

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

ROCKIN ARTWORK, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

BRAVADO INTERNATIONAL
GROUP MERCHANDISING
SERVICES, INC., a
California corporation; AUTHENTIC
HENDRIX, LLC, a Washington limited
liability company; and EXPERIENCE
HENDRIX, a Washington limited
liability company,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C15-1492-JCC

ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on the motion for registration of judgment by Defendants Bravado International Group Merchandising Services, Inc., Authentic Hendrix, LLC, and Experience Hendrix, LLC (Dkt. No. 146).¹ Defendants seek to register the Court’s judgment in other jurisdictions, in particular California and Nevada. (*Id.* at 1-2.)

Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 62(a), a district court judgment becomes final and enforceable 10 days after entry of judgment. At that time, the prevailing plaintiff is entitled to execute upon the

¹ Authentic and Experience joined Bravado’s motion. (*See* Dkt. No. 147.)

1 judgment. *Columbia Pictures Television, Inc. v. Krypton Columbia Pictures Television, Inc.*, 259
2 F.3d 1186, 1197 (9th Cir. 2001). “Pending appeal, however, the judgment is only enforceable in
3 the district in which it was rendered, unless the judgment is ‘registered’ in another district by
4 court order.” *Id.* (quoting 28 U.S.C. § 1963). Section 1963 provides:

5 A judgment in an action for the recovery of money or property entered in
6 any . . . district court . . . may be registered by filing a certified copy of the
7 judgment in any other district . . . when the judgment has become final by appeal
8 or expiration of the time for appeal or when ordered by the court that entered the
9 judgment for good cause shown. . . . A judgment so registered shall have the
10 same effect as a judgment of the district court of the district where registered and
11 may be enforced in like manner.

12 A likely absence of assets in this jurisdiction, coupled with a likelihood that there are recoverable
13 assets in another jurisdiction, is generally sufficient to show good cause for registration
14 elsewhere. *Columbia Pictures*, 259 F.3d at 1197-98. Other factors supporting good cause include
15 whether registering the judgment elsewhere may help prevent the debtor from transferring or
16 concealing property while the matter is on appeal, and whether the debtor posted a supersedeas
17 bond. *See Chicago Downs Ass’n, Inc. v. Chase*, 944 F.2d 366, 371-72 (7th Cir. 1991).

18 Here, the evidence suggests that Rockin’s assets are likely held in California or Nevada.
19 Rockin’s complaint states that it is a Nevada limited liability company “with its principle [sic]
20 place of business located in Nevada and California and with minimum business contacts in the
21 state of Washington.” (Dkt. No. 1 at 2.) Rockin’s business address is in Los Angeles. (Dkt. No.
22 75-6 at 2.) Rockin has two owners: Andrew Pitsicalis and Leon Hendrix. (*Id.* at 3.) Pitsicalis
23 resides in Los Angeles. (Dkt. No. 79-4 at 1.) Although Rockin’s counsel claimed Hendrix was a
24 resident of Washington, (Dkt. No. 63 at 3), Hendrix himself has never submitted any sworn
25 declaration. Rather, the available evidence suggests that Hendrix resides and has an office in Los
26 Angeles. (*See* Dkt. No. 146 at 2.) Rockin’s principal licensing agent appears to be located in
California. (Dkt. No. 75 at 2.) Rockin’s accountant is located in California. (Dkt. No. 103 at 9;
Dkt. No. 111 at 1.). Defendants know of no evidence that Rockin has assets in Washington.

1 Defendants argue that, in light of this evidence, as well as the fact that Rockin has not
2 filed a supersedeas bond, registration of judgment in other jurisdictions is appropriate. (Dkt. No.
3 146 at 3.) Defendants fear that otherwise “Rockin will attempt to drain or hide its assets while
4 the appeal is pending.” (*Id.*)

5 Rockin failed to respond to Defendants’ motion. The Court considers this “as an
6 admission that the motion has merit.” W.D. Wash. Local Civ. R. 7(b)(2).

7 Accordingly, the Court finds that Defendants has made a sufficient showing that:

8 (1) Rockin is unlikely to have sufficient (if any) assets in Washington;

9 (2) Rockin’s assets are likely located in California and Nevada; and

10 (3) Rockin has not filed any supersedeas bond, and given its behavior in this case, there
11 is a danger that Rockin will transfer assets or otherwise try to render itself immune from
12 collection during the pendency of its appeal.

13 Defendants’ motion (Dkt. No. 146) is GRANTED. The Court ORDERS that Defendants
14 shall be allowed to register the Court’s judgment in any other jurisdictions where Rockin’s assets
15 may be found, including California and Nevada

16 DATED this 4th day of April 2017.

17
18
19
20
21 

22
23
24 John C. Coughenour
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE