="#">WAC 390-28-100(1)(e)(iv)</a> <input type="checkbox"/> Other: WAC 390-28-100(1)(a)(c)
<b>Explanation of Rule(s)</b>	<p><b>Applicants whose spouse or registered domestic partner creates a reporting obligation for the applicant.</b> When an applicant is required to report the activities of an entity solely because the applicant's spouse or registered domestic partner held an office, directorship, general partnership or ownership interest in the entity and the applicant does not have direct knowledge of the information that must be reported, the applicant may be allowed to satisfy the disclosure requirements of RCW <a href="#">42.17A.710</a> (1)(g)(ii) and WAC <a href="#">390-24-020</a> by disclosing reportable customers from whom compensation in excess of the disclosure threshold established under RCW <a href="#">42.17A.710</a> (1)(g)(ii) has been received as follows:</p> <p>(A) All payments made by the agency or jurisdiction in which the applicant seeks or holds office to the entity;</p> <p>(B) The business and other governmental customers or clients of the applicant's spouse/domestic partner and of the entity of which the applicant is aware; and</p> <p>(C) Any other business and other governmental customers or clients of the entity whose identities are known to the applicant and whose interests are significantly affected by the agency or jurisdiction in which the applicant seeks or holds office. The commission may apply (e)(i) through (iii) of this subsection when the applicant's spouse/domestic partner is a lawyer, judge, or motor vehicle dealer.</p>
<b>Supporting Documents (attached)</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Current F-1 (filed April 16, 2018) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Modification Application <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prior order (if renewal) – August 23, 2017
<b>Reason(s) for Modification (as stated by filer)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Judge Inveen is requesting renewal of the reporting modification that would exempt her from disclosing the business customers that paid \$12,000, during 2017, to Kirkpatrick, Lockhart, Preston, Gates &amp; Ellis (K &amp; L Gates), a large law firm of which her spouse is a member with less than 1% ownership interest.</li> <li>Judge Inveen said that K &amp; L Gates had over \$1 billion dollars in revenue, with more than 13,000 business clients. The firm has 2,000 attorneys in 48 offices throughout the United States and worldwide. She stated that more than 6,000 customers would be subject to disclosure.</li> </ul>

- Judge Inveen stated that it would be a logistical hardship to provide a list of reportable business and other governmental customers of K & L Gates. She said it would also be virtually impossible to review all of the clients to determine which would have a privacy interest, or would need to give permission to have their information disclosed, as many entities do not wish the fact that they are employing a law firm to be disclosed.
- Judge Inveen stated that her husband is not part of the governing structure of the firm, and does not have immediate access to the law firm's client lists without making a special request.
- Judge Inveen said that she has no connection with K & L Gates. She stated that as a judge, she recuses herself from hearing any matters handled by K & L Gates, whether she knows the lawyer or not. She stated that she has made herself aware of her husband's clients and does not handle these clients' matters.
- Judge Inveen has confirmed that King County Superior Court made no payments to K & L Gates during 2017 and has provided reportable governmental customers.