NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FULL-TEXT PUBLICATION
File Name: 07a0701n.06
Filed: September 28, 2007

No. 06-4670

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

FEDERAL HOME LOAN MORTGAGE CORPORATION, Plaintiff-Appellee, v. CYNTHIA G. LAMAR, Defendant-Appellant, CYNTHIA G. LAMAR, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. LERNER, SAMPSON & ROTHFUSS, L.P.A., Defendant-Appellee.	)	ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

Before: SUTTON and McKEAGUE, Circuit Judges; and FORESTER, District Judge.*

PER CURIAM. Cynthia G. Lamar appeals the district court's grant of summary judgment in favor of Lerner, Sampson & Rothfuss, L.P.A., rejecting her claim that the Lerner law firm violated the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 *et seq*., when it included the notice required under the Act with the summons and complaint that it served on her. A recent decision by another

* The Honorable Karl S. Forester, Senior United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Kentucky, sitting by designation.

panel of our court, *see Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp. v. Lamar*, No. 06-4335, __ F.3d __, 2007 WL 2768305 (6th Cir. Sept. 25, 2007), governs this appeal. Save for the fact that the earlier case involved a different mortgage from the one at issue here, it parallels this case in every other material respect: It involves the same primary parties, the same key facts, the same complaints and the same defenses. *See* JA 75 (district court stating that "the claims raised here are identical to those raised [in Case No. 06-4335]"); *id*. at 117 n.1 (Lamar acknowledging that the two cases present "identical issues"). In the earlier case, our court affirmed the district court's grant of summary judgment for LS&R, concluding that "LS&R effectively conveyed notice of Lamar's right to dispute the validity of her debt." *Lamar*, __ F.3d __, 2007 WL 2768305, at *1. Because that panel's decision was filed prior to this opinion, we are bound by it. *See Salmi v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs*., 774 F.2d 685, 689 (6th Cir. 1985). Accordingly, for the reasons set forth in that panel's opinion, we affirm.