

June 7, 2023

**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 nos. **V23014058, V23014061, and V23014076**

**JAMES MCGAVOCK**

Animal Services Enforcement Appeal

Activity no.: A23001902

Appellant: **James McGavock**

[REDACTED]  
Seatac, WA 98188

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. James McGavock appeals two viciousness violations, a vicious at large violation, and a removal order. After hearing the witnesses' testimony and observing their demeanor, studying the exhibits admitted into evidence, and considering the parties' arguments and the relevant law, we uphold two of the three violations. We overturn the removal order on condition that Mr. McGavock from today forward keeps Nika leashed and muzzled before he opens his door, takes Nika out, or has visitors in his unit.

### Background

2. On September 14, 2022, Regional Animal Services of King County (Animal Services) issued Mr. McGavock violation notice V22013549-A22004978 declaring Nika vicious. Mr. McGavock filed an appeal.
3. Animal Services had a strong *paper* case for declaring Nika vicious, but none of the four people who asserted that Nika had bit or accosted them bothered to show up at our November 18 hearing. In overturning Nika’s viciousness designation, we wrote in our December 6 decision that:

Mr. McGavock is extremely lucky. The witnesses from two of the incidents (Ms. Guerrero and Ms. Ostlund) elected not to pursue their matters out of friendship for, and proximity to, Mr. McGavock. Ms. Honken seemed willing to testify but then did not appear at hearing. And Mr. Almanzar apparently decided that because he personally believed that his written statement *should* be sufficient, he did not actually need to participate in the hearing—despite Animal Services counseling him that out-of-court statements likely would not be enough.

A statement made outside of the hearing room, offered for the truth of what it asserts, typically qualifies as “hearsay.” We typically allow in hearsay statements, such as the written record here. However, admissibility is not the same thing as weight. And while we often sustain minor infractions such as trespass or running-at-large based solely on hearsay evidence, we cannot recall ever sustaining a serious charge such as a viciousness designation without live testimony at a hearing, given under oath and subject to cross examination.

Today’s case is as close as we have come to sustaining a viciousness designation without actual testimony. Mr. McGavock seems somewhat oblivious to the dangers Nika poses, especially to a vulnerable senior population. He has taken recent steps to train her, but about the best he could acknowledge was that Nika is “not easy.” He seemed far more content to push conspiracy theories and people being out to get him as explanations for Nika’s aggression.

Even without Ms. Guerrero and Ms. Ostlund, had either Mr. Almanzar or Ms. Honken testified we likely would have upheld Nika’s viciousness designation. And if both Mr. Almanzar *and* Ms. Honken had testified, Nika very well might have met KCC 11.04.290.B.2’s criteria of an “animal that bites, attacks or attempts to bite one or more persons two or more times within a two-year period is declared to be a public nuisance and shall not be kept within unincorporated King County forty-eight hours after receiving written notice from the manager.”

However, we have only the record we have, including zero complainant-witnesses at our hearing. And based on our record, we overturn Nika’s

viciousness designation. In the long run, it would certainly be better for everyone if Nika were in rural Texas or someplace other than around a vulnerable senior population. And in the short run, Mr. McGavock would be wise to muzzle Nika whenever he leaves his own room. And if Nika goes after someone again, Animal Services might bring another violation notice or even a removal order.

4. Mr. McGavock did not take that to heart, and on March 24, 2023, Animal Services issued violation notice V23014059-A23001902 to Mr. McGavock for Nika qualifying as vicious and needing to be confined after a March 22 incident. Ex. D8.
5. After Nika got loose yet again on March 29, Animal Services issued V23014061-A23001902 to Mr. McGavock for Nika running at large as a vicious animal and again qualifying as vicious. Ex. D10. Because Nika was not contained for the second incident, in violation of Animal Services' March 24 confinement order, it issued removal order V23014076-A23001902. Ex. D11.
6. Mr. McGavock timely appealed on April 10. Ex. D12. We went to hearing on May 23.

#### Hearing Testimony

##### *Testimony of Karie Kneedler*

7. Karie Kneedler testified that she brings her dog, Pepper, to the enclosed courtyard at her apartment complex for exercise. Ms. Kneedler is on oxygen, and she is unable to take Pepper on walks. There are usually at least three and sometimes up to six dogs playing in the courtyard. Ms. Kneedler and others spoke with the apartment management regarding their health and the dogs, and they were given leeway by management to allow the dogs to run around in the courtyard. Pepper is a 6.5-pound, grey yorkie terrier mix. She is usually sweet, but she barks at Nika.
8. On March 22, Ms. Kneedler was in the courtyard with Pepper and other dogs and their owners [Bonnie Calloway and Barbara Ostlund] when Mr. McGavock attempted to enter the courtyard through a side door. The dogs in the courtyard got riled up because they know Mr. McGavock's dogs do not play well. It takes a while for the dogs to calm down after being riled up.
9. Ms. Ostlund, the only non-disabled one in the group, went around the corner to take care of the situation. Ms. Kneedler heard Pepper barking until it got quieter, so Ms. Kneedler inferred that Ms. Ostlund, Mr. McGavock, and the dogs had gone inside. Ms. Ostlund came back with Pepper. Ms. Ostlund told Ms. Kneedler that Pepper tried to follow Mr. McGavock inside. Ms. Ostlund was gone maybe a minute.
10. The dogs went back to playing in the courtyard while the dog owners sat around. Around three to four minutes after the initial incident, Mr. McGavock came out his back door, which opens to the courtyard. Mr. McGavock grabbed Nika by the jowls, lifted her on her hind legs, shook her, and said either, "get 'em" or "sic 'em" or something that

ended with “em.” Nika flew. She first went after Pepper. Ms. Kneedler collapsed to the ground due to lack of oxygen while trying to get Pepper.

11. Pepper got away. Nika then went after Cece, Ms. Calloway’s dog. Nika had Cece’s leg in her mouth when Ms. Calloway tried to pick Cece up. Nika continued to hold on as Ms. Calloway lifted Cece; Nika’s front legs lifted off the ground, and Ms. Calloway got scratched. Mr. McGavock retrieved Nika. He told Ms. Kneedler and the others to leash their dogs. Mr. McGavock’s other dog, Max, had gotten out, but Max is pleasant, and he was just milling around.
12. On March 25, Ms. Kneedler and the others were again in the courtyard with their dogs. Pepper was barking on Mr. McGavock’s patio, but she left when Mr. McGavock opened his door. Mr. McGavock was attempting to take a photo of Pepper on his patio when Nika pushed past him and into the courtyard. Nika went after Pepper, and Pepper got caught in a ditch. Nika pounced on Pepper’s back end. It was nothing major, but Pepper’s pre-existing slight limp was exaggerated for about a week. Ms. Kneedler tried to save Pepper, but she again wound up on the ground needing her oxygen. Mr. McGavock came out and got Nika.<sup>1</sup>
13. Ms. Kneedler has seen Nika aggressively go after people and lunge at people twice. She has seen Mr. McGavock take his dogs out of the apartment passageways to avoid people. She also saw the aftermath and injury to Ms. Ostlund. She saw Ms. Ostlund’s bruises, from her hip down to her knee, and two bite marks on Ms. Ostlund’s leg. One was a nip, but for the other bite, she could see bitemarks for every tooth.
14. Ms. Kneedler occasionally smokes in the courtyard. She is aware that smoking is not allowed at the apartments, but she smokes away from any doors. She is not aware of an email from management about no smoking and leashing dogs.

*Testimony of Bonnie Calloway*

15. Bonnie Calloway testified that on March 22, while she was in the courtyard, she heard her dog, Minnie Lu, and Pepper barking in the back corner. Ms. Ostlund went to the corner to get the dogs. Ms. Calloway then went to the corner to get Minnie Lu. She did not see Pepper follow Mr. McGavock into the building, but she did see Ms. Ostlund follow Mr. McGavock. Ms. Calloway and Minnie Lu returned to the chairs by the pool area. Ms. Ostlund returned with Pepper less than a minute later.
16. Ms. Calloway saw Mr. McGavock come out from his apartment. He took Nika in his hands, shook her, and said, “get ‘em” or “sic ‘em.” Nika lunged. She first went after Pepper, then Cece. Nika had Cece’s leg in her mouth. Ms. Calloway tried to get Nika away. Nika’s paws were on Ms. Calloway’s leg, which drew blood. Ms. Calloway was scratched once on the front of her thigh and twice on the back. Nika still had a hold of Cece when Ms. Calloway was scratched. Nika was on her back paws, climbing Ms.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ms. Kneedler initially testified that Pepper getting caught in the gully, Nika biting Pepper on the backside, and Pepper’s limp being aggravated happened on March 22, but she clarified later in her testimony that that occurred on March 25.

Calloway's leg to get to Cece. (Ms. Calloway sent photographs to Animal Services, but they are not in our record.)

17. Ms. Calloway saw Ms. Kneedler attempt to retrieve Pepper; however, she collapsed due to a lack of oxygen and needed her oxygen machine. Mr. McGavock came over and got Nika. Max was also out, but Max is friendly. Cece was shaking in Ms. Calloway's arms. Ms. Calloway went inside with Cece. She called Animal Control. The scratches were very painful, and she still has the dark marks.
18. On March 25, Pepper was on Mr. McGavock's patio and then retreated. Mr. McGavock partially opened his door to try to take pictures, when Nika slipped past him. Nika ran after Pepper. Nika scratched Pepper's back; Ms. Calloway saw a little blood on Pepper. Mr. McGavock put Nika back in his apartment. Ms. Calloway called Animal Services. After March 25, Ms. Calloway and the other ladies were told by Animal Services to keep Pepper off Mr. McGavock's patio.
19. When Ms. Calloway and Cece encounter Mr. McGavock and Nika in the apartment complex, Nika tries to lunge at her. Ms. Calloway has to pull her dogs past. Ms. Calloway saw the injuries to Ms. Ostlund. The first time, when Ms. Ostlund was at a grocery store, Ms. Calloway saw a "nice bite", or nip on her leg. She saw teeth marks and bruising by her knee. The second time, when Nika bit Ms. Ostlund in Ms. Ostlund's apartment, the bite was pretty traumatic. Blood was coming out of the bite marks on her thigh and hip area. Her friend tried to bandage it, but it kept bleeding. She saw whole mouth bite marks. Ms. Ostlund was bruised on her leg for almost two weeks.

*Testimony of Barbara Ostlund*

20. Barbara Ostlund testified that she had previous encounters with Nika. Over a year ago, Ms. Ostlund was in a convenience store when she saw Tara [Mr. McGavock's wife] with Nika on a leash and Mr. McGavock with Max on a leash. Nika snapped at Ms. Ostlund. It happened so quick that Ms. Ostlund did not realize she had been bit until after she returned home. It was only a nip, but it bruised. She did not tell either McGavock or report it, because she did not want to bother them.
21. But a later incident was much more serious. Ms. Ostlund let Mr. McGavock and his dogs into her apartment. When Ms. Ostlund was giving the dogs treats, Nika lunged and bit Ms. Ostlund twice. Mr. McGavock tried to help. Those injuries were pretty bad, and she probably should have gone to the hospital. There were two bites that drew blood, and they continued to bleed for a couple days. She bruised immediately. The big one on her hip still bothers her. Ms. Ostlund reported the incident to the apartment complex, but she did not follow through because Mr. McGavock had a lot going on.
22. On March 22, 2023, Ms. Ostlund was standing in the courtyard with the dogs. She heard Pepper and Minnie Lu barking in the corner, so she went over there. Mr. McGavock was coming out the door and Pepper ran inside and slipped through Ms. Ostlund's hands. She asked Mr. McGavock to hold his dogs back since they were leashed. It took Ms. Ostlund about a minute to get Pepper. She carried Pepper back to the chairs. Ms. Ostlund was a little shook up.

23. Ms. Ostlund does not recall much after that. She remembered that Nika was on Cece's leg, Nika scratched Ms. Calloway's leg, and she helped Ms. Kneedler with her oxygen. Everything happened so quickly. She has PTSD from the time when Nika bit her in her apartment; she gets nervous and scared when she sees Nika.
24. On March 25, Ms. Ostlund tried to go and get Pepper from Mr. McGavock's patio. Pepper left the patio and then Nika got out. But again, given her trauma, she cannot recall many details about the March 25 incident.

*Testimony of James McGavock*

25. James McGavock testified that in June 2022, Ms. Ostlund invited him and his dogs into her apartment. Ms. Ostlund gave Max some treats. Nika got upset and nipped or bit Ms. Ostlund. That is the only bite of Nika's that he knows of. Mr. McGavock tried to help her, and he bandaged her up (he is a former EMT). Mr. McGavock went outside, and Ms. Ostlund followed, and they continued to hang out.
26. On March 22, Mr. McGavock was planning on walking through the courtyard area to get to his apartment because his hallway was blocked. He walked out the side courtyard door by about ten feet when Pepper and Ms. Calloway's dogs ran up and barked at him. Ms. Ostlund shooed away Ms. Calloway's dogs. Mr. McGavock backed up through the door and Pepper followed. Ms. Ostlund came in and Mr. McGavock told her to get Pepper.
27. Mr. McGavock went into his apartment and unleashed his dogs. As Mr. McGavock was heading out his back door to speak with [Ms. Kneedler, Ms. Calloway, and Ms. Ostlund] about their dogs, Nika slipped past him. Mr. McGavock said "no" and "leave it." It is physically impossible for him to open a door and carry Nika, because he has to use two arms to hold her.
28. Nika ran and leaped across the pond, which is thirteen feet. It is about ten to twelve feet to the pond. Mr. McGavock went around the pond and got Nika. Mr. McGavock does not recall Nika having Cece's leg. The only injury he saw was a scratch on Nika's ear. Exhibit A13 shows Nika on her hind legs. She taught herself how to do that. Mr. McGavock never picked her up.
29. Exhibit A6 shows Pepper barking at Nika and Max on her porch. Pepper will bark if she sees Mr. McGavock's dogs, so he must keep his blinds closed. Pepper was aggressive on March 22.
30. On March 25, Mr. McGavock was in his apartment with his dogs when Nika became upset because Pepper was at the back door barking. Mr. McGavock was heading out the back door to speak to [Ms. Kneedler, Ms. Calloway, and Ms. Ostlund] about Pepper upsetting Nika and about their dogs being off leash. Exhibit A5 is a screenshot from video exhibit A15 which shows Pepper on Mr. McGavock's patio. The video also shows how fast it happened. Also, the video was short because Nika almost knocked Mr. McGavock over. Mr. McGavock tried to block Nika from getting out, but she pushed past him. Nika chased Pepper because Nika was upset about the barking at her door. Nika chased Pepper around the pond and under a chair by the bushes. Mr. McGavock

went and picked up Nika. Mr. McGavock told the ladies to keep the dogs off his patio because it upsets Nika, which then upsets Max. No one was bitten or scratched. Mr. McGavock took Nika home.

31. The ladies continue to have their dogs off leash in the courtyard, which limits access for others because their dogs chase his dogs. Mr. McGavock has contacted Officer Nickelson multiple times about the dogs being off leash in the courtyard, but he has not received a reply. Nika is being harassed by the other dogs, and their owners refused to do anything.

#### Legal Standards

32. Does Nika qualify as “vicious,” defined 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,” with the violation itself framed as “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”? KCC 11.04.020.BB; KCC 11.04.230.H.
33. As to March 25, did Nika qualify as “[A] vicious animal or animal with vicious propensities that runs at large at any time it is off the owner’s premises and not securely leashed on a line or confined and in the control of a person of suitable age and discretion to control or restrain the animal”? KCC 11.04.230.I.
34. Is removal appropriate under, KCC 11.04.290.A.3 which states that:
- Failure to comply with any requirement prescribed by the manager [here, in V23014058] constitutes a misdemeanor. Such an animal shall not be kept in unincorporated King County after forty-eight hours after receiving written notice from the manager. Such an animal or animals found in violation of this section shall be impounded and disposed of as an unredeemed animal and the owner or keeper of the animal or animals has no right to redeem the animal or animals?
35. 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

*V23014059 (March 22)*

36. The only substantial thing unclear about March 22 is how Nika got loose from Mr. McGavock’s apartment before she chased after and bit Cece and scratched Ms. Calloway. Mr. McGavock testified that Nika accidentally slipped past him after he opened his glass backdoor. Ms. Kneeder and Ms. Calloway testified that Mr. McGavock sicced Nika on

them. Normally that would be a preposterous claim, but of the hundreds of animal owner appellants we have encountered, Mr. McGavock would be on our very short list of someone we could believe would do exactly that.

37. That would be relevant if this was a *criminal* case against Mr. McGavock. However, it is not relevant to whether *Nika* meets the above code criteria for vicious dog. Regardless of how *Nika* got loose—whether from intent or incompetence—Nika ran across the courtyard and bit Cece, holding on even as Ms. Calloway struggled to free her from Nika’s jaws, and then Nika scratched Ms. Calloway as Ms. Calloway tried to lift Cece.
38. Nika performed the act of endangering the safety of a person and animal without legal provocation, and thus meets the definition of vicious KCC 11.04.020.BB. And if there was any question of whether Nika constitutes a danger to the safety of persons or property off the animal’s premises or lawfully on the animal’s premises, Nika bit Ms. Ostlund twice, once seriously. KCC 11.04.230.H. Animal Services easily meets its burden of showing that Nika qualifies as vicious.

*V23014061 (March 25)*

39. The March 24 violation notice and containment order include the requirement that Mr. McGavock:

Restrain your animal using a leash with a collar or harness when taking it off your property. Your leash can extend no longer than 8’ in length. A competent and capable person must handle the animal at all times when attended outside.

Ex. D8 at 001.

40. Mr. McGavock could not even make it one day before failing to meet that requirement. Despite opening the door on March 22 and not being able to contain Nika from charging into the courtyard (per his version of how Nika got loose on March 22), Mr. McGavock somehow thought it was a good idea on March 25 to *again* open that same door without first securing Nika. And so the utterly predictable happened: Mr. McGavock was again unable to contain Nika and Nika slipped past him, ran off his property (the edge of his personal patio) and went after other dogs.
41. Because Nika had been declared vicious on March 24, on March 25 Nika was a vicious animal that ran off the owner’s premises not securely leashed on a line or confined, in violation. KCC 11.04.230.I. And we note that this finding does not turn on whether Nika did anything particularly aggressive on March 25, merely that Nika was previously declared and thereafter got loose. If Nika had wandered off Mr. McGavock’s patio and did nothing more than wag her tail, the result would be the same.
42. Nika did do significantly more than wag her tail. But was it enough to qualify as a second viciousness violation? That is a closer call. Nika’s behavior was not as extreme as March 22, where she bit and latched onto Cece and scratched Ms. Calloway. And as the video showed, Pepper was right at Nika’s patio, barking.



43. The “provocation” inquiry in animal jurisprudence focuses on how an average dog, neither unusually aggressive nor unusually docile, would react to an inciting act.<sup>2</sup> And a key touchstone of courts’ analyses is that “provocation” requires the dog’s reaction to be roughly proportional to the victim’s act.<sup>3</sup> Pepper barking on the patio would not have mattered if Nika had repeated her March 22 behavior. But she did not. Ms. Kneedler described Nika as pouncing on Pepper’s back end but “nothing major,” while Ms. Calloway saw Nika scratch Pepper. We do not think Nika’s reaction on March 25 was so disproportionate to Pepper being on her porch to be considered unprovoked. We overturn the second KCC 11.04.230.H viciousness violation and its accompanying \$1000 fine.

#### V23014076

44. On March 25, Mr. McGavock failed to comply with the requirement that he restrain Nika with a leash with a collar or harness when off her property (meaning, the McGavock apartment unit and patio). That exposed Nika to a removal order. Yet it was a first-time violation, and Nika’s response that day after Mr. McGavock was unable to contain her was not disproportionate to Pepper’s incitement.
45. Mr. McGavock did himself no favors in either hearing, exhibiting a state of denial bordering on delusional about the dangers Nika poses. Bullying Ms. Ostlund about her husband could not have reflected worse on Mr. McGavock if he tried. His whining about other people’s dogs in the courtyard—at least two of whom belong to disabled senior citizens with oxygen tanks with no good options for getting their dogs exercise—was petty; those other dogs do not have a history of biting people even once, let alone repeatedly. On that level, removal seems obvious.
46. Yet if we disentangle our disappointment in Mr. McGavock from the facts of what happened on March 25—a first-time violation of the confinement terms where Nika behaved relatively proportionate to the incitement—is removal so clear? Not really. So rather than requiring Nika’s removal, we think a more appropriated solution is to amend the compliance requirement, to ensure that—before Mr. McGavock opens his door each time—he muzzle and leash Nika and keeps Nika muzzled and leashed anytime Nika is outside her apartment and even (given that Nika attacked Ms. Ostland in an apartment when she was doing nothing more than offering treats) when he has visitors in his apartment. And if he cannot follow that, the outcome may be very different next time.

#### DECISION:

1. In V23014058, we uphold Nika’s viciousness designation, compliance order, and \$500 penalty.

<sup>2</sup> *Bradacs v. Jacobone*, 244 Mich. App. 263, 273, 625 N.W.2d 108, 113 (2001) (citing *Kirkham v. Will*, 311 Ill. App. 3d 787, 792, 724 N.E.2d 1062 (2000)).

<sup>3</sup> *Stroop v. Day*, 271 Mont. 314, 319, 896 P.2d 439 (1995); *Bradacs* at 273–75; *Kirkham* at 792.

2. In V23014061, we uphold Nika’s vicious animal at large violation and \$500 penalty, but we overturn her vicious-2<sup>nd</sup> violation and \$1000 penalty.
3. In V23014076, we overturn the removal order but modify the March 24 confinement order. From today forward:
  - A. Secure Nika in a fenced area suitable for her size when unattended and outside the home. Lock all passages with a padlock to prevent accidental release.
  - B. Before opening the door to Nika’s apartment unit, secure her in a muzzle and on a leash of no more than eight feet long, with a collar or harness. Nika must be securely leashed and muzzled anytime there are visitors inside Nika’s apartment, and anytime Nika is outside her apartment. A competent and capable person must handle Nika at all times.
  - C. If not already completed, microchip Nika and provide the microchip number to the King County Animal Licensing Office (206) 296–2712 by **July 7, 2023**.
  - D. Keep Nika current on her rabies vaccination.

ORDERED June 7, 2023.



---

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 *July 7, 2023*. 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 MAY 23, 2023, HEARING IN THE APPEAL OF JAMES  
MCGAVOCK, REGIONAL ANIMAL SERVICES OF KING COUNTY  
FILE NOS. V23014058, V23014061, & V23014076-A23001902**

David Spohr was the Hearing Examiner in this matter. Participating in the hearing were Chelsea Eykel, Karie Kneedler, Bonnie Calloway, Barbara Ostlund, and James McGavock. 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	RASKC investigation report no. A23001902
Exhibit no. D3	Witness Statement from Karie Kneedler
Exhibit no. D4	Witness Statement from Bonnie Calloway
Exhibit no. D5	Witness Statement from Barbara Ostlund
Exhibit no. D6	Photograph of Exit door where Mr. McGavock was followed by Pepper and Ms. Ostlund
Exhibit no. D7	Photograph of Mr. McGavock’s patio and the seating area where the women and their dogs were
Exhibit no. D8	Notice of violation no. V23014058-A23001902, issued March 24, 2023
Exhibit no. D9	Photograph of Mr. McGavock’s back patio door and where Nika was trying to catch and bite Ms. Kneedler’s dog
Exhibit no. D10	Notice of violation no. V23014061-A23001902, issued March 29, 2023
Exhibit no. D11	Notice and order for removal no. V23014076-A23001902, issued March 29, 2023
Exhibit no. D12	Appeal, received April 10, 2023
Exhibit no. D13	Email statement from Mr. McGavock
Exhibit no. D14	Map of subject area

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

Exhibit no. A1	Appeal statement
Exhibit no. A2	Photograph
Exhibit no. A3	Photograph
Exhibit no. A4	Photograph
Exhibit no. A5	Photograph
Exhibit no. A6	Photograph
Exhibit no. A7	Photograph
Exhibit no. A8	Map
Exhibit no. A9	RCW, notice of violations, Statement from Karie Kneedler
Exhibit no. A10	RASKC Investigation report no. A23001902
Exhibit no. A12	Video
Exhibit no. A13	Photograph
Exhibit no. A14	Photograph
Exhibit no. A15	Email and Video

June 7, 2023

**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 nos. **V23014058, V23014061, and V23014076**

**JAMES MCGAVOCK**  
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 June 7, 2023.



---

Lauren Olson  
Legislative Secretary

**Calloway, Bonnie**

Hardcopy

**Eykel, Chelsea**

Regional Animal Services of King County

**Kneedler, Karie**

Hardcopy

**McGavock, James**

Hardcopy

**Ostlund, Barbara**

Hardcopy