Li v. A Perfect Day	Franchise, Inc Doc. 510
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11	SAN JOSE DIVISION
12	GUIFU LI, MENG WANG, FANG DAI, LIN) Case No.: 10-CV-01189-LHK CUI, and ZHONG YU, on behalf of themselves)
13	and all others similarly situated,
14	Plaintiffs, Plaintiffs, SERVICE
15	A PERFECT DAY FRANCHISE, INC., a
16	California Corporation, et al.,
17	Defendants.
18	
19	As a procedural prerequisite to granting default judgment, plaintiffs must first establish that
20	the defendants were served with written notice of the application at least 7 days before the hearing
21	on the default judgment. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 55(b)(2) ("If the party against whom a default
22	judgment is sought has appeared personally or by a representative, that party or its representative
23	must be served with written notice of the application at least 7 days before the hearing."). Failure
24	to satisfy Rule 55(b)(2)'s notice requirement is a serious procedural error usually justifying
25	reversal on appeal or the setting aside of a default. <i>In re Roxford Foods, Inc.</i> , 12 F.3d 875, 879
26	(9th Cir. 1993).
27	
28	Case No.: 10-CV-01189-LHK ORDER REGARDING PROOF OF SERVICE
	Dockets.Justia.com

Defendants Huan Zou and Tailiang Li became ECF filers before the motion for default judgment was filed by Plaintiffs on May 9, 2012. Zou and Tailiang Li therefore received notice of the default judgment motion more than two weeks in advance of the hearing, thus meeting the requirements of Rule 55(b)(2). Additionally, as Zou and Tailiang Li are the sole owners of Perfect Day and Minjian, respectively, it is reasonable to conclude that Perfect Day and Minjian also received notice of Plaintiffs' application for default judgment.

Plaintiffs, however, have failed to file a proof of service of the motion for default judgment as to defendants Jun Ma or Jin Qiu. By 5:00 p.m., Wednesday May 23, 2012, Plaintiffs shall either file a proof of service establishing that Mr. Ma and Ms. Qiu were served in compliance with Rule 55(b)(2), or, if service has not yet been effected on these defendants, file a statement indicating how they intend to proceed in light of this deficiency.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 22, 2012

United States District Judge