

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

Kingvision Pay-Per-View, Ltd.,
Plaintiff,
v.
Israel R. Rodriguez, et al.,
Defendants.

NO. C 02-00981 MJJ

**ORDER GRANTING RENEWAL OF
JUDGMENT AND RENEWAL OF
JUDGMENT**

Presently before the Court is Plaintiff’s Application for Renewal of Judgment.¹ Pursuant to a timely and properly filed application, Plaintiff moves to renew a September 17, 2002 and an October 2, 2002 judgment.² See Fed. R. Civ. P. 69(a); Cal. Code Civ. P. §§ 683.110, *et seq.*

Plaintiff seeks a judgment of \$6,748.12, which includes the original judgment amount of \$5,487.50, plus \$1,260.62 in interest³ accrued since entry of the original judgment.

¹ (Application and Declaration for Renewal of Judgment, hereafter, “Application,” Docket Item No. 28.)

² On September 17, 2002, the Court granted Plaintiff default judgment in the amount of \$2,250.00. (See Application, Ex. 1, Order Granting Plaintiff’s Motion for Default Judgment; Reducing Damages, Docket Item No. 28-1; see also Docket Item No. 21.) On October 2, 2002, the Court granted Plaintiff’s request for attorney fees and costs in the amount of \$3,237.50. (See Application, Ex. 1, Order Granting Plaintiff’s Request for Attorneys’ Fees and Costs Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 605, Docket Item No. 28-1; see also Docket Item No. 23.)

³ Calculated at an interest rate of 2.5%.

1 The Court finds that Plaintiff has properly moved to renew judgment under Cal. Code Civ. P.
2 §§ 683.110, *et seq.* Accordingly, the Court GRANTS Plaintiff's Application for Renewal of
3 Judgment.

4 The Court hereby enters judgment in favor of Plaintiff Kingvision Pay-Per-View, Ltd. and
5 against Defendants Israel R. Rodriguez, individually d/b/a Altamar Restaurant, and Maria
6 Rodriguez, individually d/b/a Altamar Restaurant, in the amount of \$5,487.50, plus \$1,260.62 in
7 interest, for a total judgment of \$6,748.12.⁴

8
9
10 Dated: February 2, 2012



JAMES WARE
United States District Chief Judge

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26 _____
27 ⁴ Under California law, "there is no statutory requirement that the notice of renewal [of
28 judgment] be served on the judgment debtor in order for the renewal to be effective." See Goldman
v. Simpson, 160 Cal. App. 4th 255, 262 n.4 (Cal. Ct. App. 2008).

1 **THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT COPIES OF THIS ORDER HAVE BEEN DELIVERED TO:**

2 David J. Cook Cook@SqueezeBloodFromTurnip.com
3 Thomas Peter Riley TPRLAW@att.net

4 **Dated: February 2, 2012**

Richard W. Wieking, Clerk

5
6 **By: /s/ JW Chambers**
7 **Susan Imbriani**
8 **Courtroom Deputy**

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28