




interest that is ‘concrete and particularized,’ ‘actual or imminent’ and ‘fairly traceable’ to the challenged act of the defendant, and likely to be redressed by a favorable decision in the federal court.” *Navegar, Inc. v. United States*, 103 F.3d 994, 998 (D.C. Cir. 1997) (quoting *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 560-61 (1992)). Standing may be denied to a litigant who seeks to assert the rights of a third party. *Navegar*, 103 F.3d at 998.

In this case, the plaintiff faults a Michigan statute and the workings of a pension fund in which he does not participate. It does not appear that the plaintiff stands to suffer any injury with respect to the pension funds, and, therefore, he has no standing to assert his claims. The Court will dismiss the complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction..

An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

DATE: 6/13/16

  
United States District Judge