10

11

12

13

15

18

20

21

22

23

24

25



4

5

Case Number: 10-0021-CV

E-FILED CNMI SUPERIOR COURT E-filed: Jun 28 2011 4:41PM Clerk Review: N/A Filing ID: 38377874

FOR PUBLICATION

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT

OF THE

COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

MARITES A. AURELIO, ET. AL.,	CIVIL ACTION NO. 10-0021
Plaintiffs,)) ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S
Vs.	MOTION FOR THE SEIZURE OF REAL PROPERTY
BIENVENIDA C. CAMACHO, ET. AL.,	, INCLEASE
Defendants.))

I. SYNOPSIS

THIS MATTER came on for hearing on May 26, 2011 at 1:30 p.m. in Courtroom 223A on Plaintiff's Motion for the Seizure of Real Property pursuant to an Order in Aid of Judgment. Counsel Joshua Berger appeared on behalf of Plaintiff. Counsel Reynaldo Yana appeared on behalf of Defendant. Both parties have submitted their written arguments regarding this Motion. Based on oral arguments, the parties briefs, and the records and files in this matter, the Court is prepared to issue its ruling below.

II. BACKGROUND

This matter commenced as a labor action by several employees who were in an employment relationship with Defendant and were the victims of, as stated by the Administrative Hearing Officer, "flagrant violations of numerous provisions of the Non-Resident Workers Act and its Rules and Regulations." This was with respect to Defendant's treatment of Plaintiff. The Hearing Officer also stated that, "fraud and deceit permeate every aspect of Defendants' business activities."

As a result of the Labor Hearing, the Court found Defendant liable for unpaid wage claims and overtime, unauthorized deductions, and miscellaneous other violations and rendered a finding of liability of Defendant to Plaintiff in the sum of \$157,511.20, which at the time of filing this Motion was in the sum of approximately \$162,426.15.

This Court issued a Judgment in said amount and Plaintiff is now seeking enforcement of the Judgment requesting that the Court order Defendant's real property in the Philippines be sold or transferred to satisfy the Judgment. As of February 11, 2011, Defendant has only paid a total of \$75.00 on said Judgment.

III. DISCUSSION

The issue before the Court is whether or not Defendant's claim of a homestead exemption under 7 CMC § 4210(c) prevents Plaintiff from proceeding on Defendant's real property located outside of this jurisdiction.

It is undisputed that Defendant's real property is a townhouse in the Republic of Philippines and that Defendant does not live there, but resides with her family at her dwelling on Saipan.

The statute in question reads in pertinent part:

Land and interest in Land. All interest in land, **but any interest owned solely by a judgment debtor, in his or her own right,** may be ordered sold or transferred under an order in aid of judgment if the Court making the order deems that justice so requires and finds as a fact that after the sale or transfer, the debtor will have sufficient land remaining to support himself or herself and those persons directly dependent on the debtor according to recognized local custom and the law of the Commonwealth. No person not of Northern Marianas descent may acquire any interest in such land, by sale, transfer, or otherwise, except as otherwise provided by law.

Although Defendant claims that said statutory authority is the basis for a claimed exemption, the same statute conversely authorizes the Court to transfer property to Plaintiff. Pursuant to 7 CMC § 4102(c),

1 | th
2 | de
3 | tc
4 | si
5 | E

this Court, if it deems that justice so requires, and if an interest in land is owned solely by the judgment debtor, may issue an order that land be transferred or sold pursuant to an Order in Aid of Judgment in order to satisfy a judgment or to partially satisfy a judgment. The only caveat is that the debtor must have sufficient land remaining after such a transfer to live upon. This is commonly known as the "Homestead Exemption."

Here, Defendant cannot claim the homestead protection in CMC § 4210(c) because the exemption is limited, as a matter of law, to real property within the CNMI. In other words, this code section has no "extra territorial" force. *See In re Drenttel*, 302 B.R. 26 (D.Minn. 2003); *In re Peters*, 91 B.R. 401, 403 (W.D. Tex. 1988). "Homestead statutes can have no extra-territorial force; they must be construed to apply solely to homesteads within the state." *Drenttel at 32*.

The Court notes Defendant's arguments, that Plaintiff, on the one hand is saying that the statutory exemption has no relation to property outside the CNMI and then on the other hand, wishes to execute on such property outside the jurisdiction. However, a Court Order to Defendant to transfer by deed, real property in another jurisdiction, would not raise any inconsistency in said statute because it would be an Order to Defendant, subject to the jurisdiction of this Court, and further, enforceable by contempt proceedings for disobeyance.

In addition, the Court finds that Defendant has two pieces of property, one a long term leasehold of fifteen years in the CNMI where she lives with her present husband and others, and one a "condominium" in the Philippines where her older sister resides. The debtor is actually residing on Saipan. By her own testimony, Ms. Camacho has resided in Saipan since 1987, and only makes erratic and sporadic trips to return to the Philippines, for medical reasons. The Court therefore finds that it would be in the interest of Justice to have said property transferred and that after a sale or transfer of Defendant's said real property that Defendant will have sufficient land remaining to support herself. Accordingly, the homestead exemption claimed by Defendant is hereby denied.

Plaintiff's Motion is hereby granted.

1	SO ORDERED this <u>28th</u> day of <u>June</u> , 2011.
2	
3	/s/
4	David A. Wiseman, Associate Judge
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19 20	
20	
22 23	
23	
±-	