

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

LEONARD I. EISENFELD, et al.,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	
v.	)	98-cv-1945 (RCL)
	)	
ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

---

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR REVIVAL OF JUDGMENT**

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 69(a) requires that “[t]he procedure on execution—and in proceedings supplementary to and in aid of judgment or execution—must accord with the procedure of the state where the court is located . . . .” We apply District of Columbia law in this instance. Fed. R. Civ. P. 81(2); *U.S. v. Thornton*, 672 F.2d 101, 103-04 (1982).

District of Columbia law imposes a twelve-year period “from the date when an execution might first be issued thereon[] or from the date of the last order of revival thereof” within which judgments of this Court are enforceable. D.C. CODE § 15-101(a). District of Columbia law also permits revival of judgment, an order which “extends the effect and operation of the judgment . . . and all the remedies for its enforcement for the period of twelve years from the date of the order.” *Id.* § 15-103.

The Court issued judgment in this case on July 11, 2000. *Eisenfeld v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, 172 F. Supp. 2d 1 (D.D.C. 2000). Execution of that judgment could have been issued as early as the date of judgment. Therefore, the twelve-year period commenced on July 11, 2000 and will expire on July 11, 2012. Although plaintiffs have vigorously sought to enforce the 2000

judgment, the punitive damages award remains unsatisfied. Plaintiffs have therefore filed a Motion [47] for Revival of Judgment.

To allow plaintiffs additional time to enforce the judgment, the plaintiffs' motion is GRANTED and the Judgment entered on July 11, 2000, is hereby REVIVED.

SO ORDERED.

Signed by Royce C. Lamberth, Chief Judge, on October 5, 2011