

January 28, 2026

**OFFICE OF THE HEARING EXAMINER  
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON**  
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. **V25017797 and V25017843**

**LOUIS DAVIS**

Animal Services Enforcement Appeal

Activity nos.: A25004958 and A25005167

Appellant: **Louis Davis**

[REDACTED]  
Kent, WA 98030

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)

Overview

1. 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 deny the appeal.

### Procedural Background

2. This appeal consolidates two separate cases for violations by multiple dogs owned by Louis Davis and Arnaud Ramde.
3. On October 20, 2025, Shaunna Krebs filed an online complaint with Regional Animal Services of King County (Animal Services) for an incident on October 19. Ex. D3. On October 23, 2025, Animal Services issued Notice of Violation V25017797-A25004958 (Ex. D4) to Louis Davis for:
  - A. Boy: Running at Large 2<sup>nd</sup> offense, Potentially Dangerous Conduct 2<sup>nd</sup> offense, and Failure to Comply with a potentially dangerous order;
  - B. Jarhead: Running at Large 2<sup>nd</sup> offense, Potentially Dangerous Conduct 2<sup>nd</sup> offense, and Failure to Comply with a potentially dangerous order;
  - C. Midnight: Running at Large 2<sup>nd</sup> offense; and
  - D. Baby Girl: Running at Large 2<sup>nd</sup> offense.

Davis and Ramde filed a timely appeal on November 17. Ex. D5.

4. On November 5, 2025, Neal Mosbarger, Fadaledi Shumaker, Gary LaPlante, and Shaunna Krebs all filed separate online complaints with Animal Services for an incident on November 5. Exs. D3, D4, D6, D7. On November 6, Josh Thompson filed an online complaint with Animal Services for the same incident. Ex. D5. On November 7, 2025, Animal Services issued Notice of Violation V25017843-A25005167 (Ex. D8) to Louis Davis for:
  - A. Midnight: Trespassing, Running at Large 3<sup>rd</sup> offense, and Potentially Dangerous Conduct;
  - B. Jarhead: Trespassing 2<sup>nd</sup> offense, Running at Large 3<sup>rd</sup> offense, and qualifying as Potentially Dangerous Conduct 2<sup>nd</sup> offense; and
  - C. Pass: Trespassing, Running at Large 2<sup>nd</sup> offense, and Potentially Dangerous conduct.

Davis and Ramde filed a timely appeal on December 1. Ex. D19.

5. We went to hearing on January 15, 2026. Participating in the hearing were: Sgt. Chelsea Eykel representing Animal Services, and witnesses/complainants Shaunna Krebs, Ryan Krebs, Fadaledi Shumaker, Gary LaPlante, Neal Mosbarger, and appellants Louis Davis and Arnaud Ramde.

### Appeal Issues

6. Per the Notice of Hearing, the issues identified for consideration on appeal are as follows:
  - A. There are two separate Notices of Violation consolidated for appeal in this proceeding, with multiple dogs and multiple violations in each case.

- B. In Davis’ November 17, 2025, appeal statement for Case #A25-004958, there are “Running at Large,” “Potentially Dangerous Act,” and “Potentially Dangerous Order Compliance” violations alleged for four dogs: Boy, Midnight, Jarhead and Babygirl.
- i. The owners have surrendered Boy and Jarhead to Animal Services. The Examiner requests clarification from Animal Services by 4:00 p.m. on December 30, 2025, via email to [hearingexaminer@kingcounty.gov](mailto:hearingexaminer@kingcounty.gov), as to whether they are pursuing any of the monetary penalties for the alleged violations by Boy or Jarhead.
  - ii. Without the violations against Boy and Jarhead, only the “Running at Large 2nd Offense” violations against Midnight and Babygirl remain. In Mr. Davis’ November 17 appeal statement, he states that the gate was opened and “the dogs suddenly rushed out.” This appears to admit that Midnight and Babygirl were Running at Large.
  - iii. The remaining issue on appeal is then whether the monetary penalty for Midnight and Babygirl “Running at Large” (totaling \$200) is reasonable under the facts of this case.
- C. In Davis’ December 1, 2025, appeal statement for Case #A25-005167, there are “Running at Large,” “Trespass,” and “Potentially Dangerous” violations asserted against Midnight, Jarhead and Pass.
- i. The owners have surrendered Jarhead to Animal Services. The Examiner requests clarification from Animal Services by 4:00 p.m. on December 30, 2025, via email to [hearingexaminer@kingcounty.gov](mailto:hearingexaminer@kingcounty.gov), as to whether they are pursuing any of the monetary penalties for the alleged violations by Jarhead.
  - ii. Without the violations against Jarhead, only the violations against Midnight and Pass remain. In Mr. Davis’ December 1 appeal statement, he indicates that "the dogs chewed the wooden fence on the left side of the house and escaped." This appears to admit that Midnight and Pass were “Running at Large.”
  - iii. The issues on appeal with regards to Midnight and Pass are:
    - (1) Whether the \$100 penalty for Pass “Running at Large 2nd Offense” on November 5, 2025, is reasonable under the facts of this case;
    - (2) Whether the \$200 penalty for Midnight “Running at Large 3rd Offense” on November 5, 2025, is reasonable under the facts of this case;

- (3) Whether the November 5, 2025, violations by Midnight and Pass for “Trespassing on Private Property 1st Violation” (KCC 11.04.230.L) and the associated \$50 penalty for each dog are supported by a preponderance of the evidence and appropriate under the facts of this case.
  - (4) Whether the November 5, 2025, “Potentially Dangerous” designation for Midnight and Pass (KCC 11.04.230.F) and the associated \$500 penalty for each dog are supported by a preponderance of the evidence and appropriate under the facts of this case.
7. The Examiner did not receive clarification or limitation of the violations being pursued by Animal Services based on the request in the Notice of Appeal. At the hearing, Animal Services clarified that it is seeking enforcement of all violations and monetary penalties for both cases. Eykel Testimony.

#### Factual Findings

Weighing all the evidence, the hearing examiner finds the following facts by a preponderance of the evidence:

8. The testimony presented at the hearing painted a highly disturbing picture of ongoing fear and, frankly, trauma, being created by a pack of aggressive dogs roaming the complainants’ neighborhood. At the time of the two incidents on appeal, these dogs were the responsibility of appellants Louis Davis and Arnaud Ramde.
9. The dogs have aggressively chased multiple neighborhood children, to the point where they no longer want to play outside because they are scared the dogs might come. Krebs Testimony; Shumaker Testimony.
10. On one occasion, the dogs charged into Ms. Shumaker’s backyard, causing her 3 and 4 year old children to run inside and they were able to close the sliding glass door in time to keep the dogs outside. Shumaker Testimony. When she tried to leave the house later with the children, the dogs returned. In fear, she closed the doors on the car with her children inside and sprinted back to her front door, losing a shoe on the way, and got inside just as the dogs were pushing on the door trying to get into the house. *Id.* She said she then had to wait until the dogs left to go out to the car with her children and just prayed they didn’t open the car door in the meantime. *Id.*
11. Mr. LaPlante was accosted by three dogs, two of which were very aggressive. He fought back but was not able to walk past them to his house. This went on “nonstop for 5-10 minutes.” LaPlante Testimony. He described the “pack mentality” of the dogs. *Id.* Ultimately, Ms. Shumaker was able to get him in her car and take him home.
12. Mr. Mosbarger had four of the dogs approach him aggressively while he was in front of his house. Midnight lunged and nipped at him but didn’t break the skin. The dogs

followed him all the way into the garage as he backed into his home and shut the door. Mosbarger Testimony.

13. Mr. Davis testified that they “don’t disagree with the violations. [The dogs] did terrorize the neighborhood.” Davis Testimony. Because of this blanket admission by the appellants, the recitation of evidence and testimony supporting the violations for each of the dogs as charged by Animal Services is abbreviated in this decision. Suffice it to say that each of the violations are well supported by credible testimony and evidence in the record.
14. Jarhead and Boy have since been surrendered to Animal Services. Eykel Testimony. Midnight and Babygirl are neutered and will not have any more puppies. Davis Testimony. Pass, Midnight and Babygirl are still at the Davis house. *Id.* The dogs have not been observed off the property since the November incident but there are still significant concerns with the behavior of the remaining dogs and the ability of the fence to keep them contained on the Davis property. Eykel Testimony.
15. The appellants, recognizing that their dogs have caused a significant amount of harm in their neighborhood, appealed the violations in hopes of a financial reduction in the civil penalties associated with the violations. Davis Testimony.
16. Davis and Ramde repeatedly apologized for the behavior of their dogs and indicated that they were not aware of the extent of the harm they had caused. Ramde Testimony. They have gone to some expense to secure the side gate. Davis Testimony. Mr. Davis indicated that they have been trying to keep the dogs in the yard, but they keep finding ways to get through. *Id.* Mr. Ramde said, “it just keeps happening” and said they have “no power” over the dogs’ behavior. Ramde Testimony.
17. Sgt. Eykel indicated that Animal Services is seeking enforcement of all violations and civil penalties. Eykel Testimony. She testified that this is a very serious and ongoing situation. She noted that the restrictions on Pass and Midnight are essential to ensure accountability if they escape the Davis property again. *Id.*

#### Conclusions of Law

18. The hearing examiner has jurisdiction pursuant to KCC 20.22.040.
19. Animal Services bears the burden of proving by a preponderance of evidence both the violation and the appropriateness of the remedy it has imposed. KCC 20.22.080.G; .210.B. We do not grant substantial weight or otherwise accord deference to agency determinations. Exam. R. XV.F.3.
20. Based on the competent and voluminous testimony and evidence in the record, and the blanket admission of the appellants that the violations were committed by their dogs, I am sustaining all of the violations in cases #A25-4958 and #A25-5167.

21. To comply with the sustained “Potentially Dangerous” designations against Midnight and Pass in case #A25-5167, the owners must meet all of the requirements for that designation and register both dogs as potentially dangerous.
22. The remaining question is whether a reduction in the civil penalties is warranted. I am not inclined to modify the penalties here.
23. These two cases are not the first instances of these dogs running at large or acting in a way that qualifies them as potentially dangerous. I do not accept Mr. Ramde’s comment that they don’t have any power over their dogs’ behavior. It is the owners’ responsibility to ensure their pets comply with county regulations in the interest of public safety.
24. The appellants have had ample opportunities to comply with the requirements for potentially dangerous dogs and, had they complied after the first incident where Jarhead and Boy were designated “Potentially Dangerous,” in all likelihood, they would have avoided the two incidents being reviewed in this appeal.
25. It is clear that Davis and Ramde are “very sorry.” Davis and Ramde Testimony. Hopefully hearing the witness’s testimony and the impact on their neighbors’ families will motivate them to achieve compliance.
26. Civil penalties also serve as a deterrent for future repeated incidents, which is of utmost importance in this case. Prior warnings, violations and civil penalties have not been enough to change the appellants’ behavior or impress upon them the severity of the situation. Reducing penalties for continued noncompliance sends the wrong message to the owners and is not appropriate under these circumstances.

DECISION:

1. The appeal is DENIED.

ORDERED January 28, 2026.



---

Devon Shannon  
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 in accordance with Ch. 7.16 RCW. It is the responsibility of the party seeking to appeal the examiner’s decision to determine and meet the legal requirements for filing an appeal.

### **MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 15, 2026, HEARING IN THE APPEAL OF LOUIS DAVIS, REGIONAL ANIMAL SERVICES OF KING COUNTY FILE NOS. V25017797 AND V25017843**

Devon Shannon was the Hearing Examiner in this matter. A verbatim recording of the hearing is available in the Hearing Examiner’s Office.

The following exhibits were offered by Animal Services for V25017797-A25004958 and entered into the record:

Exhibit no. D1	Regional Animal Services of King County staff report
Exhibit no. D2	RASKC investigation report no. A25004958
Exhibit no. D3	Online Complaint form of October 19, 2025, incident by Shaunna Krebs, dated October 20, 2025
Exhibit no. D4	Notice of violation no. V25017797-A25004958, issued October 23, 2025
Exhibit no. D5	Appeal, received November 18, 2025
Exhibit no. D6	Map of subject area

The following exhibits were offered by Animal Services for V25017843-A25005167 and entered into the record:

Exhibit no. D1	Regional Animal Services of King County staff report
Exhibit no. D2	RASKC investigation report no. A25005167
Exhibit no. D3	Online Complaint form of November 5, 2025, incident by Neal Mosbarger, dated November 5, 2025
Exhibit no. D4	Online Complaint form of November 5, 2025, incident by Fadaledi Shumaker, dated November 5, 2025
Exhibit no. D5	Online Complaint form of November 5, 2025, incident by Josh Thompson, dated November 6, 2025
Exhibit no. D6	Online Complaint form of November 5, 2025, incident by Gary LaPlante, dated November 5, 2025
Exhibit no. D7	Online Complaint form of November 5, 2025, incident by Shaunna Krebs, dated November 5, 2025
Exhibit no. D8	Notice of violation no. V25017843-A25005164, issued November 7, 2025
Exhibit no. D9	Potentially Dangerous Designation
Exhibit no. D10	RASKC investigation report no. A25003146
Exhibit no. D11	Animal Services Kent Kennel record

Exhibit no. D12	RASKC investigation report no. A25003918
Exhibit no. D13	Witness Statement, dated August 22, 2025
Exhibit no. D14	Notice of violation no. V250175582-A25003918, issued August 23, 2025
Exhibit no. D15	Potentially Dangerous Designation
Exhibit no. D16	RASKC investigation report no. A25004655
Exhibit no. D17	Online Complaint form of October 2, 2025, incident by Shaunna Krebs, dated October 1, 2025
Exhibit no. D18	Notice of violation no. V25017685-A25004655, issued October 2, 2025
Exhibit no. D19	Appeal, received December 1, 2025
Exhibit no. D20	Map of subject area

January 28, 2026

**OFFICE OF THE HEARING EXAMINER**  
**KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON**  
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. **V25017797 and V25017843**

**LOUIS DAVIS**

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, through Quadient-Impress, with sufficient postage, as FIRST CLASS MAIL in an envelope addressed to the non-County employee parties/interested persons to addresses on record.

DATED January 28, 2026.



---

Lauren Olson  
Legislative Secretary

**Eykel, Chelsea**

Regional Animal Services of King County

**Krebs, Shaunna/Ryan**

Hardcopy

**Laplante, Gary**

Hardcopy

**Louis Davis, Ramde Arnaud**

Hardcopy

**Mosbarger, Neal**

Hardcopy

**Shumaker, Fedalesi**

Hardcopy

**Thompson, Josh B**

Hardcopy