

March 26, 2021

**OFFICE OF THE HEARING EXAMINER  
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON**

King County Courthouse  
516 Third Avenue Room 1200  
Seattle, Washington 98104  
Telephone (206) 477-0860  
[hearingexaminer@kingcounty.gov](mailto:hearingexaminer@kingcounty.gov)  
[www.kingcounty.gov/independent/hearing-examiner](http://www.kingcounty.gov/independent/hearing-examiner)

**REPORT AND DECISION**

SUBJECT: Regional Animal Services of King County file no. **V21011571-A21000276**

**CHERVYN LEE**

Animal Services Enforcement Appeal

Activity no.: A21000276

Appellant: **Chervyn Lee**

[REDACTED]  
Kent, WA 98032

Telephone: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

King County: Regional Animal Services of King County  
*represented by* **Chelsea Eykel**  
Regional Animal Services of King County  
21615 64th Avenue S  
Kent, WA 98032  
Telephone: (206) 263-5968  
Email: [raskcappeals@kingcounty.gov](mailto:raskcappeals@kingcounty.gov)

**FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

Overview

1. Chervyn Lee appeals a Regional Animal Services of King County (Animal Services) determination that her bluetick hound dog, Nashville, qualifies as vicious and must be confined. Exs. D5 & D7. After hearing the witnesses' testimony, studying the exhibits admitted into evidence, and considering the parties' arguments and the relevant law, we deny Ms. Lee's appeal.

## Hearing Testimony

*Jordan Holcombe*

2. Jordan Holcombe testified that on January 12, 2021, he, along with his wife (Rebekka Holcombe) and their son (Damian Holcombe), brought their dog, Dracula, to the Grandview Dog Park, to meet up with Damian's grandfather, who had already arrived. Mr. Holcombe and Damian first walked through the gate to enter the dog park, while Ms. Holcombe stayed back to hold the gate open for people leaving the dog park. Mr. Holcombe turned to grab poop bags as Damian continued to walk into the dog park and Dracula walked up to the other dogs already congregated.
3. Mr. Holcombe testified that as Damian walked up the path towards his grandfather, which was around the corner and near a group of dogs. As soon as Damian walked past those dogs, the dog in question turned and lunged at Damian, pulled him to the ground, and bit him on the arm and stomach area. Then, Dracula started fighting that dog.
4. However, Mr. Holcombe then clarified that he did not actually see what led up to Damian on the ground, turning around from the bags to see Damian already on the ground, and Dracula fighting the dog in question. Yet he returned later to saying he saw the dog push Damian down.
5. Mr. Holcombe said he started around 50 to 60 feet away from Damian. He ran up to Damian. His wife came and pulled Damian off the ground. As he was pulling the hound and Dracula apart, the hound bit him on the arm. He then kicked the dog and released Dracula.
6. Mr. Holcombe asked who the owner of the dog was. He found Ms. Lee outside the fence. He talked to her outside the gate, and then she came inside the dog park.
7. On rebuttal, Mr. Holcombe testified that the dog that was on Damian looked like a "bluetooth" hound with the salt and pepper coat and brown head with pepper fur. *See also* Ex. D3 at 001 (Nashville picture). He pulled the dogs apart and that same dog lunged at him and bit him. He then kicked that dog and it ran away. Damian then pulled up his shirt, and Mr. Holcombe saw the cut. It all happened so fast.
8. He first asked people in the immediate vicinity who the dog belonged to. He then exited the park and only then did he talk with Ms. Lee. He asked her if this was her dog, and she said yes. At no point did Ms. Lee deny it was her dog, she only said that Nashville is usually not that aggressive. He found Ms. Lee in the parking lot. Ms. Lee had walked in through the gate to restrain her dog.
9. Mr. Holcombe knows that the dog that bit his son was Ms. Lee's dog because when he exited and asked people whose dog it was, Ms. Lee responded.

*Jason Quakenbush*

10. Mr. Quakenbush was at the dog park. He testified that he was at the upper part of the park, coming over the crest of the hill. His dog, Morrie, was running around with a different group of dogs. Mr. Quakenbush heard some dogs barking, including Nashville, who Mr. Quakenbush knew from seeing him many times at the park and because Nashville has a recognizable bark.
11. Mr. Quakenbush did not see how many dogs there were, but it looked like a scrum of dogs wrestling and playing. He kept moving forward, but by the time he got to the bend, it looked like the scrum had escalated and dogs were fighting. He saw who he thought was the child's father [Mr. Holcombe] moving into where the dogs were wrestling. He saw that Nashville, Ms. Lee's dog, was excited and running around, but he was not sure what dogs were where because he kept shifting his attention to Morrie.
12. Mr. Quakenbush saw a child get knocked down and then cry out. Morrie ran up and sniffed the child. Mr. Quakenbush did not see the child get bitten, because the child was between him and the dogs, with his back turned, but it "looked like" one dog had another dog pinned and the child was moving in to separate them. When the child fell down, he noticed that Nashville was nearby the scrum, but he did not see Nashville near the child. He saw the father holding two dogs apart. He clarified that he was not certain about the sequence. Nashville was not one of the dogs pinning or being pinned; both of those dogs were smaller than Nashville. All he saw Nashville doing was barking, and later being with Ms. Lee.
13. Mr. Quakenbush saw the child pull up his shirt and he saw a bite wound on the child. At that point, he saw Ms. Lee with her dog on a leash, walking out. The family of the child was yelling. Mr. Quakenbush hung back and waited with Morrie. He saw Ms. Lee standing by her car, with Nashville in the car, while a lady [Ms. Holcombe] shouted at her.
14. On rebuttal, Mr. Quackenbush reiterated that he did not see which dog bit the child. He was only aware of the bite after Damian pulled up his shirt. The sequence of events is not clear to him. He originally thought Damian was a young woman. He did not recognize either of the dogs in the altercation. He has seen Nashville many times, so he is able to recognize him. He opined that Nashville could not have been the dog over Damian, because Mr. Holcombe would not have been able to pull Nashville off, Nashville being so big. He did know that Nashville was in the group of dogs that escalated into a fight between two other dogs. He thought Mr. Holcombe was breaking up the initial altercation.

*Damian Holcombe*

15. Damian, who is almost 13, testified that his father and grandfather were walking into the dog park. His father grabbed poop bags. Dracula ran up to the group of dogs in the park, which included Nashville. Damian was walking up to talk to his grandfather, who was approaching the group of dogs.

16. Damian noticed that Dracula was leaving one group of dogs to go to another, but he was not really focused on the dogs, and he was not interacting with the dogs. As he was about to talk to his grandfather, a dog jumped on him, grabbed his arm, bit him very “aggressively,” and tugged him down. Damian thinks the dog jumped up on him from his side, but he is not certain.
17. Damian was not certain what the dog that bit him looked like. Once he was on the ground, the same dog bit him on the abdomen. Then his father came and helped him, as did Dracula. As Dracula and that dog were fighting and his dad intervened, that dog “aggressively” bit his father, who then kicked that dog.

*Rebekka Holcombe*

18. Ms. Holcombe testified that she, Mr. Holcombe, and Damian got out of their car and met Damian’s grandfather in the parking lot of the dog park. As she walked toward the entrance of the dog park, she noticed Ms. Lee outside the park, on her cellphone. They entered the dog park, with Ms. Holcombe entering last. Damian’s grandfather was perhaps 100 yards into the park. Mr. Holcombe grabbed poop bags.
19. She saw Damian fall down and she yelled at Mr. Holcombe. She was running towards Damian and hollering, so she only saw Damian on the ground and was only focused on how quickly she could get to him. She saw Nashville and Dracula aggressively fight, but she did not see any other dog fights. As her husband separated Nashville and Dracula, Mr. Holcombe was bitten.
20. Damian was curled up in a ball on the ground. She rolled him over. She asked Mr. Holcombe which dog bit Damian; she opined he would know because he pulled the dog off Damian. When her husband pulled Nashville off Damian, Nashville ran off towards what she assumed was his owner.
21. Mr. Holcombe pointed out Ms. Lee as Nashville’s owner. Ms. Holcombe was mad at Ms. Lee for not being anywhere close enough to her dog to contain him. Ms. Lee told her that her dog [Nashville] is usually not this aggressive. Ms. Holcombe does not recall what happened after the biting, because adrenalin kicked in.
22. Ms. Holcombe initially thought Damian was bit on the hand, but her son was not sure. As to other bites, Damian was again not certain, so they reported two major bite marks.

*Steve Nickelson*

23. Ofc. Nickelson was nearby when the 911 call came in. When he arrived at the park, he saw a boy crying and holding up his arm and his shirt. Ofc. Nickelson took several photos. Exhibit D4 at 001 was of the laceration and scrape of skin to Damian’s inside right elbow. Exhibit D4 at 003 was of a three-inch open wound on Damian’s abdomen. Exhibit D4 at 005 to 008 show Mr. Holcombe’s arm.
24. Ofc. Nickelson went to talk to Ms. Lee. She was tearing up. She said she was sorry and that she had never been through this before. She brought Nashville out of the car so

Ofc. Nickelson could take pictures. At no point did she deny it was her dog, she just listened to Ofc. Nickelson as he explained the quarantine requirements. The guy with Ms. Lee [who we assume was Travis Nelson] did not say anything.

*Chervyn Lee*

25. Ms. Lee testified that she was never outside the gate of the dog park at any point during the altercation. Instead, she was walking on the path. She ran up to see what was going on. Nashville was walking towards two dogs in an altercation. She was not close enough to see what happened, but she did see the boy on the ground. She was not close enough to see which dog knocked down the boy. She called Nashville back, and Mr. Holcombe kicked at Nashville, who then bit him in response.
26. As to what was said in her conversation with Ofc. Nickelson, she was saying she was sorry because she was getting emotional, but at no point did she admit guilt. On rebuttal, Ms. Lee testified that she was not out in the parking lot. And she never said her dog was not usually that aggressive.

*Travis Nelson*

27. Mr. Nelson testified that he had already left the dog park and exited through the gate. He had put the dogs in the car when he heard an initial ruckus. He turned around and saw a dog fight. By that point, one person was on the ground and a couple of people were in the vicinity. Mr. Nelson could hear Nashville howl. Ms. Lee was still inside the park.

Legal Standard

28. Animal Services asserts that Nashville is “vicious,” which KCC 11.04.020.BB defines as:

Having performed the act of, or having the propensity to do any act, endangering the safety of any person, animal or property of another, including, but not limited to, biting a human being or attacking a human being or domesticated animal without provocation,

while KCC 11.04.230.H declares as a nuisance, “Any animal that has exhibited vicious propensities and constitutes a danger to the safety of persons or property off the animal’s premises or lawfully on the animal’s premises.”

29. We do not grant substantial weight or otherwise accord deference to agency determinations. Exam. R. XV.F.3. For those matters or issues raised in an appeal statement, Animal Services bears the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence both the violation and the appropriateness of the remedy it has imposed. KCC 20.22.080.G; .210.B.

## Analysis

*Credibility Assessments*

30. There was disputed testimony as to where Ms. Lee was, such as at what point was she inside or outside the dog park. We do not find that particularly important, as Ms. Lee agreed she was not close enough to see what happened. Thus, ours was not a scenario where, for example, Ms. Lee testified that she saw a *different* dog bite Damian, and the question would be whether she really was close enough to have had that vantage point. Whether Ms. Lee started off inside or outside the park does not significantly impact our analysis.
31. We did not find Ms. Lee particularly credible. First, her explanation of what she said—and did not say in the direct aftermath was not very plausible. Having entertained hundreds of dog appeals, owners tend to be extremely defensive of their dogs right from the get-go, denying their dog did it and often persisting in that denial even in the face of overwhelming evidence to the contrary. Sometimes they later recant and admit to the behavior. But we have never encountered an appellant who *failed* to deny it was their dog, and then later changed their position to it not being their dog.
32. Moreover, even if one could explain away conversations in the moments after the altercation as a shock or “deer in the headlights” scenario, that explanation would have evaporated by the time Ms. Lee filed her appeal statement a week later. Ex. D7 at 001. Often times, an appellant raises identification (“it wasn’t my dog”) as a main, if not the sole, thrust of an appeal statement. In such scenarios, the hearing often turns entirely on, for example, whether the attacker was appellant’s German Shepherd versus another German Shepherd in the neighborhood.
33. Here in contrast, in her appeal statement Ms. Lee did not dispute that Nashville had done the biting. Instead, as she described it, Nashville was “engaged in an altercation with two other dogs, and “[w]hen the minor [Damian] reached in and grabbed the dogs engaged in the altercation, he was accidentally bit.” She explained that Nashville had never “had an incident like this in the past.” She followed with an opinion that “I don’t believe this will ever happen again,” enclosed with “this has been his first and only offense.” Ex. D7 at 002. The appeal perhaps raised the issue of provocation, but it was not even in the ballpark of disputing Nashville was the biter.
34. And in our February 17 hearing notice, we offered that if Ms. Lee “would like to modify the issues or matters raised in the appeal statement, email that... by **February 26, 2021**. If not, the issues for hearing will be those stated [in our summary] and or contained in the original appeal statement.” Ms. Lee did not file an amendment. “The scope of an appeal shall be limited to matters or issues raised in the appeal statement and any amendments to the appeal statement the examiner may authorize.” KCC 20.22.080.G. Our rules elaborate that, “Unless the examiner authorizes an amendment to the appeal statement, matters or issues raised in the appeal statement shall define and limit the issues the examiner considers.” Exam. R. IV.D. So, we are left with the issues raised in her January 19 appeal statement.

35. Moreover, ours is not a scenario where Ms. Lee offered a credible explanation for her about-face, like “I initially thought it was Nashville, but only much later did I discover \_\_\_\_\_, so now \_\_\_\_\_.” Instead, she disputed that she had ever admitted Nashville bit Damian.
36. That does not mean we found the Holcombes much more credible.
37. Mr. Holcombe first testified that, as Damian walked up, the hound bit him and dragged him to the ground. He then walked this back, explaining he did not actually see Damian get dragged down. Yet then he reasserted that he saw the dog push Damian down. He could not get the initial portion of his story straight.
38. In Ms. Holcombe’s initial complaint, she asserted, in addition to the bite to Damian’s arm and abdomen, bites to his hand, leg, and shoulder. Ex. D2 at 003. Yet at hearing she too had to walk this back. And she claimed they only reported two major bites, when her report was for five bites. *Id.* Moreover, no one has ever enhanced their standing by filing an official government document with an email address that starts with “f-you.” Ex. D2 at 001.
39. Damian came across as more credible than either of his parents. He was clear that he only remembered two bites and that he did not initially recognize the biter. Yet statements that Nashville “aggressively” bit him and then “aggressively” bit his dad sounded coached.
40. Mr. Quackenbush seemed as the most credible, and he had far less incentive than either Ms. Lee or the Holcombes to spin things. But he did not see how Damian went down and he had divided attention, needing to keep an eye on his own dog. And he did not, for example, see a *different* dog bite Damian. Yet the physical proof, especially of the serious bite to Damian’s stomach, is unmistakable. Ex. D4 at 001-04. So, Mr. Quackenbush’s observations were incomplete.
41. Mr. Nelson had already left the dog park and put the dogs in the car when he heard the ruckus. His testimony about what he observed vis-à-vis the dogs was not specific enough to support or refute anyone else’s account. He did testify that Ms. Lee was still inside the park but, as noted above, we do not find that particularly material to our analysis. There was nothing not credible about his presentation, but it was of limited value.

#### *Factual Breakdown*

42. So where does that leave us? To accept the it-wasn’t-Nashville-who-bit-Damian hypothesis, we would have to accept that Dracula came a few feet over to defend his owner from a dog attack, but completely misidentified the assailant, and that Mr. Holcombe also misidentified the dog that was attacking his son. We find that combination highly unlikely.
43. Mr. Quackenbush’s testimony is not to the contrary. He did not see how Damian got pulled to the ground. He testified that he was looking at Damian (who he perceived to be a teenage girl) on the ground, and did not see any dog bite him. That would raise a red

flag with, for example, Ms. Holcombe’s initial assertion that, in addition to the bite to Damian’s arm and then abdomen, Nashville delivered additional bites to Damian’s hand, leg, and shoulder. Ex. D2 at 003. Mr. Quackenbush would likely not have missed that extensive a mauling. However, it is not at all unlikely that Mr. Quackenbush—or any other eyewitness—would have missed Nashville gashing Damian’s abdomen. We see that in other cases, where the bite is not in dispute and a witness explains something like, “I was standing right there, yet I totally missed the bite.”

44. Certainly, the Holcombes would have an incentive to embellish, to make the attack sound worse than it was. For example, Ms. Holcombe’s initial complaint asserted more bites to Damian than Damian’s testimony and the physical evidence actually showed. Twice describing the dog as “aggressively” biting is in this same category. But the Holcombes had no incentive to go after the *wrong* dog and let the dog that actually bit Damian get off.
45. Similarly, the Holcombes would have an incentive to shade the context for *how* Damian got bit, to show that he did nothing to provoke it. For example, instead of getting attacked as he was walking towards his grandfather and not even initially paying much attention to the dogs (as Damian testified to), perhaps Dracula was one of the two dogs in the fight. That is not an established fact, and Mr. Quackenbush caveated his statement on this point, saying he thought it “looked like” Damian was moving in to separate the dog pinning the other dog. In that not implausible scenario, if Damian intervened on Dracula’s behalf and stuck his arm in, and the other combatant dog bit Damian, that would have raised a question of whether the initial bite to Damian’s arm (though not the later one to his abdomen) was provoked.<sup>1</sup>
46. However, as Mr. Quackenbush’s testimony established more definitively that Nashville was *not* one of the two dogs involved in the fight; Mr. Quackenbush knew Nashville from before, and he was clear that neither the dog being pinned nor the dog doing the pinning was Nashville. We found Damian’s testimony as to his initial noninvolvement the most probable, but even if we found otherwise, and Mr. Quackenbush’s perception was accurate, that would not have been provocation for *Nashville* biting Damian even the first time, let alone a second time.<sup>2</sup> So, the Holcombes’ incentive on this point is either absent or irrelevant, because there is no plausible scenario where Damian provoked Nashville.
47. In sum, Ms. Lee did not raise identification in her appeal statement, nor did she amend her appeal statement to address this, nor did she even offer a credible explanation for her shifting defense. Even if she had, we do not decide cases on a beyond-a-reasonable-doubt standard employed in the criminal arena. Instead, we decide cases based on a

---

<sup>1</sup> We analyze the intervener-gets-bit scenario below, in relation to Nashville’s bite of Mr. Holcombe.

<sup>2</sup> “Provocation” requires that the dog’s reaction to be proportional to the victim’s act. *Bradacs v. Jacobone*, 244 Mich. App. 263, 273–75, 625 N.W.2d 108 (2001); *Kirkham v. Will*, 311 Ill. App.3d 787, 792, 724 N.E.2d 1062 (2000); *Stroop v. Day*, 271 Mont. 314, 319, 896 P.2d 439 (1995). There is no possible spin on these events whereby the follow up bite to Damian’s abdomen was not grossly disproportionate.



preponderance of the evidence standard.<sup>3</sup> We find it more likely than not that Nashville bit Damian on the arm, yanked him down, and then bit him again on the abdomen. Then, as Dracula and Mr. Holcombe tried to intervene, Nashville bit Mr. Holcombe.

*Applying the Law to Our Facts*

48. Ms. Lee’s appeal asserted that the bite to Damian (the minor) was accidental, when Damian reached in and grabbed the dogs. There was nothing accidental about Nashville biting Damian twice, nor as discussed above, did Damian provoke any dog, and certainly not Nashville.
49. The situation with Mr. Holcombe is more nuanced. Mr. Holcombe did enter the fray, grabbed at Nashville and Dracula, and got bit by Nashville. Was that bite provoked?
50. Where a dog is already attacking, and a person defends themselves, another person, or a pet, such defensive actions (where proportionate) do not count as “provocation.” The question is whether the victim started the altercation or whether the dog attacked first, that is, whether the victim’s actions under the circumstances were justified. *Giandalone v. Zepieri*, 86 Misc. 2d 79, 80, 381 N.Y.S.2d 621 (1976). So, where a dog was *already* in attack mode, a victim intervening and getting bitten did not make bites “provoked”; the victim’s response to violent behavior could not be considered “provocation” for a subsequent bite. *Koivisto v. Davis*, 277 Mich. App. 492, 493, 497, 745 N.W.2d 824 (2008). Similarly, a mom hitting a dog after the dog bit her child was not legal provocation for the dog then biting the mom, but instead was the mom’s “natural and inevitable reaction” to seeing the dog biting her child. *McBride v. XYZ Ins.*, 935 So. 2d 326, 332 (La. Ct. App. 2d Cir. 2006). Here we find that Animal Services has shown not only that Nashville’s bites to Damian were unprovoked, but also that Nashville’s bite to Mr. Holcombe was unprovoked.
51. Nashville endangered the safety of a person, biting Damian twice and Mr. Holcombe once, without provocation, thus meeting the definition of “vicious.” *See* KCC 11.04.020.BB. However, that is not the end of the analysis, for, in addition to exhibiting vicious behavior, Animal Services must also show that the dog constitutes a danger to the safety of people or their animals. KCC 11.04.230.H. An unprovoked bite is solid evidence of the danger a dog poses, but it is not definitive.
52. We have, in some past appeals, found that an unprovoked bite was not enough for Animal Services to prove a violation of KCC 11.04.230.H. That might have been the scenario here if the only bite Nashville delivered on January 12 was the one he inflicted on Mr. Holcombe. Again, we found that bite unprovoked, but Mr. Holcombe engaged Nashville and got between Nashville and Dracula. Nashville bit Mr. Holcombe, but not

---

<sup>3</sup> KCC 20.22.080.210.B. *See also Mansour v. King County*, 131 Wn. App. 255, 265, 128 P.3d 1241, 1246 (2006) (rejecting “arbitrary and capricious” as too low a standard, but rejecting “beyond a reasonable doubt” and “clear and convincing evidence” as too high a standard, and determining that a “preponderance of the evidence” was the correct standard for animal enforcement cases). *Mansour* occurred during an era where a different County tribunal, not the examiner, entertained animal enforcement appeals.


that seriously (exhibit D4 at 005 to 008), and then he quickly released his bite and ran off.

53. However, here the interaction with, and bite to, Mr. Holcombe was only after Nashville jumped up and bit Damian—who was not even engaging with Nashville—dragged Damian to the ground, and then gashed Damian’s abdomen. Given those facts, we find that Animal Services has met its burden of showing that Nashville constitutes a danger. We uphold his viciousness determination and confinement order.

DECISION:

We deny Ms. Lee’s appeal.

ORDERED March 26, 2021.




---

David Spohr  
Hearing Examiner

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

King County Code 20.22.040 directs the Examiner to make the County’s final decision for this type of case. This decision shall be final and conclusive unless appealed to superior court by *April 26, 2021*. Either party may appeal this decision by applying for a writ of review in superior court in accordance with chapter 7.16 RCW.

**MINUTES OF THE MARCH 17, 2021, HEARING IN THE APPEAL OF CHERVYN LEE, REGIONAL ANIMAL SERVICES OF KING COUNTY FILE NO. V21011571-A21000276**

David Spohr was the Hearing Examiner in this matter. Participating in the hearing were Chelsea Eykel, Jordan Holcombe, Jason Quackenbush, Damian Holcombe, Rebeka Holcombe, Steve Nickelson, Chervyn Lee, and Travis Nelson. A verbatim recording of the hearing is available in the Hearing Examiner’s Office.

The following exhibits were offered and entered into the record by Animal Services:

- |                |  |
|----------------|--|
| Exhibit no. D1 | Regional Animal Services of King County staff report to the Hearing Examiner                   |
| Exhibit no. D2 | Online Complaint form of January 12, 2021 incident by Rebekka Holcombe, dated January 12, 2021 |
| Exhibit no. D3 | RASKC investigation report no. A21000276   |
| Exhibit no. D4 | Photograph of bite wounds to Damian and Jordan Holcombe  |
| Exhibit no. D5 | Notice of violation no. V21011571-A21000276, issued January 13, 2021                           |

Exhibit no. D6	Bite Quarantine Notice
Exhibit no. D7	Appeal, received January 19, 2021
Exhibit no. D8	Map of subject area
DS/lo	

March 26, 2021

**OFFICE OF THE HEARING EXAMINER  
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON**

King County Courthouse  
516 Third Avenue Room 1200  
Seattle, Washington 98104  
Telephone (206) 477-0860  
[hearingexaminer@kingcounty.gov](mailto:hearingexaminer@kingcounty.gov)  
[www.kingcounty.gov/independent/hearing-examiner](http://www.kingcounty.gov/independent/hearing-examiner)

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

SUBJECT: Regional Animal Services of King County file no. **V21011571-A21000276**

**CHERVYN LEE**

Animal Services Enforcement Appeal

I, Lauren Olson, certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that I transmitted the **REPORT AND DECISION** to those listed on the attached page as follows:

EMAILED to all County staff listed as parties/interested persons and parties with e-mail addresses on record.

placed with the United States Postal Service, with sufficient postage, as FIRST CLASS MAIL in an envelope addressed to the non-County employee parties/interested persons to addresses on record.

DATED March 26, 2021.



---

Lauren Olson  
Legislative Secretary

**Eykel, Chelsea**

Regional Animal Services of King County

**Grandview Parks Department**

**Holcombe; Jordan, Rebekka, Damian**

Hardcopy

**Hover-Nelson, Travis**

**Lee, Chervyn**

Hardcopy

**Nickelson, Steve**

Regional Animal Services of King County

**Quackenbush, Jason**

Hardcopy