

**KING COUNTY DISTRICT COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
EAST DIVISION, REDMOND COURTHOUSE**

William K Hollis

v.

Pension Benefit Information, LLC

Plaintiff(s),

Defendant(s).

SMALL CLAIMS DEPARTMENT

No. 25CIV60102KCX

JUDGMENT AFTER TRIAL

This matter came on for trial on March 16, 2026.

Plaintiff(s) and the defendant(s) appeared for the trial.

Plaintiff(s) claimed damages of \$ 1,050.00 for Other.

Defendant has not made any counterclaims.

Defendant has counterclaimed \$ _____ for _____.

Both parties have presented evidence and sworn testimony. The Court has considered the evidence and sworn testimony of witnesses and the arguments of the parties, and enters the following Findings and Conclusions:

See Addendum.

Plaintiff has not proven their claim by a preponderance of the evidence. No judgment shall be awarded against defendant(s)_____.

Defendant has not proven their counterclaim by a preponderance of the evidence. No judgment shall be awarded against Plaintiff(s)_____.

Plaintiff Defendant(s) has proven their claim or counterclaim by a preponderance of the evidence against Pension Benefit Information LLC. Judgment is awarded to the Plaintiff(s) William K. Hollis Defendant(s) _____ in the following amount:

Principal	\$ <u>300.00</u>
Filing Fee	\$ <u>50.00</u>
Service Fee	\$ _____
Total	\$ <u>350.00</u>

Post-judgment interest shall accrue on this judgment at the prescribed rate below:

<input type="checkbox"/> Written contract with specified interest rate.	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Tortious conduct (Prime + 2%).	_____ %
<input type="checkbox"/> Consumer debt (9%).	_____ %
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (12%).	<u>12.00</u> %

This judgment is from a cause of action for damages arising out of the ownership, maintenance, or use of a vehicle subject to registration under the laws of this state.

This judgment shall be paid within 30 days of this order or on terms agreed to by the parties.

Execution on this money judgment shall be stayed for 30 days.



Dated: March 16, 2026

Judge

Michael J. Finkle

**KING COUNTY DISTRICT COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON
EAST DIVISION, REDMOND COURTHOUSE**

William K Hollis
Plaintiff(s),

v.

Pension Benefit Information, LLC
Defendant(s).

No. 25CIV60102KCX

**JUDGMENT AFTER TRIAL
ADDENDUM -FINDINGS AND
CONCLUSIONS**

Although a court's general duty is to determine the facts and the law, in this small claims case this Court is specifically required by RCW 12.40.090 to pursue "the sole object of dispensing speedy and quick justice between the litigants."

Defendant ("PBI") is a Minneapolis-based company that provides audit and address services to insurance companies, pension funds, and other organizations nationwide. PBI held private information relating to Plaintiff ("Hollis"). PBI utilized file transfer software called MOVEit, manufactured by a company called Progress. In 2023, a group of Russian hackers were able to breach information from MOVEit to obtain private information from PBI. PBI notified those customers whose private information was compromised, including Hollis's private information. The notification occurred 42 days after the breach.

PBI previously submitted a motion to dismiss based upon lack of contacts with the State of Washington. For the reasons set forth below, the Court denies PBI's motion to dismiss.


PBI's business office is in Minnesota, and they do not have a Washington office. But PBI holds itself as providing services nationwide, and approximately 19,000 individuals in Washington State were affected by the data breach because their information was held by PBI. Although large corporate clients might be able to bring a lawsuit in Minnesota, individuals located elsewhere cannot. Washingtonians whose information was held by PBI and was accessed in the breach situation have no practical recourse other than to file in Washington state. On that basis, the Court does have authority to retain jurisdiction over this matter.

PBI points to the fact that there are large-scale class action lawsuits pending, including against PBI. But potential class members are entitled to opt out of the class by filing their own lawsuit. That is what Hollis has done.

PBI requested at trial that the Court research the PBI Based on internet research, the Court has determined that the MOVEit software had a single security vulnerability. Based on that research that double layers of security are appropriate, the Court finds by a preponderance that MOVEit was negligent. Given the large amount of private data PBI uploaded, the Court also finds that “quick justice between the litigants” requires compensation from PBI to Hollis.

Hollis is an experienced tech person. He testified that he spent approximately one hour reviewing and researching the difficulty. He also testified that he spent one hour and 15 minutes enrolling in the three credit reporting companies.

The Court finds that the hour spent by Hollis in evaluation the breach was reasonable, and that he utilized his technological skills He is entitled the \$300 for that. The Court finds that the time spent enrolling in the three credit agencies did not require expertise. Any of the 11,000,000 people impacted by the breach could do that. As such, the time is not compensable.



Dated: March 16, 2026

Judge Michael J. Finkle