

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

Rylee Fleury, et al.
P O Box 711
Clearlake WA, [98235]

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
IN AND FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON**

Rylee Fleury, Skagit County Residents et al.)	Case No. 24-cv-???
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	
JAY ROBERT INSLEE, in his official capacity)	CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT
as Washington State Governor,)	
GOLDFINCH ENERGY STORAGE LLC, et)	DEMANDED TRIAL BY JURY
al.,)	
Defendant(s))	
)	
)	

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

INDEX

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 1

II. INTRODUCTION 2

III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE 4

IV. PARTIES 5

 A. Plaintiffs 5

 B. Defendants 6

V. STANDING 8

VI. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS 10

 A. The Goldeneye Project 10

 B. Environmental and Safety Concerns 12

 C. Administrative Decision and Improper Classification 14

 D. Jay Robert Inslee's Legal Status 16

 E. Public Opposition and Community Impact 18

VII. RICO ALLEGATIONS 20

 A. The Enterprise 20

 B. Pattern of Racketeering Activity 22

 1. Wire Fraud 24

 2. Mail Fraud 26

 3. Honest Services Fraud 28

 4. Impersonation of Public Officials 30

 C. Predicate Acts 32

 D. Damages to Plaintiffs and Class 34

VIII. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS 36

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

A. Numerosity 37

B. Commonality 38

C. Typicality 39

D. Adequacy 40

IX. CAUSES OF ACTION 42

A. First Cause of Action: RICO 18 U.S.C. § 1962(c) 42

B. Second Cause of Action: RICO Conspiracy 18 U.S.C. § 1962(d) .. 44

C. Third Cause of Action: Violation of Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) .. 46

D. Fourth Cause of Action: Public Nuisance 48

X. INAPPLICABILITY OF QUALIFIED IMMUNITY 50

XI. INTERCONNECTED NATURE OF VIOLATIONS 52

XII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF 54

XIII. DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL 56

XIV. APPENDICES 58

A. Relevant Statutes and Regulations 58

B. Key Documents 60

C. Maps and Environmental Impact Assessments 62

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1 This class action lawsuit, filed under the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act
2 (RICO), 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961-1968, seeks to prevent the construction of a large-scale lithium
3 battery energy storage system (BESS) near Henderson Creek in Skagit County, Washington. The
4 plaintiffs, led by Rylee Fleury and other Skagit County residents, allege that the defendants,
5 including former Governor Jay Robert Inslee, Goldfinch Energy Storage LLC, and others, have
6 engaged in a pattern of racketeering activity to advance the Goldeneye project while bypassing
7 proper environmental and safety reviews.
8

9 Key allegations include:

- 10 1. Defendants acted without legal authority due to a prior conviction and forfeiture of office
11 by Jay Robert Inslee.
- 12 2. The project was improperly classified to avoid stringent environmental and safety
13 reviews.
- 14 3. Defendants engaged in wire fraud, mail fraud, honest services fraud, and impersonation
15 of public officials.
- 16 4. The proposed BESS poses significant environmental and safety risks to Skagit County.
- 17 5. The defendants' actions have deprived the community of due process and proper
18 governance.

19 The plaintiffs seek injunctive relief to halt the project, treble damages, and other remedies
20 available under RICO statutes.
21
22
23
24
25
26

II. INTRODUCTION

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

1. This case arises from a coordinated effort by the defendants to construct a massive lithium battery energy storage system (BESS) in Skagit County, Washington, in contravention of environmental protections, safety regulations, and the will of the local community. The proposed Goldeneye project, spearheaded by Goldfinch Energy Storage LLC, would place a 200-megawatt/800-megawatt-hour BESS adjacent to critical salmon habitats and agricultural lands, posing significant risks to the environment and public safety.
2. At the heart of this case is a pattern of racketeering activity orchestrated by the defendants, including former Governor Jay Robert Inslee, who continued to wield governmental influence despite a court conviction that should have resulted in the forfeiture of his office. This lawsuit alleges that the defendants have engaged in a series of fraudulent acts, including the manipulation of administrative processes, misrepresentation of the project's regional impact, and the unlawful exercise of governmental authority.
3. The plaintiffs, representing a class of Skagit County residents, bring this action to protect their community from the imminent threat posed by the Goldeneye project. They seek to expose the web of deceit and unlawful conduct that has allowed this project to progress despite overwhelming local opposition and clear environmental concerns.
4. This complaint details how the defendants have violated the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act through their coordinated efforts to advance the Goldeneye project. It outlines a series of predicate acts, including wire fraud, mail fraud, honest services fraud, and impersonation of public officials, all committed in furtherance of their scheme.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
5. By bringing this RICO action, the plaintiffs aim not only to halt the Goldeneye project but also to hold accountable those who would abuse their power and influence to override the interests of local communities and the environment. This case stands as a crucial test of the ability of citizens to protect their homes, their natural resources, and their way of life from powerful interests that would sacrifice them for profit.
6. The following complaint sets forth in detail the nature of the defendants' racketeering enterprise, the specific acts of fraud and deceit committed, and the harm caused to the plaintiffs and the proposed class. It seeks both injunctive relief to prevent the construction of the BESS and monetary damages to compensate the community for the harm already inflicted by the defendants' unlawful scheme.

III. APPLICABLE LEGAL STANDARDS

A. RICO Standards

7. Pattern of Racketeering Activity: The Supreme Court in *H.J. Inc. v. Northwestern Bell Telephone Co.*, 492 U.S. 229 (1989), established that a pattern of racketeering activity requires a showing of "continuity plus relationship" among the predicate acts.
8. Proximate Cause: In *Bridge v. Phoenix Bond & Indemnity Co.*, 553 U.S. 639 (2008), the Supreme Court held that first-party reliance is not required to establish proximate cause in a civil RICO claim predicated on mail fraud.
9. Standing: *Sedima, S.P.R.L. v. Imrex Co.*, 473 U.S. 479 (1985), clarified that a plaintiff need not prove a prior criminal conviction to bring a civil RICO claim.
10. Direct Injury: *Anza v. Ideal Steel Supply Corp.*, 547 U.S. 451 (2006), emphasized that the RICO proximate cause requirement is meant to limit recovery to those who have been directly injured by the defendant's actions.

B. Environmental Law Standards

1
2 11. SEPA Compliance: *Lands Council v. Washington State Parks & Recreation*
3 Commission, 176 Wn. App. 787 (2013)
4
5

6
7 **C. Standing Requirements**

8 12. Article III Standing: *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555 (1992)

9 13. Class Action Standing: *Spokeo, Inc. v. Robins*, 136 S. Ct. 1540 (2016)
10
11

12 **D. Public Nuisance**

13 14. Statutory Definition: Under RCW 7.48.130, a public nuisance is defined as one which
14 "affects equally the rights of an entire community or neighborhood, although the extent of the
15 damage may be unequal."
16
17

18 15. Common Law Standard: *The Washington Supreme Court in Kitsap County v. Kitsap Rifle*
19 *and Revolver Club*, 184 Wash. 2d 252 (2015), held that a public nuisance is an "unreasonable
20 interference with a right common to the general public."
21
22

23 16. Elements of Public Nuisance: As outlined in *Tiegs v. Watts*, 135 Wash. 2d 1 (1998), to
24 constitute a public nuisance, an activity must: a) Injure the health or safety of citizens at large; or
25 b) Violate laws; or c) Unlawfully interfere with or obstruct citizens in free use of public property.
26

17. Environmental Public Nuisance: In *Chelan Basin Conservancy v. GBI Holding Co.*, 190
Wash. 2d 249 (2018), the court recognized that environmental damage affecting public resources
can constitute a public nuisance.

18. Anticipatory Nuisance: Washington law, as affirmed in *Park v. Stolzheise*, 24 Wash. 2d
781 (1946), allows for injunctive relief against threatened or anticipated nuisances when the
danger of the act is great and the resulting injury would be irreparable.

19. Standing for Public Nuisance Claims: The Washington Court of Appeals in *Branson v.*
Port of Seattle, 152 Wash. 2d 862 (2004), held that private individuals have standing to bring a
public nuisance claim if they can show special injury different in kind, not just degree, from that
suffered by the general public.

1
2 20. Balancing Test: In *Mathewson v. Primeau*, 64 Wash. 2d 929 (1964), the court established
3 that determining whether an activity constitutes a nuisance involves balancing the rights of the
4 actor and other members of the public.
5

6
7 E. Qualified Immunity

8
9 21. The doctrine of qualified immunity, while generally shielding government officials from
10 liability for civil damages, does not apply when an official's conduct violates "clearly established
11 statutory or constitutional rights of which a reasonable person would have known." *Harlow v.*
12 *Fitzgerald*, 457 U.S. 800, 818 (1982). Recent case law has further refined the application of
13 qualified immunity:
14
15

16
17 In *Taylor v. Riojas*, 141 S. Ct. 52 (2020), the Supreme Court held that qualified immunity
18 can be denied even without a case directly on point if the constitutional violation is
19 obvious.
20
21

22 The 9th Circuit in *Hernandez v. City of San Jose*, 897 F.3d 1125 (9th Cir. 2018), denied
23 qualified immunity to officials who created dangerous situations, even if they didn't
24 directly cause harm.
25
26

21. *Taylor v. Riojas*, 141 S. Ct. 52 (2020) The Supreme Court held that qualified immunity
can be denied even without a case directly on point if the constitutional violation is obvious. This
case emphasizes that "no reasonable officer" could have concluded that the conduct at issue was
constitutional.

22. *Tanzin v. Tanvir*, 141 S. Ct. 486 (2020) While primarily about remedies under the
Religious Freedom Restoration Act, this case suggests the Court's willingness to allow damages
suits against federal officials in their personal capacities.

23. *Estate of Anderson v. Marsh*, 985 F.3d 726 (9th Cir. 2021) The 9th Circuit held that
officers could be liable for their conduct leading up to the use of force, not just the moment of

1 force itself. This expands the scope of conduct that can be considered in denying qualified
2 immunity.
3
4

5 24. *Hernandez v. City of San Jose*, 897 F.3d 1125 (9th Cir. 2018) The court denied qualified
6 immunity to police officers who directed attendees of a political rally into a violent crowd of
7 protesters. This case emphasizes that officials can be held liable for creating danger, even if they
8 didn't directly cause harm.
9

10 25. *Jessop v. City of Fresno*, 936 F.3d 937 (9th Cir. 2019) While the court granted qualified
11 immunity here, the case is notable for its strong dissent arguing that theft by police officers under
12 color of law is so obviously unconstitutional that it doesn't require a specific precedent to
13 establish the right.
14
15
16
17

18 26. *Hardwick v. County of Orange*, 844 F.3d 1112 (9th Cir. 2017) The court denied qualified
19 immunity to social workers who allegedly fabricated evidence in child custody proceedings. This
20 case is relevant for situations where officials misrepresent or manipulate evidence.
21
22

23 27. *Rico v. Ducart*, 980 F.3d 1292 (9th Cir. 2020) The court held that prison officials were not
24 entitled to qualified immunity for conduct that violated clearly established law, even if the exact
25 circumstances had not been previously decided by the courts.
26

F. Forfeiture of Public Office

21. RCW 9.92.120 (Conviction of public officer forfeits trust)

22. *State ex rel. Guthrie v. Chapman*, 187 Wash. 327, 60 P. (2d) 245 (1936)

23. *State ex rel. Knabb v. Frater*, 198 Wash. 675, 89 P. (2d) 1046 (1939)

IV. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

24. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331
(federal question jurisdiction) because this case arises under the laws of the United

1 States, specifically the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO), 18
2 U.S.C. §§ 1961-1968.

3
4
5 25. This Court also has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1964(c), which
6 provides for civil remedies for violations of RICO.

7
8
9 26. Additionally, this Court has supplemental jurisdiction over the state law claims pursuant
10 to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a) because they are so related to the federal claims that they form
11 part of the same case or controversy under Article III of the United States Constitution.

12
13
14 27. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because a substantial
15 part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in this district.

16
17 Specifically, the proposed Goldeneye project is located in Skagit County, Washington,
18 which is within the Western District of Washington.

19
20
21 28. Venue is also proper under 18 U.S.C. § 1965(a), which provides that any civil action
22 under RICO may be instituted in the district court of the United States for any district in
23 which such person resides, is found, has an agent, or transacts his affairs. Defendant
24 Goldfinch Energy Storage LLC transacts its affairs within this district, and Defendants
25 Jay Robert Inslee and Robert Watson Ferguson reside and/or conduct official business
26 within this district.

29. This Court has personal jurisdiction over the Defendants because they are residents of
the State of Washington and/or have conducted business within the State of Washington,
and because the tortious acts alleged in this Complaint occurred within the State of
Washington.

30. The exercise of jurisdiction and venue in this district does not offend traditional notions
of fair play and substantial justice.

V. PARTIES

14. A. Plaintiffs Rylee Fleury and other Skagit class representatives, et al.

B. Defendants Jay Robert Inslee, Goldfinch Energy Storage LLC, et al.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

VI. STANDING

31. Article III Standing: The named Plaintiff, Rylee Fleury, and the proposed class members have standing to bring this action under Article III of the United States Constitution, as articulated in *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555 (1992). The plaintiffs meet all three elements required for standing: a. Injury in Fact: Plaintiffs have suffered an injury in fact that is both concrete and particularized, and actual or imminent, not conjectural or hypothetical. Specifically: i. Increased environmental risks due to the proposed Goldeneye project's proximity to critical salmon habitats and agricultural lands. ii. Elevated safety hazards, including the risk of high-temperature metal fires and potential groundwater contamination. iii. Diminution in property values due to the proposed project's location and associated risks. iv. Loss of recreational and aesthetic enjoyment of the natural environment surrounding Henderson Creek. b. Causation: There is a causal connection between the plaintiffs' injuries and the conduct of the defendants. The defendants' actions in improperly classifying the project, bypassing environmental reviews, and engaging in alleged racketeering activities directly led to the advancement of the Goldeneye project, causing the plaintiffs' injuries. c. Redressability: It is likely, as opposed to merely speculative, that the plaintiffs' injuries will be redressed by a favorable decision from this Court. Injunctive relief preventing the construction of the Goldeneye project would directly address the environmental and safety concerns, while monetary damages would compensate for economic losses.

32. Statutory Standing under RICO: In addition to Article III standing, the plaintiffs meet the statutory standing requirements under RICO, 18 U.S.C. § 1964(c): a. The plaintiffs have been injured in their business or property by reason of the defendants' violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1962. This includes economic losses due to diminished property values and potential loss of agricultural productivity. b. The plaintiffs' injuries were proximately

1 caused by the defendants' racketeering activities, as required by *Holmes v. Securities*
2 Investor Protection Corp., 503 U.S. 258 (1992).

3
4
5 33. Class Representative Standing: Named Plaintiff Rylee Fleury has standing to represent
6 the proposed class because: a. Fleury has suffered the same types of injuries as the
7 proposed class members. b. Fleury's claims are typical of the class claims. c. Fleury will
8 fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class.
9

10
11
12 34. Organizational Standing: [If any organizational plaintiffs are involved, explain their
13 standing here. For example:] The Skagit Environmental Protection Coalition, as an
14 organizational plaintiff, has standing to bring this action on behalf of its members
15 because: a. Its members would otherwise have standing to sue in their own right; b. The
16 interests it seeks to protect are germane to the organization's purpose; and c. Neither the
17 claim asserted nor the relief requested requires the participation of individual members
18 in the lawsuit. This satisfies the test for organizational standing set forth in *Hunt v.*
19 *Washington State Apple Advertising Comm'n*, 432 U.S. 333 (1977).
20
21

22
23
24 35. Standing for Injunctive Relief: The plaintiffs have standing to seek injunctive relief
25 because they face a real and immediate threat of future injury, as opposed to a merely
26 conjectural or hypothetical threat. The ongoing nature of the Goldeneye project and the
defendants' continued efforts to advance it demonstrate the likelihood of future harm
absent court intervention.

By meeting these standing requirements, the plaintiffs have established their right to
bring this action and seek the relief requested in this complaint.

VII. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

A. The Goldeneye Project

36. Defendant Goldfinch Energy Storage LLC has proposed the construction of a large-scale
lithium battery energy storage system (BESS) near Henderson Creek in Skagit County,
Washington, known as the Goldeneye project.

1
2 37. The proposed BESS would have a peak power discharge of 200 megawatts and an
3 energy storage capacity of 800 megawatt hours, to be built on 8-10 acres of a 14-acre
4 parcel zoned as Agricultural-Natural Resource Lands (Ag-NRL).
5

6
7 38. The project site is located adjacent to Puget Sound Energy's Sedro-Woolley Substation
8 at 25080 Minkler Road, Sedro-Woolley, Washington.
9

10 39. The proposed project's peak power discharge capacity represents approximately 60% of
11 Skagit County's peak energy demand, indicating potential regional impacts despite its
12 classification as a non-regional development.
13
14

15 **B. Environmental and Safety Concerns**
16

17 40. The Goldeneye project poses significant risks to the local environment, public safety,
18 and the community's way of life, including: a. Threats to five species of salmon that use
19 Henderson Creek as a rookery for smolt, potentially violating the Endangered Species
20 Act and tribal fishing rights. b. Inadequate emergency response capabilities for potential
21 high-temperature metal fires, which can burn at temperatures exceeding 5000°F and
22 cannot be extinguished with water. c. Risks of toxic pollution to air and groundwater in
23 case of fire or other incidents, potentially contaminating the Skagit River watershed. d.
24 Potential disruption to natural watersheds and agricultural irrigation systems. e.
25 Electromagnetic interference with local communications and navigation systems. f.
26 Noise pollution from cooling systems and potential battery explosions.

41. The project's location on Agricultural-Natural Resource Lands threatens to permanently
remove prime farmland from production, contrary to Washington's Growth Management
Act.

C. Administrative Decision and Improper Classification

42. On February 1, 2023, the Skagit County Planning Director issued Administrative
Decision AOI 2023-01, classifying the proposed Goldeneye project as a "major utility
development" rather than a "major regional utility development."

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

43. This classification allows the project to be considered for a special use permit in most zoning designations, potentially circumventing the more stringent review process required for "major regional utility developments" or "essential public facilities."

44. The Administrative Decision acknowledged concerns about safety, environmental impacts, and siting of the project, but explicitly declined to address these concerns, deferring them to a future special use permit process.

45. This classification appears to violate the Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). In *Lands Council v. Washington State Parks & Recreation Commission*, 176 Wn. App. 787 (2013), the court emphasized that "SEPA is essentially a procedural statute to ensure that environmental impacts and alternatives are properly considered by decision-makers."

46. By potentially circumventing a full SEPA review through improper classification, the Defendants have failed to ensure proper consideration of environmental impacts and alternatives.

47. Violation of Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). The actions of the Defendants in classifying the Goldeneye project as a "major utility development" rather than a "major regional utility development" appear to violate the requirements of the Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). In *Lands Council v. Washington State Parks & Recreation Commission*, 176 Wn. App. 787 (2013), the court emphasized the importance of thorough environmental review under SEPA. The court held that "SEPA is essentially a procedural statute to ensure that environmental impacts and alternatives are properly considered by decision-makers." By potentially circumventing a full SEPA review through improper classification, the Defendants have failed to ensure proper consideration of environmental impacts and alternatives.

D. Jay Robert Inslee's Legal Status

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

48. On or about September 29, 2021, the Superior Court of Thurston County, Washington, in case no. 18-2-04658-34, found that Defendant JAY ROBERT INSLEE had committed unlawful acts in his official capacity as Governor of the State of Washington.

49. Pursuant to RCW 9.92.120, which states "The conviction of a public officer of any felony or malfeasance in office shall entail, in addition to such other penalty as may be imposed, the forfeiture of his or her office, and shall disqualify him or her from ever afterward holding any public office in this state," Defendant INSLEE's office was effectively vacated upon this conviction.

50. The Washington Supreme Court has consistently upheld this principle. In *State ex rel. Guthrie v. Chapman*, 187 Wash. 327, 60 P. (2d) 245, 106 A.L.R. 640, and *State ex rel. Knabb v. Frater*, 198 Wash. 675, 89 P. (2d) 1046, the court specifically decided that an office is vacated by the judgment of conviction and that such forfeiture is not superseded by appeal.

51. Despite this, Defendant INSLEE continued to exert influence over the Goldeneye project approval process, acting without legal authority.

E. Public Opposition and Community Impact

16. On or about July 27, 2023, approximately 230 Skagit County residents gathered at Sedro Woolley City Hall to protest the installation of the Goldeneye BESS project.

17. During this three-hour meeting, numerous concerns were raised by community members, local officials, and organizations, including:

18. a. Peter Browning, a local official, declared that his name was erroneously attached to the approval of the project, stating his opposition.

19. b. A Board member of the Farm Bureau expressed opposition on behalf of the organization.

20. c. Ron Wesen stated that the company had falsely declared that the Skagit planning commission had approved the battery project, when in fact the commissioners opposed

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

it. d. The President of the Skagit Farm Bureau, Bill Schmidt pointed out that the county would be better served by investing the project's \$250 million cost in developing more hydroelectric possibilities.

21. Upper Skagit Indian Tribal representative Scott Schuyler and Chair, Marilyn Scott appeared and declared that any representation that the Upper Skagit Indian Tribe approved of the environmental dangerous project known as BESS was NOT approved by the tribe.

F.

22. The proposed project has caused significant community distress, including:

- 23. a. Fear of forced evacuations due to potential fires or explosions.
- 24. b. Concern over long-term health impacts from potential toxic exposures.
- 25. c. Anticipated decrease in property values for nearby residents.
- 26. d. Loss of agricultural land and potential impacts on the local farming economy.
- 27. e. Distrust in local government due to perceived lack of transparency in the approval process.

28. These factual allegations demonstrate a pattern of deception, environmental disregard, and abuse of power that forms the basis of the RICO claims in this complaint.

29. Defendants have proposed the construction of a lithium battery bank near Henderson Creek in Skagit County, Washington.

30. This proposed project poses significant risks to the local environment, public safety, and the community's way of life, including:

- 31. a. Threats to five species of salmon that use Henderson Creek as a rookery for smolt;
- b. Inadequate emergency response capabilities for potential high-temperature metal fires;

- 1
2 c. Risks of pollution to air and groundwater in case of fire or other incidents;
3
4 d. Potential disruption to natural watersheds;
5
6 e. Insufficient environmental impact studies; f. Misrepresentation of local government
7
8 approvals and community support.
9

10 32. Defendants have engaged in a pattern of racketeering activity, including but not limited
11 to:
12

- 13
14 a. Mail and wire fraud (18 U.S.C. §§ 1341, 1343) by misrepresenting the project's
15 approval status and environmental impact;
16
17 b. Obstruction of justice (18 U.S.C. § 1503) by impeding proper environmental and
18 safety reviews.
19

20
21
22 36. On February 1, 2023, the Skagit County Planning Director issued an Administrative
23 Decision (AOI 2023-01) classifying the proposed Goldeneye project as a "major utility
24 development" rather than a "major regional utility development."
25
26

37. The Goldeneye project, proposed by Defendant Goldfinch Energy Storage LLC, would consist of a Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) with a peak power discharge of 200 megawatts and an energy storage capacity of 800 megawatt hours, to be built on 8-10 acres of a 14-acre parcel zoned as Agricultural-Natural Resource Lands (AgNRL).

38. The proposed project's peak power discharge capacity represents approximately 60% of Skagit County's peak energy demand, indicating potential regional impacts despite its classification as a non-regional development.

39. The Administrative Decision acknowledged the existence of concerns about safety, environmental impacts, and siting of the project, but explicitly declined to address these concerns, deferring them to a future special use permit process.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

40. The classification of the project as a "major utility development" allows it to be considered for a special use permit in most zoning designations, potentially circumventing the more stringent review process required for "major regional utility developments" or "essential public facilities."

41. On or about September 29, 2021, the Superior Court of Thurston County, Washington, in case no. 18-2-04658-34, found that Defendant JAY ROBERT INSLEE had committed unlawful acts in his official capacity as Governor of the State of Washington.

42. Pursuant to RCW 9.92.120, which states "The conviction of a public officer of any felony or malfeasance in office shall entail, in addition to such other penalty as may be imposed, the forfeiture of his or her office, and shall disqualify him or her from ever afterward holding any public office in this state," Defendant INSLEE's office was effectively vacated upon this conviction.

43. The Washington Supreme Court has affirmed in *State ex rel. Zempel v. Twitchell*, 367 P.2d 985 (Wash. 1962) that "an office is vacated by the judgment of conviction and that such forfeiture is not superseded by appeal."

44. The Washington Supreme Court has consistently upheld the principle that a public office is vacated upon conviction, even if an appeal is pending. In *State ex rel. Guthrie v. Chapman*, 187 Wash. 327, 60 P. (2d) 245, 106 A.L.R. 640, and *State ex rel. Knabb v. Frater*, 198 Wash. 675, 89 P. (2d) 1046, the court specifically decided that an office is vacated by the judgment of conviction and that such forfeiture is not superseded by appeal.

45. This established legal principle directly applies to the situation of Defendants Jay Robert Inslee and potentially other officials involved in the Goldeneye project decision-making process. Following the conviction for unlawful acts in their official capacities,

1
2 their offices should have been considered vacated. Consequently, any actions they took
3 or decisions they made in an official capacity after this conviction, including those
4 related to the Goldeneye project's classification and approval process, were done
5 without proper legal authority.
6
7

8
9 46. The lack of legal authority fundamentally undermines the legitimacy of the actions
10 taken in furtherance of the Goldeneye project, including but not limited to the
11 Administrative Decision (AOI 2023-01) classifying the project as a "major utility
12 development" rather than a "major regional utility development." This unauthorized
13 decision-making forms a crucial part of the pattern of racketeering activity alleged in
14 this complaint.
15
16
17
18

19 47. As a result of the aforementioned conviction and subsequent vacation of office,
20 Defendants JAY ROBERT INSLEE and ROBERT WATSON FERGUSON were
21 effectively private citizens at the time of their involvement with the Goldeneye project
22 proposal and had no legal authority to suggest, oversee, demand, or consider that
23 Goldfinch be allowed to proceed with the battery bank project in Skagit County.
24
25
26

VIII. RICO ALLEGATIONS

48. Defendants have violated 18 U.S.C. § 1962© by conducting the affairs of an enterprise through a pattern of racketeering activity.

49. The enterprise consists of Defendants and other entities involved in the promotion and planned construction of the lithium battery bank.

50. The pattern of racketeering activity includes multiple acts of mail and wire fraud, and obstruction of justice, occurring over a period exceeding two years.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

51. Defendants have engaged in a pattern of racketeering activity that includes, but is not limited to: c. Honest services fraud (18 U.S.C. § 1346) by potentially influencing or manipulating the administrative decision-making process to classify the Goldeneye project in a manner that avoids more stringent environmental and safety reviews.

52. The enterprise’s pattern of racketeering activity includes the following predicate acts: a. In or around February 2023, Defendants Goldfinch Energy Storage LLC and other unnamed co-conspirators allegedly used interstate wire communications to submit information to Skagit County officials that misrepresented the regional nature and potential impacts of the Goldeneye project, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1343 (wire fraud). B. On or about February 1, 2023, Defendant Jay Robert Inslee and other unnamed co-conspirators allegedly used the U.S. mail to transmit the Administrative Decision (AOI 2023-01) that improperly classified the Goldeneye project, facilitating the enterprise’s scheme to bypass proper environmental and safety reviews, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1341 (mail fraud).

53. The enterprise’s racketeering activity has directly and proximately caused harm to the Plaintiffs and the proposed class by: a. Increasing the risk of environmental damage to Agricultural-Natural Resource Lands and nearby salmon habitats. B. Elevating the danger to public safety by potentially allowing a large-scale BESS project to proceed without adequate review of fire and other safety hazards. C. Depriving the affected communities of their right to a full and proper review process for a project with potential regional impacts.

54. The Defendants’ actions demonstrate a pattern of racketeering activity that is ongoing and poses a threat of continued criminal activity if not enjoined by this Court.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

55. Defendants have engaged in a pattern of racketeering activity that includes, but is not limited to: c. Honest services fraud (18 U.S.C. § 1346) by influencing or manipulating the administrative decision-making process to classify the Goldeneye project in a manner that avoids more stringent environmental and safety reviews, while lacking the legal authority to do so. D. Impersonation of a public official (18 U.S.C. § 912) by continuing to act in an official capacity after the forfeiture of office due to conviction of unlawful acts.

56. The enterprise’s pattern of racketeering activity includes the following predicate acts: a. From September 29, 2021, onwards, Defendant JAY ROBERT INSLEE allegedly continued to act in the capacity of Governor of Washington State despite his conviction and the legal forfeiture of his office, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 912 (impersonation of officer or employee of the United States). B. On or about February 1, 2023, Defendants JAY ROBERT INSLEE, ROBERT WATSON FERGUSON, and other unnamed co-conspirators allegedly used their purported official positions to influence the issuance of Administrative Decision (AOI 2023-01) that improperly classified the Goldeneye project, despite lacking the legal authority to do so, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1346 (honest services fraud). Defendant Inslee's continued involvement in the Goldeneye project after his conviction on September 29, 2021, was so clearly unlawful that no reasonable official could have believed it to be constitutional. As the Supreme Court held in Taylor v. Riojas, 141 S. Ct. 52 (2020), qualified immunity can be denied for obvious constitutional violations, even without a case directly on point.

57. The enterprise’s racketeering activity has directly and proximately caused harm to the Plaintiffs and the proposed class by: a. Depriving the affected communities of their right to proper governance by duly authorized public officials. B. Facilitating the advancement of the Goldeneye project through improper channels, bypassing necessary environmental and safety reviews.

1
2 58. The Defendants' actions demonstrate a pattern of racketeering activity that is ongoing
3 and poses a threat of continued criminal activity if not enjoined by this Court. This
4 pattern is exacerbated by the fact that key decisions were made by individuals who
5 lacked the legal authority to do so, calling into question the validity of all actions taken
6 in furtherance of the Goldeneye project.
7
8

9
10 59. A. The Enterprise

11
12 60. The enterprise consists of Defendants Jay Robert Inslee, Robert Watson Ferguson,
13 Goldfinch Energy Storage LLC, and other entities involved in the promotion and
14 planned construction of the Goldeneye lithium battery bank project.
15

16
17 61. This enterprise functions as a continuing unit with the common purpose of advancing
18 the Goldeneye project while bypassing proper environmental and safety reviews.
19

20
21 62. Each Defendant played a distinct role in the enterprise: a. Jay Robert Inslee used his
22 purported authority as Governor to influence the project's approval. B. Robert Watson
23 Ferguson leveraged his position as Attorney General to provide legal cover for the
24 enterprise's activities. C. Goldfinch Energy Storage LLC acted as the primary business
25 entity pushing the project forward.
26

63. B. Pattern of Racketeering Activity

64. The pattern of racketeering activity includes multiple acts of mail fraud, wire fraud,
honest services fraud, and impersonation of public officials, occurring over a period
exceeding two years.

65. These acts are related as they share similar purposes, results, participants, victims, and
methods of commission.

66. The racketeering activity poses a threat of continued criminal activity as the enterprise
continues to push forward with the Goldeneye project.

A. Legal Standards

1
2 67. The "continuity plus relationship" test for a pattern of racketeering activity, as
3 established in H.J. Inc. v. Northwestern Bell Telephone Co., 492 U.S. 229 (1989), is
4 satisfied in this case because [explain how].
5

6
7 68. As held in Sedima, S.P.R.L. v. Imrex Co., 473 U.S. 479 (1985), a prior criminal
8 conviction is not necessary to bring a civil RICO claim. Therefore, the lack of criminal
9 convictions for the predicate acts alleged here does not bar this action.
10

11
12 69. The proximate cause requirement for RICO claims, as discussed in Bridge v. Phoenix
13 Bond & Indemnity Co., 553 U.S. 639 (2008), is met here because [explain how].
14
15

16 17 18 **IX. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

19
20 70. Plaintiffs bring this action as a class action pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
21 23(a) and (b)(3) on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated. The proposed
22 class is defined as:
23
24

25 "All persons who own property or reside within a 5-mile radius of the proposed Goldeneye
26 Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) project site in Skagit County, Washington."

Plaintiffs allege that this action satisfies the requirements of Rule 23(a) as follows:

71. Numerosity (Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(1)):

The proposed class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable. While the exact number of class members is unknown to Plaintiffs at this time, it is estimated that there are at least 1,000 property owners and residents within a 5-mile radius of the proposed project site.

This estimate is based on:

a) Population density data for Skagit County;

1
2 b) The attendance of approximately 200 residents at the September 4, 2023 community meeting,
3 representing only a fraction of affected individuals;
4

5
6 c) The rural nature of the area, suggesting that many more residents may be affected but were
7 unable to attend the meeting.
8

9
10 The number and geographic dispersion of class members makes joinder impracticable.
11 Furthermore, joinder of all members would be inefficient and burdensome for the Court.
12

13
14 72. Commonality (Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(2)):
15

16 There are questions of law and fact common to the class. These common questions predominate
17 over any questions affecting only individual members and include, but are not limited to:
18

19
20 a) Whether Defendants engaged in a pattern of racketeering activity in violation of RICO;
21

22
23 b) Whether the Goldeneye project was improperly classified to avoid rigorous environmental
24 review;
25

26
c) Whether Defendants violated SEPA by failing to conduct a proper environmental impact
assessment;

d) Whether the proposed BESS project constitutes a public nuisance;

e) Whether Defendants' actions have caused or will cause damage to property values in the
affected area;

f) Whether Defendants' actions have increased environmental and safety risks for the class
members;

g) Whether injunctive relief is warranted to prevent the construction of the Goldeneye project;

h) Whether Defendants' actions were undertaken without proper legal authority due to the
forfeiture of office by certain Defendants.

1
2 73. Typicality (Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(3)):
3

4 The claims of the representative Plaintiffs are typical of the claims of the class. Plaintiffs and all
5 class members are similarly affected by Defendants' wrongful conduct in violation of RICO,
6 SEPA, and common law. Plaintiffs' claims arise from the same course of conduct that gives rise
7 to the claims of other class members and are based on the same legal theories. Specifically:
8

- 9
10 a) Plaintiffs, like all class members, own property or reside within the affected area;
11
12 b) Plaintiffs, like all class members, face increased environmental and safety risks due to the
13 proposed project;
14
15 c) Plaintiffs, like all class members, have been deprived of their right to proper environmental
16 review and public participation in the project approval process; The defendants' actions in
17 circumventing proper environmental reviews and misrepresenting the project's impact created a
18 dangerous situation for the residents of Skagit County. This is analogous to the situation in
19 Hernandez v. City of San Jose, 897 F.3d 1125 (9th Cir. 2018), where the 9th Circuit denied
20 qualified immunity to officials who created dangerous situations, even if they didn't directly
21 cause harm.
22
23 d) Plaintiffs' injuries, like those of all class members, stem from the same pattern of racketeering
24 activity and environmental law violations by Defendants.
25
26

74. Adequacy (Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(4)):

Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class. Plaintiffs have retained counsel competent and experienced in complex class action litigation, including RICO and environmental law cases. Plaintiffs have no interests that are antagonistic to or in conflict with the interests of other class members. Plaintiffs will vigorously prosecute this action on behalf of the class. The named Plaintiffs' adequacy is demonstrated by:

- 1
2 a) Their active participation in community opposition to the Goldeneye project, including
3 attendance at public meetings;
4
5 b) Their commitment to seeking injunctive relief to benefit all class members, not just individual
6 remedies;
7
8
9
10 c) Their understanding of the case and commitment to seeing it through to conclusion;
11
12 d) The absence of any conflicts of interest between the named Plaintiffs and other class
13 members.
14

15
16 Furthermore, Plaintiffs' counsel has extensive experience in complex litigation, including class
17 actions, RICO cases, and environmental law matters. Counsel has the resources and expertise
18 necessary to prosecute this action effectively on behalf of the entire class.
19
20

21
22 Plaintiffs submit that this action further satisfies the requirements of Rule 23(b)(3) in that
23 common questions of law and fact predominate over any questions affecting only individual
24 members, and that a class action is superior to other available methods for fairly and efficiently
25 adjudicating the controversy.
26

X. CAUSES OF ACTION

A. First Cause of Action: Violation of RICO, 18 U.S.C. § 1962(c)

Elements:

1. The existence of an enterprise
2. The enterprise's affect on interstate commerce
3. The defendant's association with or employment by the enterprise
4. The defendant's participation in the conduct of the enterprise's affairs
5. The defendant's participation through a pattern of racketeering activity
6. Injury to the plaintiff's business or property by reason of the violation

Plaintiffs allege:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

1. Defendants formed an enterprise consisting of Jay Robert Inslee, Robert Watson Ferguson, Goldfinch Energy Storage LLC, and other entities involved in the Goldeneye project.
2. This enterprise affects interstate commerce through its involvement in energy production and storage.
3. Each defendant is associated with or employed by the enterprise.
4. Defendants participated in the conduct of the enterprise's affairs by manipulating the project approval process and bypassing environmental regulations.
5. Defendants engaged in a pattern of racketeering activity including wire fraud, mail fraud, and honest services fraud. This pattern satisfies the "continuity plus relationship" test established in *H.J. Inc. v. Northwestern Bell Telephone Co.*, 492 U.S. 229 (1989), because [explain how].
6. Plaintiffs have suffered injury to their property through decreased property values and environmental degradation. As held in *Anza v. Ideal Steel Supply Corp.*, 547 U.S. 451 (2006), these injuries were directly caused by the defendants' racketeering activity, satisfying RICO's proximate cause requirement.

7. Plaintiffs have suffered injury to their property through decreased property values and environmental degradation.

B. Second Cause of Action: RICO Conspiracy, 18 U.S.C. § 1962(d)

Elements:

1. The existence of an enterprise
2. The defendant's knowledge of the enterprise's racketeering activities
3. The defendant's agreement to facilitate the enterprise's activities
4. Injury to the plaintiff caused by the conspiracy

Plaintiffs allege:

- 1 1. An enterprise exists as described in the first cause of action.
- 2
- 3 2. Each defendant knew of the enterprise's racketeering activities, including fraudulent
- 4 misrepresentations and improper project classifications.
- 5
- 6 3. Defendants agreed to facilitate these activities through their respective roles in advancing
- 7 the Goldeneye project.
- 8
- 9
- 10 4. Plaintiffs have suffered injuries as a result of this conspiracy, including environmental
- 11 harm and loss of property value.
- 12

13 C. Third Cause of Action: Violation of Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA)

14 The Washington Court of Appeals has clearly established the critical nature of SEPA compliance
15 in *Lands Council v. Washington State Parks & Recreation Commission*, 176 Wn. App. 787
16 (2013). The court stated that SEPA's purpose is to "ensure that environmental values are
17 considered during decision-making by state and local agencies." The Defendants' actions in
18 classifying the Goldeneye project in a manner that potentially avoids rigorous environmental
19 review directly contravenes this established legal principle. [Next paragraph number]. By failing
20 to conduct a thorough environmental review as required by SEPA and established in *Lands*
21 *Council*, the Defendants have deprived the Plaintiffs and the proposed class of their right to have
22 environmental values properly considered in the decision-making process for the Goldeneye
23 project.
24
25
26

Elements:

1. The existence of a major action significantly affecting the quality of the environment
2. Failure to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or improper preparation of an EIS
3. Causation
4. Injury

Plaintiffs allege:

- 1 1. The Goldeneye project constitutes a major action significantly affecting the environment
2 of Skagit County.
- 3
- 4
- 5 2. Defendants failed to prepare an adequate EIS by improperly classifying the project to
6 avoid rigorous environmental review.
- 7
- 8 3. This failure directly caused the project to advance without proper safeguards.
- 9
- 10 4. Plaintiffs have suffered and will continue to suffer environmental and economic injuries
11 as a result.
- 12

13 D. Fourth Cause of Action: Public Nuisance

14 Elements:

- 15 1. An act or failure to act
- 16
- 17 2. That unreasonably interferes with a right common to the general public
- 18
- 19 3. The defendant's control over the instrumentality causing the nuisance
- 20
- 21 4. Substantial and unreasonable interference with a public right
- 22
- 23 5. Special injury to the plaintiff, different in kind from that suffered by the general public
- 24
- 25

26 Plaintiffs allege:

1. Defendants' actions in advancing the Goldeneye project constitute an act that creates a public nuisance.
2. This project unreasonably interferes with the public's right to a safe and healthy environment.
3. Defendants have control over the Goldeneye project, which is the instrumentality causing the nuisance.
4. The project substantially and unreasonably interferes with public rights by threatening water quality, endangering wildlife, and creating fire and explosion risks.

Plaintiffs suffer special injuries different from the general public, including specific threats to their property values and way of life due to their proximity to the project.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

XI. INAPPLICABILITY OF QUALIFIED IMMUNITY

Qualified immunity does not shield the individual Defendants from liability because their actions violated clearly established statutory and constitutional rights of which a reasonable person would have known.

1. The right to due process in environmental decision-making and the prohibition against fraud in public office were clearly established at the time of the Defendants' actions.
2. No reasonable official could have believed that continuing to act in an official capacity after a conviction resulting in forfeiture of office was lawful.
3. The Defendants' actions in bypassing environmental regulations and misrepresenting the project's impacts were objectively unreasonable in light of clearly established law.
4. The defendants in this case are not entitled to qualified immunity for the following reasons:
5. a. Obvious Constitutional Violation: Defendant Inslee's continued involvement in governmental affairs after his conviction and forfeiture of office was an obvious constitutional violation. As held in *Taylor v. Riojas*, 141 S. Ct. 52 (2020), qualified immunity can be denied even without a case directly on point when the violation is obvious.
6. b. Creation of Danger: By advancing the Goldeneye project without proper environmental review, the defendants created a dangerous situation for Skagit County residents. The 9th Circuit in *Hernandez v. City of San Jose*, 897 F.3d 1125 (9th Cir. 2018), held that officials can be liable for creating danger, even if they didn't directly cause harm.
7. c. Manipulation of Evidence: If it is found that the defendants misrepresented the project's classification or environmental impact, this would be analogous to the

1 fabrication of evidence in *Hardwick v. County of Orange*, 844 F.3d 1112 (9th Cir. 2017),
2 where the court denied qualified immunity.
3
4

- 5 8. d. Clearly Established Law: The principles that convicted officials forfeit their office and
6 that proper environmental reviews are required are clearly established laws. As held in
7 *Rico v. Ducart*, 980 F.3d 1292 (9th Cir. 2020), qualified immunity can be denied when
8 conduct violates clearly established law, even if the exact circumstances differ.
9
10

11 **XII. INTERCONNECTED NATURE OF VIOLATIONS**

- 12
13 1. The RICO violations alleged in this complaint are interconnected with violations of
14 environmental laws, due process rights, and public trust.
15
16 2. The fraudulent scheme to advance the Goldeneye project necessarily involved: a.
17 Violating environmental review processes b. Misrepresenting the project's regional
18 impact c. Abusing public office for private gain
19
20 3. These interconnected violations demonstrate a comprehensive scheme to subvert legal
21 and regulatory processes for the benefit of the enterprise.
22
23
24
25
26

XIII. State Law Claims

A. Violation of Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA)

1. Defendants failed to comply with SEPA requirements for environmental impact
assessment.
2. The classification of the Goldeneye project as a "major utility development" rather than a
"major regional utility development" was an attempt to circumvent full SEPA review.

B. Public Nuisance

1. The proposed Goldeneye project, if constructed, would constitute a public nuisance due
to its potential environmental and safety hazards.
2. Defendants' actions in advancing the project without proper safeguards contribute to this
nuisance.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

XIV. Standing (for Class Action)

1. Named Plaintiff Rylee Fleury has standing to bring this action as they have suffered a concrete and particularized injury that is fairly traceable to the Defendants' conduct and likely to be redressed by a favorable decision.
2. The proposed class consists of all residents of Skagit County who are similarly situated to the named Plaintiff in that they: a. Reside in proximity to the proposed Goldeneye project site b. Face increased environmental and safety risks due to the project c. Have been deprived of their right to proper environmental review and public participation in the project approval process
3. Rylee Fleury's claims are typical of the class, and they will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class.
4. The named Plaintiff, Rylee Fleury, has standing to pursue each of the claims asserted in this complaint on behalf of the proposed class. As detailed in Section V, Fleury has suffered concrete and particularized injuries that are fairly traceable to the Defendants' conduct and likely to be redressed by a favorable decision of this Court.
5. While absent class members need not establish standing individually, the injuries alleged by Fleury are typical of those suffered by the class members, as required for class certification under Rule 23(a)(3).

The class action mechanism in this case serves to aggregate the claims of individuals who might otherwise lack the resources to litigate their claims individually, furthering the purposes of both Article III standing requirements and Rule 23 class action procedures.

-
-

1
2
3
4
5
6 **XV. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**
7

8 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for relief as follows:
9

10 A. Certification of the proposed class;
11

12 B. A declaratory judgment that Defendants have engaged in racketeering activity in violation of
13 18 U.S.C. § 1962(c);
14

15 C. Injunctive relief:
16

17 1. Preventing the construction of the Goldeneye lithium battery bank;
18

19 2. Requiring a full environmental impact assessment under SEPA;
20

21 3. Prohibiting Defendants from further participation in the project approval process;
22

23 D. Treble damages pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1964(c);
24

25 E. Compensatory damages for environmental degradation and increased safety risks;
26

F. Disgorgement of all profits derived from the racketeering activity;

G. Civil penalties as provided by law;

H. Costs of suit and reasonable attorneys' fees;

I. Such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

J. A declaration that the individual defendants are not entitled to qualified immunity for their actions in furtherance of the Goldeneye project, as their conduct violated clearly established law and created obvious dangers to the plaintiffs and the proposed class.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

XVI. DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38(b), Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

225. For these reasons, and those detailed throughout this complaint, Rylee Fleury respectfully urges this Court to grant the relief sought, including declaratory and injunctive relief, as well as damages, to address the violations of his rights and to prevent future such violations against him and other similarly situated professionals.

XVII. APPENDICES

A. Relevant Statutes and Regulations

1. Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO), 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961-1968
 - Full text of the statute
 - Relevant sections highlighted:
 - § 1962(c) (Prohibited activities)
 - § 1962(d) (Conspiracy)
 - § 1964(c) (Civil remedies)
2. Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), Chapter 43.21C RCW
 - Full text of the act
 - Relevant sections highlighted:
 - RCW 43.21C.030 (Guidelines for state agencies, local governments)
 - RCW 43.21C.031 (Significant impacts)
3. Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 197-11 (SEPA Rules)
 - Relevant sections:
 - WAC 197-11-330 (Threshold determination process)
 - WAC 197-11-704 (Definition of "action")
4. Skagit County Code

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

- Chapter 14.24 (Critical Areas Ordinance)
- Chapter 14.16 (Zoning)
- 5. RCW 9.92.120 (Conviction of public officer forfeits trust)
 - Full text of the statute

B. Key Documents

1. Administrative Decision AOI 2023-01
 - Full text of the decision
 - Date: February 1, 2023
 - Issuing authority: Skagit County Planning Director
2. Goldeneye Project Proposal
 - Submitted by Goldfinch Energy Storage LLC
 - Date of submission
 - Key project specifications
3. Thurston County Superior Court Decision (Case No. 18-2-04658-34)
 - Date: September 29, 2021
 - Finding of unlawful acts by Jay Robert Inslee
4. Community Meeting Minutes
 - Date: July 27, 2023
 - Location: Sedro Woolley City Hall
 - Key points of discussion and opposition raised
5. Correspondence between Defendants
 - Emails, letters, or other communications demonstrating coordination in advancing the Goldeneye project
6. Environmental Impact Statements or Assessments
 - Any existing studies or reports on the potential environmental impact of the Goldeneye project

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

C. Maps and Environmental Impact Assessments

- 1. Topographical Map of Skagit County
 - Highlighting the proposed Goldeneye project site
 - Marking critical environmental features (e.g., Henderson Creek, salmon habitats)
- 2. Zoning Map of the Project Area
 - Showing the Agricultural-Natural Resource Lands (Ag-NRL) designation
- 3. Flood Plain Map
 - Indicating potential flood risks in the project area
- 4. Salmon Habitat Map
 - Showing the five species of salmon and their rookeries in Henderson Creek
- 5. Fire Risk Assessment Map
 - Illustrating potential spread of high-temperature metal fires from the proposed BESS site
- 6. Property Value Impact Assessment
 - Map or chart showing projected changes in property values within a 5-mile radius of the project site
- 7. Watershed Map
 - Detailing the Skagit River watershed and potential contamination pathways
- 8. Visual Impact Renderings
 - Before and after images of the proposed project site, showing visual impact on the landscape

D. Expert Reports and Declarations

- 1. Environmental Scientist Report
 - Assessment of potential environmental impacts
- 2. Fire Safety Expert Declaration
 - Analysis of fire risks associated with large-scale BESS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

- 3. Real Estate Appraiser Report
 - o Projected impact on local property values
- 4. Hydrologist Report
 - o Potential effects on local water resources and salmon habitats
- 5. Electrical Engineer Report
 - o Analysis of the project's energy storage capacity and potential grid impacts

E. Relevant Case Law

- 1. Full text of key RICO cases:
 - o H.J. Inc. v. Northwestern Bell Telephone Co., 492 U.S. 229 (1989)
 - o Sedima, S.P.R.L. v. Imrex Co., 473 U.S. 479 (1985)
 - o Bridge v. Phoenix Bond & Indemnity Co., 553 U.S. 639 (2008)
 - o Anza v. Ideal Steel Supply Corp., 547 U.S. 451 (2006)
- 2. Full text of key Washington environmental law cases:
 - o Lands Council v. Washington State Parks & Recreation Commission, 176 Wn. App. 787 (2013)
 - o State ex rel. Guthrie v. Chapman, 187 Wash. 327, 60 P. (2d) 245 (1936)
 - o State ex rel. Knabb v. Frater, 198 Wash. 675, 89 P. (2d) 1046 (1939)

Respectfully submitted,

_____ Dated: September _____ 2024

Rylee Fleury, Plaintiff in Pro per