

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

JAMES A. BIGELOW,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
NORTHWEST TRUSTEE SERVICES,  
INC., et al.,  
  
Defendants.

CASE NO. C14-5798 BHS  
  
ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION FOR A TEMPORARY  
RESTRAINING ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff James Bigelow's ("Bigelow") ex parte motion for a temporary restraining order (Dkt. 10). The Court has considered the pleadings filed in support of the motion and the remainder of the file and hereby denies the motion for the reasons stated herein.

**I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

On October 7, 2014, Bigelow filed a verified complaint against Defendants Northwest Trustee Services, Inc., Green Tree Servicing, LLC, and Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc. ("Defendants") alleging violations of the Fair Debt Collections

1 Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, *et seq.* (“FDCPA”), the Washington Deed of Trust Act,  
2 RCW Chapter 61.24 (“DTA”), and the Washington Consumer Protection Act, RCW  
3 Chapter 19.86 (“CPA”). Dkt. 1. That same day, Bigelow filed an ex parte motion for a  
4 temporary restraining order to prevent the foreclosure of his home scheduled for October  
5 10, 2014. Dkt. 2. The Court denied Bigelow’s motion. Dkt. 3.

6 On November 13, 2014, Bigelow filed another ex parte motion for a temporary  
7 restraining order to prevent the foreclosure of his home, which is now scheduled for  
8 November 14, 2014. Dkt. 10. Bigelow also filed an amended complaint that day. Dkt.  
9 11.

## 10 II. DISCUSSION

11 In this case, Bigelow’s motion fails for procedural and substantive reasons. First,  
12 the Court is only authorized to grant an ex parte motion if (1) specific facts are alleged  
13 showing that immediate harm will be suffered if relief is not granted before the adverse  
14 party may be heard and (2) the movant states his efforts to give notice and reasons why  
15 notice should not be required. Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(b)(1). Bigelow has again failed to show  
16 that he attempted to give any notice to Defendants. Bigelow has also failed to show why  
17 notice should not be required in this case. The Court therefore denies Bigelow’s motion  
18 for failure to meet the procedural requirements under the federal rules of procedure.

19 Second, the only claim entitling Bigelow to injunctive relief is his DTA claim.  
20 The FDCPA and the CPA claim entitle Bigelow only to monetary relief. The DTA  
21 claim, however, entitles Bigelow to injunctive relief if Defendants have failed to follow  
22 the strict procedures set forth in the DTA. Under the DTA, the Court shall require, as a

1 condition of granting any injunction, that the applicant deposit with the Court the amount  
2 due on the obligation secured by the deed of trust and the Court may not restrain a  
3 scheduled foreclosure unless the applicant has given the trustee five days notice of the  
4 injunction hearing. RCW 61.24.130. Again, Bigelow has failed to show that he will  
5 make the requisite deposit or that he gave the trustee five days notice of any hearing or  
6 request for a hearing on an injunction. The Court therefore denies Bigelow's motion for  
7 failure to comply with the DTA.

8 **III. ORDER**

9 Therefore, it is hereby **ORDERED** that Bigelow's motion for a temporary  
10 restraining order (Dkt. 10) is **DENIED**.

11 Dated this 13<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2014.

12  
13 

14 

---

BENJAMIN H. SETTLE  
15 United States District Judge  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22