

Dockets.Justia.com

United States District Court For the Northern District of California A common mistake is to assume that the scope of offending conduct can be fleshed out with supplemental declarations. Not so. The scope of offending conduct is limited to the well-pled allegations in the operative complaint served on the defaulting defendant, for this is the pleading to which the recipient had to decide whether to appear and defend versus concede by default. In other words, before a motion for a default judgment is filed, plaintiff should make sure the operative complaint served on the defaulting defendant provides all of the allegations necessary. *Alan Neuman Productions., Inc. v. Albright*, 862 F.2d 1388, 1393 (9th Cir. 1988), *cert. denied*, 493 U.S. 858 (1989).

4. With respect to any motion for default judgment, plaintiff must file all of the declarations and relevant documents necessary to show the damages sought. The motion should explain with specificity the damages flowing from (and only from) the well-pled, specific allegations in the complaint. Please be reasonable. General unspecified damage claims will not be sufficient. *Eitel v. McCool*, 782 F.2d 1470, 1471–72 (9th Cir. 1986).

5. Once judgment is entered, a new lawsuit against the same defendant by the same plaintiff based on the same transaction and occurrence will be barred by *res judicata*.

Dated: April 3, 2015.

WILLIAM ALSUP UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE