

Slip Copy, 2010 WL 582597 (C.A.9 (Cal.))
 (Not Selected for publication in the Federal Reporter)
 (Cite as: 2010 WL 582597 (C.A.9 (Cal.)))

Only the Westlaw citation is currently available. This case was not selected for publication in the Federal Reporter.

Not for Publication in West's Federal Reporter See Fed. Rule of Appellate Procedure 32.1 generally governing citation of judicial decisions issued on or after Jan. 1, 2007. See also Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3. (Find CTA9 Rule 36-3)

United States Court of Appeals,
 Ninth Circuit.
 PRUDENCE CORPORATION, Plaintiff/
 Appellee,
 v.
 SHRED-IT AMERICA, INC., Defendant/
 Appellant.
No. 08-56759.

Submitted Feb. 11, 2010. ^{FN*}

^{FN*} The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. See *Fed. R.App. P. 34(a)(2)*.

Filed Feb. 18, 2010.

Peter C. Lagarias, Lagarias and Boulter, Robert S. Boulter, The Legal Solution Group, LLP, San Rafael, CA, for Plaintiff/Appellee.

Shelly Carissa Gopaul, Bryan Cave, LLP, Santa Monica, CA, **William Lowell Killion**, Faegre & Benson, LLP, Minneapolis, MN, for Defendant/Appellant.

Appeal From the United States District Court for the Central District of California, **Andrew J. Guilford**, District Judge, Presiding. D.C. No. CV-07-00555-AG-RNB.

Before **THOMAS** and **SILVERMAN**, Circuit Judges, and **BEISTLINE**,^{FN**} Chief District Judge.

^{FN**} The Honorable **Ralph R. Beistline**, United States District Judge for the District of Alaska, sitting by designation.

MEMORANDUM ^{FN***}

^{FN***} This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

*1 Shred-it America, Inc. (SAI) appeals the district court's judgment in favor of Prudence Corporation (Prudence) in Prudence's diversity action alleging breach of a franchise agreement between SAI, the franchisor, and Prudence, the franchisee. The district court determined that SAI had breached the franchise agreement by failing to timely submit proposed renewal terms to Prudence. The district court ordered the renewal of the franchise agreement under specific performance and declaratory relief, and awarded attorneys' fees and costs to Prudence. SAI challenges the court's finding of breach, and argues that the court's order of specific performance constitutes an improper rewriting of the contract. We disagree.

There is substantial evidence to support the court's finding of breach. SAI's delay of well over a year in even attempting to renew the franchise agreement was entirely unreasonable and harmful to Prudence. None of SAI's excuses for delay are legit-

Slip Copy, 2010 WL 582597 (C.A.9 (Cal.))
(Not Selected for publication in the Federal Reporter)
(Cite as: 2010 WL 582597 (C.A.9 (Cal.)))

imate.

Moreover, the district court acted properly when it ordered specific performance at the original royalty rate. According to the express terms of the franchise agreement, where a party improperly withholds its approval of any action provided for in the contract, specific performance is the proper remedy. Therefore, the court had discretion to fashion an equitable remedy of specific performance, and it did not abuse that discretion when it ordered renewal at the original royalty rate. See *Rogers v. Davis*, 34 Cal.Rptr.2d 716, 720 (Cal.Ct.App., 1994) (quoting *Restatement (First) of Contracts*, § 359(2)) (noting that “a ‘decree [of specific performance] need not be absolute in form, and the performance that it requires need not be identical with that promised in the contract; it may be so drawn as best to effectuate the purposes for which the contract was made, and it may be granted on such terms and conditions as justice requires.’ ”); see also *Restatement (Second) of Contracts* § 358(1). Furthermore, by improperly delaying renewal of the agreement, SAI waived its right to negotiate more generous terms than those provided for in the original agreement. See *Engalla v. Permanente Med. Group, Inc.*, 938 P.2d 903, 924 (Cal.1997) (holding that a party’s “course of delay” in performing the terms of the contract, when “unreasonable or undertaken in bad faith, may provide sufficient grounds” for a finding of waiver).

The award of fees and costs should also be upheld. According to *Cal. Civ.Code* § 1717 (a), all attorneys’ fees provisions in the contract are made reciprocal between the parties. Also, any fees provisions which are limited to certain sections of the contract must be applied to the entire contract “unless each party was represented by

counsel in the negotiation and execution of the contract, and the fact of that representation is specified in the contract.” *Cal. Civ.Code* § 1717(a). The franchise agreement does not specifically note that the parties were represented by counsel. Thus, the provisions that permit SAI to collect attorney’s fees in certain instances are made applicable to this suit won by Prudence. The award of fees and costs was therefore proper.

*2 AFFIRMED.

C.A.9 (Cal.),2010.
Prudence Corp. v. Shred-It America, Inc.
Slip Copy, 2010 WL 582597 (C.A.9 (Cal.))

END OF DOCUMENT