

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
7 AT SEATTLE

8 LVB-OGDEN MARKETING, LLC,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 DAVID S. BINGHAM, et al.,

12 Defendants.

C18-243 TSZ

MINUTE ORDER

13 The following Minute Order is made by direction of the Court, the Honorable
14 Thomas S. Zilly, United States District Judge:

15 (1) Currently pending before the Court is a series of motions to dismiss (docket
16 nos. 85, 87, 89, 90, and 115), a motion for relief from deadline (docket no. 103), and a
17 motion for protective order (docket no. 105).

18 a. **Motions to Dismiss:** Before the Court is (1) Defendant Henry
19 Dean's Motion for Order of Dismissal Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) or in the
20 Alternative to Show Cause, docket no. 85 ("Dean's 41(b) Motion"); (2) Defendant
21 Henry Dean, in his Capacity as Trustee of the Sharon Graham Bingham 2007
22 Trust's, Motion to Dismiss, docket no. 87 ("Trustee's Motion"); (3) Motion to
23 Dismiss by David S. Bingham, Sharon Bingham, Christopher Bingham, Kelly
Bingham, Bingo Investments, LLC, and CCRB Enterprises, docket no. 89
("Judgment Debtors' Motion"); (4) Henry Dean and BGH Holdings, LLC's
Motion to Dismiss, docket no. 90 ("BGH Motion"); and (5) SKBB Enterprises,
LLC's Motion to Dismiss, docket no. 115 ("SKBB Motion"). The legal theories
and arguments presented in these motions largely overlap and seek dismissal of
the First Amended and Verified Complaint, docket no. 82 (the "Amended
Complaint") under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1) for lack of subject
matter jurisdiction, 12(b)(6) for failure to state a claim, 12(b)(7) for failure to join

1 indispensable parties, and 41(b) for failure to comply with Court order. The Court
2 rules on these issues and the pending motions as follows:

3 i. Plaintiff has complied with the Court’s April 25, 2018,
4 Minute Order, docket no. 69, ordering Plaintiff to file a verified
5 complaint.

6 ii. The Court concludes it has ancillary jurisdiction over the
7 claims for declaratory judgment and relief under Washington’s Uniform
8 Fraudulent Transfer Act (UFTA) asserted in the Amended Complaint.
9 *Peacock v. Thomas*, 516 U.S. 349, 356 (1996). On or around July 27,
10 2009, LVB-Ogden Marketing Corporation filed the underlying lawsuit in
11 the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois. *See*
12 Amended Complaint, Exhibit B (later assigned case number 09-cv-4518)
13 (the “Underlying Lawsuit”). On October 29, 2009, the Northern District
14 of Illinois granted LVB-Ogden Marketing Corporation’s “Motion to
15 Substitute Party Plaintiff LVB-Ogden Marketing, LLC in the place of
16 LVB-Ogden Marketing Corporation” Underlying Lawsuit, docket
17 no. 33. LVB-Ogden Marketing, LLC is the named plaintiff in these
18 supplemental proceedings and the Court concludes that LVB-Ogden
19 Marketing, LLC is the proper judgment creditor for purposes of
20 concluding that the Court has ancillary jurisdiction over the instant
21 dispute. Neither Washington’s Trust and Estate Dispute Resolution Act
22 (TEDRA) nor Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 69 divest the Court of its
23 ancillary jurisdiction. *See Thomas, Head & Greisen Emps. Trust v.*
Buster, 95 F.3d 1449, 1454–55 (9th Cir. 1996). For these reasons, the
Court declines to dismiss the Amended Complaint under Rule 12(b)(1).

iii. The Court incorporates by reference the arguments and
rulings made at the May 3, 2018, hearing. *See* docket 81 (motion hearing
transcript). At that hearing the Court rejected Defendants’ arguments that
Plaintiff has failed to state its UFTA and declaratory relief claims. Since
then, Plaintiff has filed the Amended Complaint which has bolstered the
allegations contained in the original complaint at issue during the hearing.
The Court concludes that Plaintiff has properly plead its claim for
declaratory judgment and relief under the UFTA consistent with Federal
Rules of Civil Procedure 8(a) and 12(b)(6).¹ *See Aqua-Chem, Inc. v.*
Marine Sys., Inc., No. C13–2280JLR, 2014 WL 795922, at *3–4 (W.D.

¹ That Plaintiff has already registered with this Court the judgment from the Underlying
Lawsuit does not somehow render its declaratory relief or UFTA claims implausible. As the
Amended Complaint makes clear, the instant litigation is an effort to assist Plaintiff in enforcing
that judgment.

1 Wash. Feb. 27, 2002) (the definition of “transfer” under the UFTA is to
2 be construed as broad as possible to include both direct and indirect
3 dispositions of assets); RCW 19.40.081(2)(a) (permitting a judgment
4 creditor to recover the value of an asset that has been fraudulently
5 transferred, irrespective of whether the fraudulent transferee still
6 possesses that asset).² Likewise, the Amended Complaint is not subject
7 to dismissal on statute of limitations grounds. The vast majority of the
8 allegedly fraudulent transfers took place within the four-year limitations
9 period identified in RCW 19.40.091(1). For those limited transfers that
10 allegedly occurred outside of the limitations period, the Court concludes
11 that the Amended Complaint contains enough allegations to warrant
12 application of the discovery rule contained in the statute of limitations for
13 fraud at this stage of the litigation. *See Freitag v. McGhie*, 133 Wash. 2d
14 816, 821 (1997). Defendants will have the opportunity to test these
15 allegations during discovery. The Court therefore declines to dismiss the
16 Amended Complaint under Rule 12(b)(6).

17
18 iv. Plaintiff has joined all necessary parties sufficient to
19 withstand dismissal under Rule 12(b)(7). The Court concludes that it can
20 accord complete relief among the existing parties and Defendants have
21 not identified any absent party that has a legally protected interest in this
22 lawsuit. *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 19(a)(1)*. The Court declines to dismiss the
23 Amended Complaint for failure to join any necessary parties.

v. For the foregoing reasons, the Court DENIES Dean’s 41(b)
Motion, docket no. 85, the Trustee’s Motion, docket no. 87, the Judgment
Debtors’ Motion, docket no. 89, the BGH Motion, docket no. 90, and the
SKBB Motion, docket no. 115.

b. **Motion for Relief from Deadline:** The Motion for Order Granting
Relief from Court Deadline Regarding Preliminary Injunction Briefing, docket no.
103, is DENIED. The pending motion for Preliminary Injunction, docket no. 4
(the “Preliminary Injunction Motion”) is ripe for the Court’s review.

c. **Motion for Protective Order:** Plaintiff’s Motion for Protective
Order, docket no. 105, is DENIED. The Court has determined that no diversity
jurisdiction exists, but that this enforcement proceeding may continue under the

² Defendants argue that Plaintiff’s claims fail because the trust contains a spendthrift
provision. *See Judgment Debtors’ Motion at 5*. Courts routinely look past the language
contained in a trust and look to the conduct of the relevant actors in assessing the extent to which
a trust is entitled to spendthrift protection. *See, e.g., Britannica Holdings Ltd. v. Greer*, 127
Wash. App. 926, 935 (2005).

1 Court's ancillary jurisdiction. However, Defendants may challenge the Court's
2 jurisdiction at any time. Correspondingly, Defendants may depose LVB-Ogden
3 Marketing, LLC's Rule 30(b)(6) witness about facts pertaining to jurisdiction,
4 including but not limited to whether the District Court for the Northern District of
Illinois had jurisdiction over the underlying action. Additionally, the parties may
proceed with the depositions of Steve Weiss, Joel Solomon, and James Raved, but
the Court will not delay its ruling on the Preliminary Injunction Motion.

5 (2) The parties are DIRECTED to confer regarding the Proposed Case
6 Management Order submitted by Plaintiff at docket no. 99 and, within fourteen (14) days
7 of this Minute Order, submit a joint status report including a proposed trial date and
8 pretrial schedule.

9 (3) The Clerk is directed to send a copy of this Minute Order to all counsel of
10 record.

11 Dated this 27th day of July, 2018.

12 William M. McCool

13 Clerk

14 s/Karen Dews

15 Deputy Clerk