

February 13, 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 no. **V25017873-A25005381**

**CHRISTINA LUX**

Animal Services Enforcement Appeal

Activity no.: A25-005381

Appellant: **Christina Lux**

[REDACTED]  
Shoreline, WA 98133

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 Ms. Lux's appeal and reduce the applicable monetary penalty.

### Procedural Background

2. On November 17, 2025, Kayla McArthur filed an online complaint with Regional Animal Services of King County (Animal Services) for an incident on November 15. Ex. D3. On November 25, Animal Services issued Notice of Violation V25017873-A25005381 to Christina Lux for her dog, Aros, qualifying as potentially dangerous. Exs. D7, D8. Christina Lux filed a timely appeal. Ex. D10.
3. We went to hearing on January 30, 2026. Participating in the hearing were: Sgt. Chelsea Eykel representing Animal Services, complainant Kayla McArthur, their witness Maxwell Farrell, and appellant Christina Lux.

### Appeal Issues

Per the Notice of Hearing, the issues identified for consideration on appeal are as follows:

4. In Ms. Lux's December 18, 2025, appeal statement, she acknowledges the events that led to the violation, but asserts that Aros was provoked because Peanut's owner "purposefully threatened" Aros.
5. Based on the scope of the appeal statement, the issue on appeal is whether the November 25, 2025, "Potentially Dangerous" designation of Aros under KCC 11.04.230.F and the associated \$500 penalty are supported by a preponderance of the evidence and appropriate under the facts of this case.

### Factual Findings

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

6. On November 15, Mr. Farrell left his apartment with his dog, Peanut, and walked down the stairwell to exit the building into a common outdoor area. Farrell Testimony. Ms. Lux was outside the apartment building with her dog, Aros, approximately 7 feet away. *Id.* Both dogs were leashed. *Id.*
7. Aros immediately saw Peanut and charged toward Peanut and Mr. Farrell. Farrell Testimony. Ms. McArthur testified that she could hear Aros snarl and growl from inside the apartment, where she was putting on her jacket to come outside with Mr. Farrell. McArthur Testimony. Because it was wet and slippery, Ms. Lux slipped and Aros was able to pull her toward Peanut. Lux Testimony.
8. Peanut tried to run up the stairs between Mr. Farrell's legs but Aros caught Peanut's hind legs. Farrell Testimony. Mr. Farrell put himself between the dogs and attempted to separate them, getting a small bite on his index finger in the process. *Id.*; Ex. D5.

9. Peanut had multiple bite wounds on his back legs and significant bruising on his abdomen. McArthur Testimony; Exs. D3-5.
10. Ms. Lux got control of Aros and went upstairs to put him in her apartment, then came down to Ms. McArthur's apartment to apologize and see if there was anything she could do to help. Lux Testimony.
11. Ms. Lux did not deny the events and acknowledged she did not see anything Mr. Farrell did at that time that would have provoked Aros. *Id.* She indicated that Aros is an 85 pound unaltered male, who she sometimes muzzles, because he can get more "anxious" when there are female dogs in heat. *Id.*
12. Ms. Lux indicated Aros is not aggressive typically, but this incident "woke her up" and she has been working with him to avoid this situation happening again. *Id.* She is requesting the fine be dropped and the potentially dangerous designation be removed. *Id.*
13. Sgt. Eykel noted that, although Ms. Lux was not cited, Aros does not have a current license or rabies vaccination and needs to get those updated. Eykel Testimony.

#### Conclusions of Law

14. The hearing examiner has jurisdiction pursuant to KCC 20.22.040.
15. 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.
16. The sole issue here is whether Aros' "Potentially Dangerous" designation is supported by a preponderance of the evidence and the associated monetary penalties are reasonable. KCC 11.04.230.F; 11.04.035.C.2.
17. A "potentially dangerous animal" is any animal that, when unprovoked "bites or inflicts injury on a human or domesticated animal." KCC 11.01.320.A(1). A preponderance of the evidence supports the conclusion that Aros caused Peanut's injuries and injured Mr. Farrell's finger. Whether the injury was a bite, or a scratch, or intentional or not, it is clear that Peanut's puncture wounds and bruising, as well as Mr. Farrell's laceration, were caused by Aros and, as a result, the potentially dangerous designation is affirmed, along with the associated requirements and restrictions. KCC 11.04.275.
18. There has been no assertion that Aros was provoked on November 15, and no evidence would support a finding or conclusion of provocation.
19. In many cases a fee reduction is granted based on an appellant's financial need, compliance with licensing requirements in advance of the hearing, contribution to the injured dog's veterinary expenses, or proactive steps taken to comply with the potentially dangerous dog restrictions.

20. Here, Ms. Lux was clearly acting responsibly with Aros being on-leash in the common outdoor area and the situation was an unfortunate incident for both parties. Ms. Lux was sincere and apologetic at the time of the incident and at the hearing, and recognized the need to comply with the muzzling requirement, as well as license Aros and update his shots. She also expressed financial hardship, and compliance with the potentially dangerous restrictions, licensing requirement and vaccinations will come at a cost.
21. As a result, the monetary penalty is reduced to \$200 to facilitate compliance with the requirements and restrictions of the potentially dangerous designation for Aros.

DECISION:

1. The monetary penalty is reduced from \$500 to \$200
2. The appeal is otherwise DENIED.

ORDERED February 13, 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 30, 2026, HEARING IN THE APPEAL OF  
CHRISTINA LUX, REGIONAL ANIMAL SERVICES OF  
KING COUNTY FILE NO. V25017873-A25005381**

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 and entered into the record:

Exhibit no. D1	Regional Animal Services of King County staff report
Exhibit no. D2	RASKC investigation report no. A25005381
Exhibit no. D3	Online Complaint form of November 15, 2025, incident by Kayla McArthur, dated November 17, 2025
Exhibit no. D4	Maxwell Farrell’s statement
Exhibit no. D5	Photograph of injuries to Peanut
Exhibit no. D6	Photograph of injury to Mr. Farrell
Exhibit no. D7	Notice of violation no. V25017873-A25005381, issued November 25, 2025
Exhibit no. D8	Potentially Dangerous Designation
Exhibit no. D9	Bite Quarantine Notice
Exhibit no. D10	Appeal
Exhibit no. D11	Map of subject area

February 13, 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 no. **V25017873-A25005381**

**CHRISTINA LUX**  
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 February 13, 2026.



---

Lauren Olson  
Legislative Secretary

**Eykel, Chelsea**

Regional Animal Services of King County

**Lux, Christina**

Hardcopy

**Mcarthur, Kayla (Maxwell Ferrell)**

Hardcopy