

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
3 AT TACOMA

4 JEAN PIERRE REY and ILZE
5 SILARASA,

6 Plaintiffs,

7 v.

8 MICHEL REY, et al.,

9 Defendants.

CASE NO. C14-5093 BHS

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFFS'
MOTION AND GRANTING
DEFENDANTS' PROPOSED
CONDITIONS

10 This matter comes before the Court on Defendants Builders Surplus Northwest
11 Inc., Nevawa, Inc., Michel Rey, Renee Rey, US Growing Investments Inc., US
12 Investment Group Corporation, and Visitrade, Inc.'s ("Defendants") response to the
13 Court's order to show cause (Dkt. 45) and Plaintiffs Jean Pierre Rey and Ilze Silarasa's
14 ("Plaintiffs") motion (Dkt. 46). The Court has considered the pleadings filed in support of
15 and in opposition to the motions and the remainder of the file and hereby grants
16 Defendants' proposed conditions and denies Plaintiffs' motion for the reasons stated
17 herein.

18 **PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

19 On April 10, 2014, the Court denied Plaintiffs' motion to appoint a receiver and
20 ordered that "Defendants show cause, if any they may have, why the Court should not
21 enter an order requiring that [certain conceded] conditions be imposed." Dkt. 41. On
22 May 2, 2014, Defendants responded. Dkt. 45. In that response, Defendants asserted that

1 they attempted to agree to stipulated conditions with Plaintiffs, but that Plaintiffs objected
2 to using corporate assets to pay for attorneys' fees. *Id.*

3 On May 6, 2014, Plaintiffs filed the instant motion requesting an order prohibiting
4 use of corporate assets to pay attorneys' fees or leave to respond to Defendants' response
5 to the Court's show cause. Dkt. 46. On May 19, 2014, Defendants responded. Dkt. 47.
6 On May 23, 2014, Plaintiffs replied. Dkt. 48.

7 DISCUSSION

8 Plaintiffs argue that the Court should exercise its inherent authority and
9 supervisory powers to protect the corporate assets by prohibiting the corporations from
10 paying Defendants Michel and Renee Rey's attorney's fees. Dkt. 48 at 2-3. The Court
11 declines to exercise its authority in such a manner. Therefore, the Court denies Plaintiffs'
12 motion. Moreover, the Court finds that the conditions set forth in Defendants' proposed
13 order (Dkt. 45-1) are appropriate and will enter that proposed order as an order of the
14 Court.

15 ORDER

16 Therefore, it is hereby **ORDERED** that Plaintiffs' motion (Dkt. 46) is **DENIED**
17 and Defendants' proposed conditions (Dkt. 45) are **GRANTED**.

18 Dated this 28th day of May, 2014.

19
20 

21 BENJAMIN H. SETTLE
22 United States District Judge