

From: Tyler R-G Reutimann <reutimann@lasher.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 18, 2026 5:24 PM
To: LR Comments <lrcomments@kingcounty.gov>
Cc: Tyler R-G Reutimann <reutimann@lasher.com>
Subject: Proposed Changes | LFLR 6(c)(1)

[EXTERNAL Email Notice!] External communication is important to us. Be cautious of phishing attempts. Do not click or open suspicious links or attachments.

Good afternoon:

I would like to provide some feedback related to LFLR 6(c)(1) related to Oversetting Family Law Motions Calendar.

On multiple occasions when filing such motion I have received a denial order from commissioners stating the following:

The court having reviewed a motion for order, hereby DENIES the entry because:

The court was not able to locate the underlying motion that the Respondent is requesting to **overset**. The court is not able to make a determination whether an **overset** is appropriate based on LFLR 6 without reviewing the underlying motion. Further the motion to **overset** should be filed in the court file and provided as a supporting document in the FL queue. The motion to **overset** should not be submitted as a proposed order.

The commissioner stated that the underlying motion must be filed with the motion to **overset**. This requirement is not contained in the rules nor the motion to **overset** document. In the past the motion to **overset** was granted or denied based on the facts solely contained in the motion to **overset**. I think the rule should be clarified to state that the underlying motion needs to be submitted with the motion to **overset**.

Secondly, the motion to **overset** states that is should be submitted with a proposed order to the “Orders for Review” queue:

To the person filing this motion:

You must submit this motion, and a proposed order in Word format, to the “Orders for Review” queue in the clerk’s e-filing application. For instructions on how to use the queue visit: <https://kingcounty.gov/~media/courts/superior-court/docs/COVID-19/FL-Default-AO-for-Review-Instructions.ashx?la=en>. Notice: The court is unable to review these immediately upon submission, but in most cases will review the motion two business days after submission.

As you can see from the denial, the commissioner said the motion to **overset** should be filed in the court in the FL queue, this is in contravention to the language in the order which says to submit it to “Orders for Review.”

I believe this should be clarified.

LASHER

Tyler R-G Reutimann

Paralegal

601 Union Street, Suite 2600 Seattle, WA 98101

direct: +1 206-654-2411

email: reutimann@lasher.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email and any attachments may contain confidential or attorney-client protected information that may not be further distributed by any means without permission of the sender. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you are not permitted to read its content and that any disclosure, copying, printing, distribution or use of any of the information is prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please immediately notify the sender by return e-mail and delete the message and its attachments without saving in any manner.