

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
7

8 BP West Coast Products LLC,
9 Plaintiff,
10 v.
11 Crossroad Petroleum, Inc. et al.,
12 Defendants.

Case No.: 12cv665-JLS-JLB Lead Case

**ORDER FOR MONETARY
SANCTIONS**

13 AND RELATED CONSOLIDATED
14 ACTIONS

[ECF No. 631]

15 This matter is before the Court on a pending Order to Show Cause for failure to
16 comply with Section II.C. of Magistrate Judge Jill L. Burkhardt’s Civil Chambers Rules
17 and certain of this Court’s orders, all of which require all parties to appear in person at
18 mandatory settlement conferences. (ECF No. 631.) After careful review of the record, the
19 facts, and the applicable law, the Court hereby ORDERS that monetary sanctions be paid
20 by the following four defendants for failure to appear at the Mandatory Settlement
21 Conference held on October 18 and 19, 2016: (1) NP Petroleum Corp.; (2) Payam Sahih;
22 (3) William Kirmiz; and (4) Sahar Kirmiz.¹
23

24 _____
25
26 ¹ By separate order, this Court recommends terminating sanctions against the other defendants identified
27 in the pending Order to Show Cause who also failed to appear at the Mandatory Settlement Conference
28 held on October 18 and 19, 2016—Behzad Kianmahd, Nader Sahih, Rajesh Arora, Basel Hassounch, and
Parshotam S. Kamboj. (ECF Nos. 627; 628; 631.) This order is limited to the defendants against whom
monetary sanctions are appropriate—Defendants NP Petroleum Corp., Payam Sahih, William Kirmiz, and
Sahar Kirmiz.

1 **BACKGROUND**

2 As pled in the operative Fifth Amended Complaint, Defendant **NP Petroleum Corp.**
3 was the operator and franchisee of the gasoline service station located at 14114 Vanowen
4 St., Van Nuys, California 91405 (Facility No. 9633); Defendant **Payam Sahih** (along with
5 Defendant Nader Sahih) executed a Franchise Agreement Guaranty, personally
6 guaranteeing the obligations of Defendant NP Petroleum Corp. with respect to its Franchise
7 Agreements with Plaintiff; and Defendants **William Kirmiz** and **Sahar Kirmiz** executed
8 a Franchise Agreement Guaranty, personally guaranteeing the obligations of Defendant
9 Parshotam S. Kamboj with respect to his Franchise Agreement with BPWCP. (ECF No.
10 296-3 at ¶¶42, 57, 58.)

11 District Judge Sammartino’s December 14, 2015 and May 2, 2016 orders recount
12 the “repeated discovery misconduct” of Defendants NP Petroleum Corp., Payam Sahih,
13 William Kirmiz, and Sahar Kirmiz, which resulted in the district court granting in part
14 Plaintiff’s motions for sanctions.² (ECF Nos. 478; 498.) These defendants were among
15 the defendants referred to as “Motion 3 Defendants” who violated multiple court orders,
16 including a May 19, 2015, order granting in part Plaintiff’s motion to compel, (ECF No.
17 404); a May 28, 2015, order granting in part another of Plaintiff’s motions to compel, (ECF
18 No. 411); a June 2, 2015, order granting yet another of Plaintiff’s motions to compel, (ECF
19 No. 421); and/or a July 7, 2015, Minute Order directing the parties to meet and confer
20 regarding the Motion 3 Defendants’ non-compliance with the Court’s discovery orders,
21 (ECF No. 436).³ (ECF Nos. 448-11; 478 at 3.) The district court explicitly warned these
22
23

24 ² In addition to its attorneys’ fees and costs, in its motions, Plaintiff sought the terminating sanction of
25 default judgment in Plaintiff’s favor on its Fifth Amended Complaint and dismissal of any counterclaims.
26 (ECF Nos. 446; 447; 448.) The district court granted Plaintiff’s request for its attorneys’ fees and costs,
27 but denied Plaintiff’s request for default and dismissal against Defendants NP Petroleum Corp., Payam
28 Sahih, William Kirmiz, and Sahar Kirmiz (among others). (ECF No. 478.)

³ The district court labeled groups of defendants as Motion 1, Motion 2, and Motion 3 Defendants to
correspond with three motions for sanctions filed by Plaintiff against three groups of defendants based on
common sets of facts. As Judge Sammartino explained, “the alleged misconduct gets less severe with

1 defendants that failure to comply with discovery orders would result in terminating
2 sanctions. (ECF No. 478 at 16-17 (“the Court hereby **GIVES NOTICE** . . . that further
3 failure to comply with discovery orders or to meaningfully participate in discovery, even
4 absent an order to compel, **SHALL** result in entry of default judgment against them and
5 dismissal of their counterclaims pursuant to Rule 37(b)”).)

6 Magistrate Judge Jill L. Burkhardt held the first mandatory settlement conference
7 involving these defendants on June 8, 2016. Although many defendants failed to appear
8 or arrived more than an hour late, Defendants NP Petroleum Corp., Payam Sahih, William
9 Kirmiz, and Sahar Kirmiz all attended the June 8, 2016 mandatory settlement conference,
10 and thus, were *not* among the absent or late defendants.⁴ (ECF Nos. 548; 550.)

11 Subsequently, this Court held another mandatory settlement conference on October
12 18 and October 19, 2016. (ECF No. 627; 628.) Defendants NP Petroleum Corp., Payam
13 Sahih, William Kirmiz, and Sahar Kirmiz (among others) failed to appear. (*Id.*)
14 Accordingly, on October 21, 2016, this Court issued an Order to Show Cause in this case
15 instructing Defendants NP Petroleum Corp., Payam Sahih, William Kirmiz, and Sahar
16 Kirmiz that “on or before **November 4, 2016**,” they “**SHALL** each file a separate sworn
17 declaration informing the Court why they did not comply with Section II.C. of Magistrate
18 Judge Jill L. Burkhardt’s Civil Chambers Rules and this Court’s this Court’s orders.” (ECF
19 No. 631 (emphasis in original).) Defendants never filed a declaration (or any written
20 response) as required by the Court’s October 21, 2016 Order to Show Cause. (*See* ECF
21 No. 675.) Thus, this Court took the matter under submission without oral argument. (*Id.*)⁵
22
23

24 each motion, so that Motion 1 sets forth the most serious episodes of misconduct whereas Motion 3 details
25 the least serious.” (ECF No. 478 at 2.)

26 ⁴ Thirty-six defendants were ordered to show cause why sanctions should not issue against them because
27 they either failed to appear or were more than an hour late to the mandatory settlement conference held
28 on June 8, 2016. (*See* ECF Nos. 531; 532.) Of those thirty-six, twenty-eight received sanctions. (ECF
No. 550.)

⁵ Defendants’ counsel was critically injured in an accident *after* Defendants’ November 4, 2016 deadline.
(*See* ECF No. 657.) Due to counsel’s unavailability, the Court repeatedly continued its hearing on the

1 **LEGAL STANDARD**

2 “All federal courts are vested with inherent powers enabling them to manage their
3 cases and courtrooms effectively and to ensure obedience to their orders. . . . As a function
4 of this power, courts can dismiss cases in their entirety, bar witnesses, award attorney’s
5 fees and assess fines.” *Aloe Vera of Am., Inc. v. United States*, 376 F.3d 960, 964–65 (9th
6 Cir. 2004). “Sanctions are an appropriate response to ‘willful disobedience of a court
7 order . . . or when the losing party has acted in bad faith, vexatiously, wantonly, or for
8 oppressive reasons.’” *Id.* (citing *Fink v. Gomez*, 239 F.3d 989, 991 (9th Cir. 2001)); *see*
9 *also Adriana Int’l Corp. v. Thoeren*, 913 F.2d 1406, 1411 (9th Cir. 1990) (noting that a
10 “determination that an order was disobeyed is entitled to considerable weight” because
11 the judge issuing the order “is the best equipped to assess the circumstances of the non-
12 compliance” (quotation marks and citations omitted)). “Failure of counsel or of any party
13 to comply with any order of the court may be grounds for imposition by the court of
14 any and all sanctions authorized by statute or rule or within the inherent power of the
15 court, including, without limitation, dismissal of any actions, entry of default, finding of
16 contempt, imposition of monetary sanctions or attorneys’ fees and costs, and other lesser
17 sanctions.” CivLR 83.1.a.

18 **ANALYSIS & CONCLUSION**

19 Defendants NP Petroleum Corp., Payam Sahih, William Kirmiz, and Sahar Kirmiz
20 failed to appear for the court-ordered Mandatory Settlement Conference held on October
21 18-19, 2016. They have not provided any explanations for their failures to appear, much
22 less demonstrated that their failures to appear were for reasons outside their control. The
23 Court concludes monetary sanctions should issue against Defendant NP Petroleum Corp.,
24 Payam Sahih, William Kirmiz, and Sahar Kirmiz as follows:

25
26
27
28

Order to Show Cause. (ECF Nos. 643; 658; 668.) However, having received no written response to the
Court’s Order to Show Cause, this matter was deemed appropriate for decision without oral argument.

1 1. On or before **November 10, 2017**, **Defendant NP Petroleum Corp. is**
2 **ORDERED to pay monetary sanctions in the amount of \$500.00** to the Miscellaneous
3 Fines, Penalties and Forfeitures, Not Otherwise Classified, fund of the United States
4 Treasury **and file a Notice of Payment** in this case. *See* CivLR 83.1. In making its
5 determination that \$500.00 is an appropriate sanction, the Court has considered
6 Defendant's failure to appear for the court-ordered Mandatory Settlement Conference held
7 on October 18-19, 2016, its prior conduct and sanctions orders (*see* ECF Nos. 404; 411;
8 421; 436; 478; 498), and its failure to timely pay court-ordered monetary sanctions owed
9 to Plaintiff (*see* ECF Nos. 576; 652).

10 2. On or before **November 10, 2017**, **Defendant Payam Sahih is ORDERED**
11 **to pay monetary sanctions in the amount of \$500.00** to the Miscellaneous Fines,
12 Penalties and Forfeitures, Not Otherwise Classified, fund of the United States Treasury
13 **and file a Notice of Payment** in this case. *See* CivLR 83.1. In making its determination
14 that \$500.00 is an appropriate sanction, the Court has considered Defendant's failure to
15 appear for the court-ordered Mandatory Settlement Conference held on October 18-19,
16 2016, Defendant's prior conduct and sanctions orders (*see* ECF Nos. 411; 421; 436; 478;
17 498), and Defendant's failure to timely pay court-ordered monetary sanctions owed to
18 Plaintiff (*see* ECF Nos. 576; 652).

19 3. On or before **November 10, 2017**, **Defendant William Kirmiz is**
20 **ORDERED to pay monetary sanctions in the amount of \$400.00** to the Miscellaneous
21 Fines, Penalties and Forfeitures, Not Otherwise Classified, fund of the United States
22 Treasury **and file a Notice of Payment** in this case. *See* CivLR 83.1. In making its
23 determination that \$400.00 is an appropriate sanction, the Court has considered
24 Defendant's failure to appear for the court-ordered Mandatory Settlement Conference held
25 on October 18-19, 2016 and Defendant's prior conduct and sanctions orders (*see* ECF Nos.
26 404; 411; 421; 436; 478; 498).

1 4. On or before **November 10, 2017**, Defendant Sahar Kirmiz is **ORDERED**
2 **to pay monetary sanctions in the amount of \$400.00** to the Miscellaneous Fines,
3 Penalties and Forfeitures, Not Otherwise Classified, fund of the United States Treasury
4 **and file a Notice of Payment** in this case. *See* CivLR 83.1. In making its determination
5 that \$400.00 is an appropriate sanction, the Court has considered Defendant's failure to
6 appear for the court-ordered Mandatory Settlement Conference held on October 18-19,
7 2016 and Defendant's prior conduct and sanctions orders (*see* ECF Nos. 404; 411; 421;
8 436; 478; 498).

9 Finally, the Court hereby **GIVES NOTICE** to all sanctioned Defendants that future
10 failure to comply with Court orders, including failure to comply with this Order, **SHALL**
11 result in a recommendation from this Court that judgment be entered against them and any
12 of their counterclaims be dismissed.

13 Dated: October 13, 2017

14 
15 Hon. Jill L. Burkhardt
16 United States Magistrate Judge
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28