

647 F.Supp.2d 517

(Cite as: 647 F.Supp.2d 517)

United States District Court,
D. Maryland.
Thomas L. MOFFETT, II, et al., Plaintiffs
v.
COMPUTER SCIENCES CORPORATION, et al.,
Defendants.
Civil No. PJM 05-1547.

July 6, 2009.


Background: Maryland residents, who were insureds and family or household members of insureds under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) whose homes suffered damaged as a result of flooding during Hurricane Isabel, sued various insurance companies, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and a number of its employees, private contractors who assisted FEMA in the administration of the NFIP.

Holdings: The District Court, [Peter J. Messitte, J.](#), held that:

- (1) a district court had authority to review FEMA decisions regarding individual requests for waiver of the time to file proofs of loss under their NFIP policies, and
- (2) FEMA's failure to disclose that waivers of proof of loss deadlines were available or on what grounds was arbitrary and capricious.

So ordered.

West Headnotes

[1] Insurance 217 1834(1)

217 Insurance

217XIII Contracts and Policies


217XIII(G) Rules of Construction

217k1830 Favoring Insureds or Beneficiaries; Disfavoring Insurers

217k1834 Particular Types of Coverage

217k1834(1) k. In general. **Most****Cited Cases**

When interpreting the language of a National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) provision, the court is obliged to apply unambiguous language; if, however, the language is susceptible to different constructions, the court must adopt the construction most favorable to the insured.

[2] Statutes 361 190

361 Statutes

361VI Construction and Operation


361VI(A) General Rules of Construction

361k187 Meaning of Language

361k190 k. Existence of ambiguity.

Most Cited Cases

To decide whether statutory language is plain or ambiguous, the court looks to the language itself, the specific context in which that language is used, and the broader context of the statute as a whole.

[3] Statutes 361 188

361 Statutes


361VI Construction and Operation

361VI(A) General Rules of Construction

361k187 Meaning of Language

361k188 k. In general. **Most Cited****Cases**

When examining statutory language, a court generally gives words their ordinary, contemporary, and common meaning.

[4] Insurance 217 1070

217 Insurance

217II Regulation in General

217II(C) State Agencies and Regulation

217k1070 k. Judicial remedies and review. **Most Cited Cases**

A request for waiver of a proof of loss deadline is a “claim” under statute authorizing judicial review of any claims for proved and approved losses covered by flood insurance that the director disallows, and thus the District Court has authority to review Fed-

647 F.Supp.2d 517

(Cite as: 647 F.Supp.2d 517)

eral Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) decisions regarding individual requests for waiver of the time to file proofs of loss under their National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) policies. Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, § 1341, 42 U.S.C.A. § 4072.

[5] Insurance 217 3190

217 Insurance

217XXVII Claims and Settlement Practices

217XXVII(B) Claim Procedures

217XXVII(B)2 Notice and Proof of Loss

217k3187 Insurer's Waiver or Estoppel

217k3190 k. Express waiver. [Most](#)

[Cited Cases](#)

Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) denials of waivers of proof of loss deadlines must not be arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law. Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, § 1341, 42 U.S.C.A. § 4072.

[6] Insurance 217 3191(1)

217 Insurance

217XXVII Claims and Settlement Practices

217XXVII(B) Claim Procedures

217XXVII(B)2 Notice and Proof of Loss

217k3187 Insurer's Waiver or Estoppel

217k3191 Implied Waiver or Estoppel

pel

217k3191(1) k. In general. [Most](#)

[Cited Cases](#)

Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) failure to disclose that waivers of proof of loss deadlines under plaintiffs' National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) policies were available or on what grounds was arbitrary and capricious and, in any case, constituted an abuse of discretion warranting, as a matter of law, a finding that plaintiffs' proof of loss claims be deemed timely pled.

[7] Insurance 217 1070

217 Insurance

217II Regulation in General

217II(C) State Agencies and Regulation

217k1070 k. Judicial remedies and review. [Most Cited Cases](#)

For purposes of determining proper standard of review, Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) factual findings on merits of waiver of proof of loss claims under National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) policies filed beyond officially declared deadlines cannot be arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with the law.

[8] Administrative Law and Procedure 15A 754.1

15A Administrative Law and Procedure

15AV Judicial Review of Administrative Decisions

15AV(D) Scope of Review in General

15Ak754 Discretion of Administrative Agency

15Ak754.1 k. In general. [Most Cited](#)

[Cases](#)

Administrative Law and Procedure 15A 763

15A Administrative Law and Procedure

15AV Judicial Review of Administrative Decisions

15AV(D) Scope of Review in General

15Ak763 k. Arbitrary, unreasonable or capricious action; illegality. [Most Cited Cases](#)

Administrative Law and Procedure 15A 785

15A Administrative Law and Procedure

15AV Judicial Review of Administrative Decisions

15AV(E) Particular Questions, Review of

15Ak784 Fact Questions

15Ak785 k. Clear error. [Most Cited Cases](#)

Under the “arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with the law” standard, the court must uphold an agency decision

if it was based on a fair consideration of the relevant factors and there has been no clear error of judgment.

*518 Donald W. Marcari, Frank D. Lawrence, III, Marcari Russotto and Spencer, Chesapeake, VA, Martin H. Freeman, Freeman and Freeman PC, Rockville, MD, for Plaintiffs.

Arthur F. Ferguson, Ansa Assuncao LLP, Holly Drumheller Butler, DLA Piper U.S. LLP, Jamie M. Bennett, Allen F. Loucks, Office of the United States Attorney, Steven Michael Klepper, Kramon and Graham PA, Monte Fried, James D. Skeen, Wright Constable and Skeen LLP, Michael J. Halaiko, Miles and Stockbridge PC, Jennifer S. Lubinski, Kathleen M. Bustraan, Lord and Whip PA, Baltimore, MD, Jay I. Morstein, Owings Mills, MD, Tyler Brian Raimo, Computer Sciences Corporation, Falls Church, VA, Robert H. King, Jr., Sonnenschein Nath and Rosenthal LLP, Chicago, IL, Kirk Robert Ruthenberg, Sonnenschein Nath and Rosenthal LLP, Steuart H. Thomsen, Sutherland Asbill and Brennan LLP, Jennifer Caitlin Argabright, Scott Nathan Auby, W. Neil Eggleston, Debevoise and Plimpton LLP, Elizabeth Treubert Simon, Pamela Anne Bresnahan, Vorys Sater Seymour and Pease LLP, Washington, DC, Gerald Joseph Nielsen, Nielsen Law Firm LLC, Metairie, LA, Peter F. Axelrad, Council Baradel Kosmerl and Nolan PA, Annapolis, MD, Patricia McHugh Lambert, Steven B. Schwartzman, Patricia McHugh Lambert, Hodes Pessin and Katz PA, Towson, MD, Craig Russell Blackman, Samuel J. Arena, Jr., Stradley Ronon Stevens and Young LLP, Philadelphia, PA, Edward J. Hutchins, Jr., Stacey Ann Moffet, Eccleston and Wolf PC, Hanover, MD, William J. Hickey, Law Offices of William J. Hickey LLC, Debra Anne Nelson, William Lowell Mundy, Mundy and Nelson, Huntington, WV, James Hilton Crosby, Crosby Saad LLC, Mobile, AL, William Gerald Gandy, Wilson Elser Moskowitz Edelman and Dicker, McLean, VA, Bradish J. Waring, Mary Legare Hughes, Nexsen Pruet LLC, Charleston, SC, for Defendants.

OPINION

PETER J. MESSITTE, District Judge.

Plaintiffs are Maryland residents seeking to recover damages for flood losses *519 resulting from Hurricane Isabel that occurred in September 2003. They are insured by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and a number of independent insurance carriers under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The background of their dispute is set forth in an earlier opinion of the Court. See *Moffett, et al. v. Computer Sciences Corp., et al.*, 457 F.Supp.2d 571 (D.Md.2006). Presently before the Court is the issue of whether it has authority to review FEMA's decisions regarding Plaintiffs' individual requests for waiver of the time to file proofs of loss under their insurance policies.

Having considered the parties' briefs and oral arguments, the Court **HOLDS** that it has authority to review the waiver decisions.

I.

The NFIP is a federally-subsidized program designed to make flood insurance available to the general public at or below actuarial rates. NFIP insurance is written either directly by FEMA or by private carriers through what is known as the "Write-Your-Own Program" ("WYO Program"). See 42 U.S.C. §§ 4071, 4081(a) (2006); 44 C.F.R. § 62.23-24 (2008).

As to all the carriers, the terms and conditions of coverage are fixed by FEMA regulation in the form of a Standard Flood Insurance Policy (SFIP). See 44 C.F.R. §§ 61.4(b), 61.13(d)-(e), 62.23(c)-(d) (2008). The SFIP sets out several conditions for collecting on a claim. One such condition requires the insured, within 60 days after the flood loss, to submit a proof of loss consisting of detailed written notice identifying the nature of the property damaged, how and when the damage occurred, and the monetary value of the damage. 44 C.F.R. § 61, App. A(1), Art. VH(J)(4) (2008). An insured may

not sue the issuer of an SFIP until he or she has complied with all of the requirements of the policy. *Id.* at Art. VII, ¶ R.

Plaintiffs allege that they suffered their flood losses on September 18, 2003. Accordingly, under the terms of the SFIP, proofs of loss had to be filed within 60 days, *i.e.* by November 17, 2003. On October 28, 2003, however, FEMA notified all potentially affected insureds that the deadline for filing proofs of loss would be extended until January 17, 2004. Some insureds filed claims within the extended period. A number of insureds, including Plaintiffs, missed the extended deadline.

Under its regulatory framework, the Federal Insurance Administrator is authorized to waive the proof of loss deadline at his discretion. *See* 44 C.F.R. § 61.13(d) (2008). Upon receipt of a waiver request, the Administrator, or his delegates, “determine whether it is an appropriate claim to waive the [proof of loss] deadline and whether there is a legitimate reason why the [proof of loss] was not timely submitted.” Suzanne E. Woods Decl. ¶ 6 (June 21, 2007).^{FN1}

^{FN1}. Suzanne E. Woods is the Insurance Examiner in the Mitigation Division of FEMA. Suzanne E. Woods Decl. ¶ 6 (June 21, 2007).

During one of several oral arguments before the Court that occurred in these proceedings during 2007, FEMA acknowledged that it had granted waivers for some insureds beyond the January 17, 2004 deadline. But when asked by the Court what criteria were used to determine whose claims might be considered after the deadline and whether such criteria had ever been publicly announced, FEMA was not able at first to articulate the criteria, except to suggest that some claims for *520 additional compensation were deemed to be meritorious and were therefore granted late. Thereafter, per the Woods Affidavit *it*. FEMA advised the Court of the criteria, effectively conceding^{FN2} that they had not theretofore been published.

^{FN2}. The criteria included: the severity of the damages caused by flood; whether the damage required an expert to evaluate the extent of structural damages caused by flood; whether the damage required a Certified Public Accountant to review the stock and inventory; whether salvage is involved and if the adjuster must either sell it back to the insured or dispose of it, which would further delay the adjustment process; whether the insured experienced difficulty listing all items damaged by flood due to the extent of personal property inventory involved; whether there were settlement disputes which may have caused delay in finalizing the claim adjustments; whether the insured required additional time due to health conditions (*i.e.*, hospitalization) and required a family member's assistance in the presentation of their claim; whether the claim involved prior losses and the insured was required to document repairs to the structure and replacement of personal property prior to the recent flood loss; and whether the insured demonstrates that there is additional covered damage for which a supplemental payment is appropriate. Suzanne E. Woods Decl. ¶ 6 (June 21, 2007).

Because it felt that these criteria for waiver were potentially invalid as to pending claims in that they were not previously-announced, the Court, contingent upon a subsequent finding that the criteria would indeed be held invalid for that reason, granted Plaintiffs leave to file individual requests for waiver of the proof of loss deadline.

Plaintiffs thereupon filed individual waiver requests based upon the newly announced criteria set forth by FEMA. In July and August 2008, FEMA issued a series of letters denying all but five of Plaintiffs' waiver requests.^{FN3} Plaintiffs now seek review of the denials. FEMA submits that the Court lacks authority to review its waiver decisions.

FN3. FEMA offered to grant limited waivers to five individuals but conditioned that offer on the individuals' acceptance of a specified amount of supplemental damages. *See* Letters 20 (Allen Godlewski), 33 (Joanne Kraft), 41 (Thomas Moffett), 53 (Patricia Sligh) and 56 (James Thaden). These requests for waivers were otherwise denied.

II.

Plaintiffs argue that the Court has authority to review FEMA's waiver decisions under two theories. First, they cite 42 U.S.C. § 4072, which states in relevant part:

[T]he Director [Administrator of FEMA] shall be authorized to adjust and make payment of any claims for proved and approved losses covered by flood insurance, and upon the disallowance by the Director of any such claim ... the claimant ... may institute an action against the Director on such claim in the United States district court for the district in which the insured property or the major part thereof shall have been situated, and original exclusive jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon such court to hear and determine such action without regard to the amount in controversy.

42 U.S.C. § 4072 (2006). Plaintiffs submit that a waiver request constitutes a “claim” for purposes of section 4072 and therefore the Court has the authority to review FEMA's denials of waivers as well as denials of claims of loss on the merits. Alternatively, say Plaintiffs, even if review is not authorized by section 4072, it is authorized under the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. § 702, which provides that “[a] person suffering legal wrong because of agency action, or adversely affected or aggrieved by agency action within *521 the meaning of a relevant statute, is entitled to judicial review thereof.” 5 U.S.C. § 702 (2006).

Defendants dispute that the Court has authority to

review FEMA's waiver decisions under either theory. As to section 4072, they argue that a “claim” can only mean a timely filed proof of loss for covered losses, not a request for waiver of the time to file the claim. While the statute does not define the term “claim,” Defendants say, the ordinary meaning of “claim” is to assert a right. A request for waiver does not assert a right; it acknowledges that no right exists and seeks leave to assert a right. As to the Administrative Procedure Act, Defendants contend that it is inapplicable because Plaintiffs already have an adequate remedy in section 4072. Defendants also submit that the Act does not apply because FEMA's decision to deny the waiver requests is discretionary and the Court lacks a meaningful standard against which to judge its decision. *See Inova Alexandria Hosp. v. Shalala*, 244 F.3d 342, 346 (4th Cir.2001).

III.

[1][2][3] When interpreting the language of an NFIP provision, the court is obliged to apply unambiguous language. *Studio Frames, Ltd. v. Std. Fire Ins. Co.*, 483 F.3d 239, 245 (4th Cir.2007). If, however, the language is “susceptible to different constructions,” the court must adopt the construction most favorable to the insured. *Id.* To decide whether statutory language is plain or ambiguous, the court “look[s] to the ‘language itself, the specific context in which that language is used, and the broader context of the statute as a whole.’ ” *Id.* at 249 (quoting *Robinson v. Shell Oil Co.*, 519 U.S. 337, 341, 117 S.Ct. 843, 136 L.Ed.2d 808 (1997)). “When examining statutory language, [a court] generally give[s] words their ordinary, contemporary, and common meaning.” *Scott v. United States*, 328 F.3d 132, 139 (4th Cir.2003) (citations omitted).

IV.

[4] The Court agrees with Plaintiff's that it possesses authority to review the waiver decisions pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 4072. That section authorizes

judicial review of “any claims for proved and approved losses covered by flood insurance” that the Director disallows. 42 U.S.C. § 4072 (2006). Defendants concede that section 4072 is a limited waiver of sovereign immunity that applies “with respect to circumstances involving the denial of a claim submitted pursuant to a federally-issued SFIP.” *Gumpert v. Allstate Ins. Co.*, No. Civ. A. 97-1531, 1997 WL 538003, at *3 (E.D.La. Aug. 26, 1997); see also *Wiedemann v. Harleysville Mut. Ins.*, Civ. A. No. 06-4723, 2006 WL 3462926, at *1 (E.D.La. Nov. 28, 2006).

The key question is whether a request for a waiver of a proof of loss deadline to submit a claim for payment of the loss is itself a “claim.” The Court believes it is.

The term “claim” is not defined by section 4072. Is it nonetheless “unambiguous”? The Court concludes that it is not, or stating the proposition directly, that the word “claim” is ambiguous. *Black's Law Dictionary* 247 (6th Ed.1990), for instance, defines a claim *inter alia* as a “[m]eans by or through which claimant obtains possession or enjoyment of privilege or thing.” In that sense, one makes a “claim” for possession or enjoyment of a waiver of a proof of loss deadline as much as a claim for the loss itself. *Black's*, it is true, also defines “claim” as a “[d]emand for money or property as of right, e.g., insurance claim.” *Id.* In that sense, a request to have a demand considered by having the period for considering the demand extended can perhaps be distinguished from the *522 presentation of the demand itself. But the critical point is that the statute is silent as to the meaning of “claim,” as is the standard NFIP policy, and construing, as it must, the ambiguity favorably to the insured, the Court concludes that it may review denials of the waiver requests. *Holmes' Appleman on Insurance 2d*, discussing the law of liability insurance, is instructive. Although the treatise is primarily concerned with defining “claim” for purposes of determining when a claim is first made under a liability policy, what it says about the clarity

or lack of clarity of the undefined term “claim” is spot-on in the present case:

the policy's definition of a “claim” is of crucial importance. Surprisingly, not every claims made liability insurance policy defines the term “claim.” More surprising is the idea that without defining claim—the most significant word in a claims made policy—the insurance company, arguably, is not only inviting litigation but also inviting apt advocacy that claim sans definition is ambiguous. And anyone acquainted with insurance law knows the bedrock insurance rule of “contra proferentem” (sometimes called “contra-insurer”), which courts will use to judicially construe the word “claim” against the insurer as policy drafter who created the ambiguity. The Supreme Court of New Hampshire applied “contra proferentem” to a claims made policy that provided no definition or meaning for the word “claim.”

Eric Mills Holmes, *Holmes' Appleman on Insurance* § 130.2 (2d ed.2002); see *Shaheen, Cappiello, Stein & Gordon, P.A. v. Home Ins. Co.*, 143 N.H. 35, 719 A.2d 562, 566-67 (1998) (interpreting policy in favor of insured where “claim” was not defined); *Walker v. Larson*, 223 Mont. 333, 727 P.2d 1321, 1323 (1986) (where word “claim” was not defined in policy, it was “sufficiently ambiguous to spring the rule which requires the ambiguity be construed against the insurer”).

The Court holds that a request for waiver of a proof of loss deadline is a “claim” and, as such, is reviewable by a federal district court.

V.

[5] Having determined that it has authority to review FEMA's denials of waivers of the proof of loss deadlines in this case, by what standard does the Court review the denials? Since section 4072 does not indicate that the Court's review should be *de novo*, the Court accepts the basic standard of the Administrative Procedure Act that the denials not

be “arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law.” 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A) (2006); see *Citizens to Pres. Overton Park, Inc. v. Volpe*, 401 U.S. 402, 413-14, 91 S.Ct. 814, 28 L.Ed.2d 136 (1971) (overruled on other grounds by *Califano v. Sanders*, 430 U.S. 99, 105, 97 S.Ct. 980, 51 L.Ed.2d 192 (1977)) (holding that agency action must be set aside if it was arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with the law). Against this standard, how do the denials of waiver measure up?

The denial letters sent to Plaintiffs, all signed by the Federal Insurance Administrator of the NFIP, and all dated variously between July and August 2008, are not, strictly speaking, limited to finding no reasonable explanation for the insured's delay in submitting a timely proof of loss. Typically, the letters also discuss the lack of merit of the claim, e.g., the policy for which the insured sought coverage was cancelled before the flood damage occurred, the policy limits were paid, or repairs to the type of building damaged (e.g., a duplex) were not covered. But then, almost uniformly, the Administrator's letters end by denying *523 the “request for a waiver of the time period within which to file a POL [proof of loss].”^{FN4}

^{FN4}. The letters to James Folderauer, John and Lydia Helmer, Arley Horne, Patricia Jasinski, Joel Kelley, Monica McCall, John and Frances Schmidt, Edward and Tammy Schwartz, and Fred Staigerwald instead state that “the Insurance Examiner found no basis to set aside the original findings.” See Letter 17, 25, 27, 28, 31, 38, 49, 50 and 54. As noted above, FEMA also offered to grant limited waivers to five individuals. See Letter 20 (Allen Godlewski), 33 (Joanne Kraft), 41 (Thomas Moffett), 53 (Patricia Sligh) and 56 (James Thaden).

The implication of the letters certainly seems to be that, if the late-filed claim had been deemed meritorious, the loss period would have been extended

and the loss allowed. Indeed, that is very much in accord with FEMA's criteria for granting waivers of the lime for filing, first articulated by Suzanne Woods in response to this Court's inquiry in 2007.

[6] But therein lies the problem-FEMA was disposed to grant waivers, but that fact was not publicly known, much less were the criteria for obtaining waivers. When individual insureds, including all the Plaintiffs here, claim they were not aware that waivers were obtainable or on what grounds, their position rings entirely true. FEMA gave them absolutely no reason to know otherwise. It is no answer for FEMA to insist that it possessed “discretion” to grant waivers.^{FN5} Its failure to disclose that waivers were even available or on what grounds was arbitrary and capricious and, in any case, constituted an abuse of discretion.

^{FN5}. FEMA contends that the Court cannot review its discretionary decisions. However, inasmuch as proof of loss deadline waiver requests are “claims,” they are subject to judicial review pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 4072. See *supra* pp. 5-7 at IV.

The Court therefore finds as a matter of law that all proofs of loss filed by Plaintiffs in this case must be deemed timely Bled.^{FN6} That said, the next question is how the proofs of loss must be evaluated.

^{FN6}. This is not to say that hereafter, apart from the claims in this case, late-filed claims for waiver of the time to file proof of loss must be deemed timely filed.

VI.

Had FEMA simply denied Plaintiffs' requests for waiver on the grounds that they were filed beyond the officially declared deadlines without making findings on the merits of the claims, judicial review on the merits would have been difficult. See *Citizens to Pres. Overton Park*, 401 U.S. at 417, 91 S.Ct. 814. Although findings may be required in cases where the agency action is ambiguous, there

647 F.Supp.2d 517

(Cite as: 647 F.Supp.2d 517)

is no such ambiguity in this case. *See id.* As indicated, FEMA-no doubt in an effort to be especially accommodating to the insureds-went beyond responding to the waiver requests and addressed virtually all of Plaintiffs' claims on their merits. That being so, there appears to be a factual record upon which to review those claims.

[7][8] What, then, is the proper standard of review? Lacking a specific statutory standard, the Court again looks to the Administrative Procedure Act, which provides that an agency's factual decisions cannot be arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with the law. *See 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A)* (2006); *Indiana Bell Tel. Co. v. McCarty*, 362 F.3d 378, 385 (7th Cir.2004) (holding that agency's decisions with regard to questions of fact are reviewed by the district court under the arbitrary and capricious standard). Under this standard, the court must uphold the agency decision if it was based on a fair consideration of the *524 relevant factors and there has been no clear error of judgment. *Cent. Elec. Power Coop. v. Se. Power Admin.*, 338 F.3d 333, 337 (4th Cir.2003) (citing *Citizens to Pres. Overton Park, Inc.*, 401 U.S. at 416, 91 S.Ct. 814). The ultimate standard of review is a narrow one. *Id.* Although the inquiry into the facts must be searching and careful, the court is not empowered simply to substitute its judgment for that of the agency. *Id.*

Against this background, the Court, in the near future, will make a proposal to the parties regarding the expeditious determination of Plaintiffs' claims in light of Defendants' pending Motions for Summary Judgment.

D.Md.,2009.

Moffett v. Computer Sciences Corp.

647 F.Supp.2d 517

Briefs and Other Related Documents ([Back to top](#))

- [2009 WL 4496210](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Federal Defendants' Reply Memorandum in Response to Plaintiffs' Motion to Strike

(Aug. 28, 2009) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2009 WL 4496209](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Plaintiffs' Memorandum in Support of Motion to Strike the Federal Defendants' Motion for Reconsideration (Aug. 3, 2009) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2009 WL 4496208](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Federal Defendants' Motion for Reconsideration (Jul. 16, 2009) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2008 WL 7200167](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendant Allstate Insurance Company's Reply Memorandum in Support of its Motion for Summary Judgment regarding Mary Ann Marks' Claim (Dec. 15, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2008 WL 7200168](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendant Allstate Insurance Company's Reply Memorandum in Support of Its Amended Motion for Summary Judgment regarding the Hallanans' Claim (Dec. 15, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2008 WL 7200165](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Plaintiff, Mary Ann Marks, Opposition to Allstate Insurance Company's Motion for Summary Judgment (Dec. 5, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2008 WL 7200166](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Plaintiffs, Marie and Edwin Hallanans, Opposition to Defendant Allstate Insurance Company's Amended Motion for Summary Judgment Regarding the Hallanans' Claim (Dec. 5, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2008 WL 7200164](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendant Allstate Insurance Company's Memorandum in Support of its Motion for Summary Judgment regarding Mary Ann Marks' Claim (Nov. 18, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2008 WL 7200149](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Reply Memorandum of Certain Wyo Carrier Defendants in Further Support of Their Motions for Summary Judgment (Jul. 8, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2008 WL 7200151](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendant Allstate Insurance Company's Reply Memorandum in Support of its Motion for Summary Judgment Regarding the Crocettis' Claim (Jul. 8, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200152](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendant Nationwide Mutual Fire Ins. Co.'s Reply in Support of its Motion for Summary Judgment (as to Plaintiffs Moffett, Folderauer, Gielner, Krajewski and Thaden) (Jul. 8, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200153](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendant Allstate Insurance Company's Reply Memorandum in Support of its Motion for Summary Judgment Regarding Robert Thomsen's Claim (Jul. 8, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200154](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Federal Emergency Management Agency's Reply Memorandum in Support of its Motion for Summary Judgment on Count V (Jul. 8, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200155](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendant Allstate Insurance Company's Reply Memorandum in Support of its Motion for Summary Judgment Regarding the Parsons' Claim (Jul. 8, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200156](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendant Allstate Insurance Company's Reply Memorandum in Support of its Motion for Summary Judgment Regarding the Thompsons' Claim (Jul. 8, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200157](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendant Allstate Insurance Company's Reply Memorandum in Support of its Motion for Summary Judgment Regarding Lori Healan's Claim (Jul. 8, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200158](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendant Allstate Insurance Company's Reply Memorandum in Support of its Motion for Summary Judgment Regarding Marie Hal-
- lanan's Claim (Jul. 8, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200159](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendant Allstate Insurance Company's Reply Memorandum in Support of its Motion for Summary Judgment regarding Adrian Goodman's Claim (Jul. 8, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200160](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendant Allstate Insurance Company's Reply Memorandum in Support of its Motion for Summary Judgment regarding Bernard Ferguson's Claim (Jul. 8, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200161](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendant Allstate Insurance Company's Reply Memorandum in Support of its Motion for Summary Judgment regarding Alvin V. Cook's Claim (Jul. 8, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200162](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendant State Farm Fire and Casualty Company's Reply Memorandum in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment (Jul. 8, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200163](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendants' Motion to Strike Plaintiffs' Purported Cross-Motions for Summary Judgment or in the Alternative to Defer any Response by Defendants (Jul. 8, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200129](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Plaintiff, Lori Healan's, Opposition to Allstate Insurance Company's Motion for Summary Judgment (Jun. 16, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200130](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Plaintiffs, Thomas and Virginia Parson's, Opposition to Allstate Insurance Company's Motion for Summary Judgment (Jun. 16, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200131](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Plaintiffs, Daniel and Kathryn Thompson's, Opposition to Allstate Insurance Company's Motion for Summary Judgment (Jun. 16,

2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2008 WL 7200132](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Plaintiff, Robert Thomsen's, Opposition to Allstate Insurance Company's Motion for Summary Judgment (Jun. 16, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200133](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Plaintiff, Michael Daras', Opposition to the Standard Fire Insurance Company's Motion for Summary Judgment (Jun. 16, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200134](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Plaintiff, Patricia Jasinski's, Opposition to the Standard Fire Insurance Company's Motion for Summary Judgment (Jun. 16, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200135](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Plaintiffs, William and Kelly Kenney's, Opposition to the Standard Fire Insurance Company's Motion for Summary Judgment (Jun. 16, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200136](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Plaintiff, Michele Petro's, Opposition to the Standard Fire Insurance Company's Motion for Summary Judgment (Jun. 16, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200137](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Plaintiff, Delmus Simmons', Opposition to the Standard Fire Insurance Company's Motion for Summary Judgment (Jun. 16, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200138](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Plaintiffs, Blann, Darr, Deaver, Bonner, Michael Kondylas, Marzocchi, and Sudbrok's, Opposition to State Farm Fire and Casualty Company's Motion for Summary Judgment (Jun. 16, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200139](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Plaintiffs Lisa and Jesse Ray's Opposition to Fidelity National Property Casualty Insurance Company's Motion for Summary Judgment (Jun. 16, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200140](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Plaintiff Dorothea Reilly's Opposi-

tion to Westfield Insurance Company's Motion for Summary Judgment (Jun. 16, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2008 WL 7200141](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Plaintiff Gerald T. Fenton's Opposition to Windsor-Mt. Joy Mutual Insurance Company's Motion for Summary Judgment (Jun. 16, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200142](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Plaintiffs Wade and Christine Wisnom's Opposition to Liberty Mutual Fire Insurance Company's Motion for Summary Judgment (Jun. 16, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200143](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Plaintiffs Joanne Kraft, Ann Jackson and Michael McCormick and Julia Koczela, and Debra Simon's Opposition to Defendant Hartford Fire Insurance Company's Motion for Summary Judgment (Jun. 16, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200144](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Plaintiffs, Jennifer Dieux and Eric Mackay, Christine Lee, Joanne Dolgow, and Alan and Laima Fiterman's, Opposition to, and Plaintiff Clarissa A. Vowler's, Response to, Defendant Omaha Property and Casualty Insurance Company / Mutual of Omaha Insurance Company's Motion for Summary Judgment (Jun. 16, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200145](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Plaintiffs, Moffett, Thaden, Krajewski and Gielner's, Opposition to Nationwide Insurance Company's Motion for Summary Judgment (Jun. 16, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200146](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Plaintiffs Claudette Birchette and John Dey, Tina Malara, Joanne McKenzie, Dale and Georgia Poling, Wanda Dickey, and Janice Vincent's Opposition to Defendant Harleysville Mutual Insurance Company's Motion for Summary Judgment (Jun. 16, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200147](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Plaintiffs, Nila Hinefelt, James Rich-

mond, Philemon Greenhawk, Allan Godlewski, Beverly Motta, Phillip Blythe, Edward Jones and Todd Lewis', Opposition to, and Plaintiff Diane Lobien's Response to, Defendant Selective Insurance Company of the Southeast's Motion for Summary Judgment (Jun. 16, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2008 WL 7200148](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Plaintiffs Marion Gagnon, Linda Kalb and Patricia Sligh's, Opposition to Defendant American Bankers Insurance Company/American Reliable Insurance Company's Motion for Summary Judgment (Jun. 16, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200122](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Memorandum in Support of Rule 12(b)(6) and 12(c) Motion to Dismiss (Apr. 2, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200123](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Memorandum in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment (Apr. 2, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200124](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Memorandum in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment (Apr. 2, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200125](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Memorandum in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment (Apr. 2, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200126](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Memorandum in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment (Apr. 2, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200127](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Memorandum in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment (Apr. 2, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200128](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Memorandum in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment (Apr. 2, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200169](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Memorandum in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment (Apr. 2, 2008) Original Im-

age of this Document (PDF)

- [2008 WL 7200100](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendant Allstate Insurance Company's Memorandum in Support of Its Motion for Summary Judgment Regarding Healan's Claims (Apr. 1, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200101](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendant Allstate Insurance Company's Memorandum in Support of Its Motion for Summary Judgment Regarding the Parsons' Claim (Apr. 1, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200102](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendant Allstate Insurance Company's Memorandum in Support of Its Motion for Summary Judgment regarding the Petros' Claim (Apr. 1, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200103](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendant Allstate Insurance Company's Memorandum in Support of Its Motion for Summary Judgment regarding Thomsen's Claim (Apr. 1, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200104](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendant Allstate Insurance Company's Memorandum in Support of Its Motion for Summary Judgment regarding the Toporzyckis' Claim (Apr. 1, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200105](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendant Allstate Insurance Company's Memorandum in Support of Its Motion for Summary Judgment Regarding the Thompsons' Claim (Apr. 1, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200106](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendant Allstate Insurance Company's Memorandum in Support of Its Motion for Summary Judgment Regarding Alvin v. Cook's Claim (Apr. 1, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)
- [2008 WL 7200107](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendant Allstate Insurance Com-

pany's Memorandum in Support of Its Motion for Summary Judgment Regarding Michael and Clara Crocetti's Claim (Apr. 1, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2008 WL 7200108](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendant Allstate Insurance Company's Memorandum in Support of Its Motion for Summary Judgment Regarding Bernard Ferguson's Claim (Apr. 1, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2008 WL 7200109](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendant Allstate Insurance Company's Memorandum in Support of Its Motion for Summary Judgment Regarding the Hocks' Claim (Apr. 1, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2008 WL 7200110](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendant Allstate Insurance Company's Memorandum in Support of Its Motion for Summary Judgment Regarding Adrian Goodman's Claim (Apr. 1, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2008 WL 7200111](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendant Nationwide Mutual Fire Ins. Co.'s Memorandum in Support of Its Motion for Summary Judgment (Apr. 1, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2008 WL 7200112](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendant Allstate Insurance Company's Memorandum in Support of Its Motion for Summary Judgment Regarding William Alcares's Claim (Apr. 1, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2008 WL 7200113](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendant Allstate Insurance Company's Memorandum in Support of Its Motion for Summary Judgment Regarding Marie Hallanan's Claim (Apr. 1, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2008 WL 7200114](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendant Allstate Insurance Company's Memorandum in Support of Its Motion for Summary Judgment Regarding Thaddeus Biedrzycki's Claim (Apr. 1, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2008 WL 7200115](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Federal Emergency Management Agency's Memorandum of Law and Points of Authority in Support of Its Motion for Summary Judgment of Count V of Plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint (Apr. 1, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2008 WL 7200118](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Federal Defendants' Memorandum of Law and Points of Authority in Response to Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Law on the Court's Authority to Review Fema's Decisions Regarding Waivers (Apr. 1, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2008 WL 7200099](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Law on the Court's Authority to Review Fema's Decisions regarding Waivers (Feb. 25, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2008 WL 7200098](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendant Safeco's Reply Brief in Support of Its Supplemental Motion to Dismiss (Feb. 5, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2008 WL 7200097](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Plaintiff Charles V. Clarkson's Supplemental Opposition to Defendant Safeco Surplus Lines Insurance Company's Motion to Dismiss Count V of the Amended Complaint (Jan. 25, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2008 WL 7200096](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendant Safeco's Supplemental Brief in Support of its Motion to Dismiss Count V of the Amended Complaint (Jan. 4, 2008) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2007 WL 4609043](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendant Safeco's Reply Brief in Support of Motion to Dismiss Count V of the Amended Complaint (Sep. 26, 2007)

- [2007 WL 4609042](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Plaintiff Charles V. Clarkson's Opposition to Defendant Safeco Surplus Lines Insurance Company's Motion to Dismiss Count V of the Amended Complaint (Sep. 13, 2007)

- [2007 WL 4609041](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum

and Affidavit) Memorandum in Support of Safeco's Motion to Dismiss Count V of the Amended Complaint (Aug. 13, 2007)

- [2007 WL 4609040](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Plaintiffs' Response to Defendants' Memorandum in Response to This Court's Order of April 23, 2007 (Aug. 7, 2007)

- [2006 WL 1312260](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Federal Defendants' Reply Memorandum in Support its Motion to Dismiss County I, II, III, and IV of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint (Apr. 10, 2006) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2006 WL 1312256](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) The CSC Defendants' Reply in Support of their Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint (Apr. 7, 2006) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2006 WL 1312257](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Independent Adjusters' Reply to Plaintiffs' Omnibus Opposition Memorandum to Motion to Dismiss Counts II, III, and IV of the First Amended Complaint (Apr. 7, 2006) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2006 WL 1312258](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Reply Memorandum in Support of Defendant Jerry Dubyak's Motion to Dismiss Count I (Apr. 7, 2006) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2006 WL 1312259](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Reply Memorandum in Support of Partial Motion to Dismiss Filed by Defendants Jerry Dubyak and Twelve Wyo Program Insurance Companies (Apr. 7, 2006) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2006 WL 1451658](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Reply Memorandum in Support of Certain Write Your Own Insurance Company Defendants' Motion to Dismiss the First Amended Complaint, and for more Definite Statement (Apr. 7, 2006) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2006 WL 1451659](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Reply Memorandum in Support of Administrator Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Counts II, III, and IV of Plaintiffs' First Amended

Complaint (Apr. 7, 2006) Original Image of this Document with Appendix (PDF)

- [2006 WL 679524](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Plaintiffs' Omnibus Opposition Memorandum to Motions to Dismiss and for more Definite Statement (Feb. 8, 2006) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2005 WL 3682403](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Memorandum in Support of Partial Motion to Dismiss Filed by Defendants Jerry Dubyak and Twelve WYO Program Insurance Companies (Oct. 31, 2005) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2005 WL 3682404](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Memorandum in Support of Defendant Jerry Dubyak's Motion to Dismiss Count I (Oct. 31, 2005) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2005 WL 3682405](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Memorandum in Support of Certain Write Your Own Insurance Company Defendants' Motion to Dismiss the First Amended Complaint, and for More Definite Statement (Oct. 31, 2005) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2005 WL 3682406](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Memorandum in Support of Independent Adjusters' Motion to Dismiss Counts II, III, and IV of the First Amended Complaint (Oct. 31, 2005) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2005 WL 3682407](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Memorandum in Support of Administrator Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Counts II, III, and IV of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint (Oct. 31, 2005) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2005 WL 3682401](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint Against the CSC Defendants (Oct. 27, 2005) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2005 WL 3569473](#) (Trial Pleading) First Amended Complaint (Sep. 6, 2005) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [8:05cv01547](#) (Docket) (Jun. 8, 2005)

- [2005 WL 3682402](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Federal Defendants' Memorandum

647 F.Supp.2d 517

(Cite as: 647 F.Supp.2d 517)

of Law and Points of Authority in Support of Their Motion to Dismiss Counts I, II, III, and IV of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint (2005) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2005 WL 3682408](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Defendant Safeco Surplus Lines Insurance Company's Joinder in Certain Write Your Own Insurance Company Defendants' Motion to Dismiss the First Amended Complaint, and for More Definite Statement (2005) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

- [2005 WL 4708387](#) (Trial Motion, Memorandum and Affidavit) Fema's Motion to Dismiss Complaint and Opposition to Motion Filed by Plaintiffs Eileen and James Thaden, Jennifer Dieux and Eric Mackay for A Preliminary Injunction (2005) Original Image of this Document (PDF)

END OF DOCUMENT