

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA

No. 15-0983
Filed July 27, 2016

**BOOTHAPURI VENKATESH, ANITHA
VENKATESH, JAY JONNAGADLA, and
VANISREE JONNAGADLA,**
Plaintiffs-Appellees,

vs.

RAJASEKHAR UDDANDAM,
Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the Iowa District Court for Linn County, Paul D. Miller (default judgment) and Sean W. McPartland (damages award), Judges.

Rajasekhar Uddandam appeals from a default judgment of liability as a discovery sanction and from the damages awarded after a hearing. **AFFIRMED.**

Larry J. Thorson and Laura A. Kamienski of Ackley, Kopecky & Kingery, L.L.P., Cedar Rapids, for appellant.

Paul D. Gamez and Thomas D. Wolle of Simmons Perrine Moyer Gergman PLC, Cedar Rapids, for appellees.

Considered by Vaitheswaran, P.J., and Doyle and Mullins, JJ.

MULLINS, Judge.

Boothapuri Venkatesh, Anitha Venkatesh, Jay Jonnagadla, and Vanisree Jonnagadla (Plaintiffs) filed suit against Rajasekhar Uddandam, alleging fraudulent misrepresentation, fraudulent nondisclosure, and breach of fiduciary duty arising out of the alleged sale and purchase of stock in a land-investment company in India. After the district court granted Plaintiffs' two motions to compel discovery, Plaintiffs filed a motion for default as a sanction for failure to provide discovery and failure to comply with the court orders. After a contested hearing, the district court sanctioned Uddandam by finding him in default and ordering judgment of liability, and the court set a hearing on damages. The court then awarded damages to Plaintiffs and judgment against Uddandam. He has appealed, arguing the district court abused its discretion in finding him in default and alleging the evidence of damages was insufficient.

We have considered the record, the briefs, the ruling granting the default, and the ruling on the issue of damages. We find the district court properly exercised its discretion when it considered the facts, circumstances, and appropriate factors in granting the default judgment of liability as a sanction for repeated and ongoing failures to comply with discovery rules and court orders. After a thorough hearing on damages in which all parties participated, the court committed no errors at law in its exhaustive, well-reasoned written ruling on damages, and there was substantial evidence to support the judgment on damages.

Accordingly, we affirm by memorandum opinion pursuant to Iowa Court Rule 21.26(1)(a), (b), and (d).

AFFIRMED.