1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 PARADISE NORTHWEST INC., 11 No. 2:09-cv-02027-MCE-DAD Plaintiff, 12 13 MEMORANDUM AND ORDER V. 14 SATVINDER PALSINGH RANDHAWA, LORNA MARIE RANDHAWA dba GREAT 15 EASTERN EXPORT & TRADING COMPANY, 16 Defendants. 17 ----00000----18 19 20 Presently before the Court is a Motion by Plaintiff Paradise Northwest ("Plaintiff") requesting that this Court issue a writ 21 22 of attachment on the property of Defendants Satvinder Palsingh Randhawa and Lorna Marie Randhawa ("Defendants") pursuant to 23 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 64. 24 25 /// 26 /// 27 /// 28 /// 1

However, California's attachment statutes are strictly construed. See Jordan-Lyon Productions, Ltd. v. Cineplex Odeon Corp., 29 Cal. App. 4th 1459, 1466 (1994); Hobbs v. Weiss, 73 Cal. App. 4th 76, 79-80 (1999); Vershbow v. Reiner, 231 Cal. App. 3d 879, 882-83 (1991); Nakasone v. Randall, 129 Cal. App. 3d 757, 761 (1982). The application and declarations submitted by Plaintiff do not contain all statements required for the issuance of a writ of attachment. See Cal. Code of Civ. Pro. §§ 484.020, 485.210 (both requiring certain sworn statements to be included as part of an application). Since not all required sworn statements have been made to the Court, Plaintiff's Motion for a Writ of Attachment (Docket No. 25) is DENIED without prejudice.

Defendant's request for hearing (Docket No. 40) is DENIED as moot.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 12, 2010

MORRISON C. ENGLAND, (R.)
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE