

NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FULL-TEXT PUBLICATION

File Name: 12a0298n.06

No. 09-3994

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

FILED
Mar 16, 2012
LEONARD GREEN, Clerk

ENGINTEC CORP., an Ohio Corp.; LISA G. HUFF;)
REGGIE D. HUFF; DAVID A. BRY; FRANKLIN H.)
JOHNSON,)

Plaintiffs-Appellants,)

v.)

RODERICK A. BOUTIN; VINCENT MARINO;)
ROBERT K. JACKSON; LUANN JACKSON; JOHN D.)
HALLSWORTH, JR.; L.B.LAND, INC., an Oregon)
Corp.; JACKSON FAMILY TRUST; JDH SERVICES,)
INC., an Oregon Corp.; CHRISTOPHER MILLER;)
MATTHEW K. NAPIER; ROBERT W. HARRIS;)
MARK J. ENDRE; JOHN/JANE DOES,)

Defendants-Appellees.)

ON APPEAL FROM THE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT
COURT FOR THE NORTHERN
DISTRICT OF OHIO

OPINION

Before: GILMAN, ROGERS, and STRANCH, Circuit Judges.

JANE B. STRANCH, Circuit Judge. Plaintiffs Engintec Corp., Reggie Huff, Lisa Huff, Franklin Johnson, and David Brys (collectively “Engintec”) appeal from a district court order dismissing their complaint against various Defendants. The district court dismissed seven of the thirteen Defendants for lack of personal jurisdiction and dismissed Engintec’s entire complaint with prejudice for violating Rule 8 of the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure and for acting in bad faith. Engintec appeals both holdings.

No. 09-3994

Engintec Corp., et al. v. Boutin, et al.

After reviewing the record, the parties' briefs, and the applicable law, and hearing oral argument, this Court determines that no jurisprudential purpose would be served by a panel opinion. Therefore, we **AFFIRM** the district court's judgment dismissing Engintec's complaint with prejudice for the reasons stated in Judge Lioi's July 27, 2009 Memorandum Opinion, with the following qualification:

The district court's analysis of Rules 8(a) and 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure is applicable to Engintec's entire complaint, as it relates to all claims and all Defendants, and we find this analysis dispositive. Therefore, we adopt the district court's summation of the facts and procedure in Section I of its opinion and its analysis of Rules 8 and 41 in Section II.C and affirm dismissal of Engintec's entire complaint with prejudice.