

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

NANCY GUCWA AND MARK MARUSZA,

Plaintiffs,

v.

DR. JEFFREY LAWLEY, ET AL.,

Defendants.

Case No. 15-10815

SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT  
JUDGE ARTHUR J. TARNOW

U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
ANTHONY P. PATTI

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

\_\_\_\_\_ /

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFFS’ MOTION FOR REHEARING AND  
RECONSIDERATION, TO ALTER JUDGMENT, AND FOR RELIEF FROM JUDGMENT  
[112]**

Plaintiffs Nancy Gucwa and Mark Marusza filed a Motion for Rehearing and Reconsideration, to Alter Judgment, and for Relief from Judgment on February 6, 2017 [Dkt. #112]. Plaintiffs move the Court for rehearing and reconsideration of its January 23, 2017 Opinion and Order Granting Defendants’ Motions to Dismiss, Denying Defendant Dr. Rubin’s Motion for Sanctions, and Denying Plaintiffs’ Motion for Leave to File an Amendment to the Second Amended Complaint [110]. Specifically, Plaintiffs ask the Court to rehear, reconsider, and reverse its holdings as to Nancy Gucwa’s RICO Claim (Count I), Mark Marusza’s Claim under the

16 Medicare Secondary Payer Act (“MSPA”) (Count II), and Plaintiffs’ Claims of  
17 Tortious Interference (Count III).

18 For the reasons stated below, Plaintiffs’ Motions are **DENIED**.

19 **LEGAL STANDARDS**

20 Local Rule 7.1(h)(3), which governs motions for reconsideration, provides:

21 Generally, and without restricting the court’s discretion, the  
22 court will not grant motions for rehearing or reconsideration that  
23 merely present the same issues ruled upon by the court, either  
24 expressly or by reasonable implication. The movant must not  
25 only demonstrate a palpable defect by which the court and the  
26 parties and other persons entitled to be heard on the motion have  
27 been misled but also show that correcting the defect will result in  
28 a different disposition of the case.

29  
30 *See Hansmann v. Fid. Invs. Institutional Servs. Co.*, 326 F.3d 760, 767 (6th Cir.  
31 2003) (A motion for reconsideration is granted only “if the movant demonstrates  
32 that the district court and the parties have been misled by a palpable defect, and  
33 correcting the defect will result in a different disposition of the case”). “A palpable  
34 defect is a defect which is obvious, clear, unmistakable, manifest or plain.” *Fleck*  
35 *v. Titan Tire Corp.*, 177 F. Supp. 2d 605, 624 (E.D. Mich. 2001) (internal citations  
36 and quotations omitted). “The decision whether to grant reconsideration lies  
37 largely within the discretion of the court.” *Yuba Natural Res., Inc. v. United States*,  
38 904 F.2d 1577, 1583 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

39           Plaintiffs also move the Court under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 59(e)  
40 and 60(b) to alter or amend the January 23, 2017 Judgment. Rule 59(e) allows  
41 courts to alter the judgment based on “(1) a clear error of law; (2) newly  
42 discovered evidence; (3) an intervening change in controlling law; or (4) a need to  
43 prevent manifest injustice.” *Intera Corp. v. Henderson*, 428 F.3d 605, 620 (6th Cir.  
44 2005). In deciding whether to grant a Rule 59(e) motion, courts must “consider[ ]  
45 the competing interest of protecting the finality of judgments and the expeditious  
46 termination of litigation.” *Morse v. McWhorter*, 290 F.3d 795, 800 (6th Cir. 2002).  
47 Parties are not permitted to use such motions to re-argue their case. *See Davison v.*  
48 *Roadway Express, Inc.*, 562 F. Supp. 2d 971, 984 (N.D. Ohio 2008) (Rule 59(e)  
49 motions are not “designed to give an unhappy litigant an opportunity to relitigate  
50 matters already decided[.]”).

51           Similarly, “relief under Rule 60(b) is ‘circumscribed by public policy  
52 favoring finality of judgments and termination of litigation.” *Blue Diamond Coal*  
53 *Co. v. Trs. of the UMWA Combined Benefit Fund*, 249 F.3d 519, 524 (6th Cir.  
54 2001) (quoting *Waifersong Ltd., Inc. v. Classic Music Vending*, 976 F.2d 290, 292  
55 (6th Cir. 1992)). Relief under Rule 60(b) may be granted for the following reasons:

56           (1) mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect; (2) newly  
57 discovered evidence which by due diligence could not have been discovered  
58 in time to move for a new trial under Rule 59(e); (3) fraud (whether previously  
59 called intrinsic or extrinsic), misrepresentation, or misconduct by an opposing

60 party; (4) the judgment is void; (5) the judgment has been satisfied, released,  
61 or discharged; it is based on an earlier judgment that has been reversed or  
62 vacated; or applying it prospectively is no longer equitable; or (6) any other  
63 reason that justifies relief.

64  
65 Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b). “Relief under rule 60(b) is extraordinary and may only be  
66 granted in exceptional circumstances.” *Higgs v. Sanford*, 2009 WL 1734467, at \*1  
67 (W.D. Ky. June 17, 2009) (internal quotations omitted).

## 68 ANALYSIS

### 69 A. Gucwa’s RICO Claim

70 Plaintiff Gucwa argues that the Court erred when it dismissed her RICO  
71 claim for lack of standing. Gucwa highlights the fact that she filed a Form C  
72 Application for Mediation or Hearing with the Workers’ Compensation Agency,  
73 demonstrating that she continued asserting her “entitlement to be paid for services  
74 rendered.” (Dkt. 112 at 12). Further, according to Plaintiffs, Gucwa suffered an  
75 injury in that she was not compensated for the services she rendered.

76 Gucwa’s arguments are the same as those presented in response to  
77 Defendants’ motions to dismiss. “[T]he proper forum for expressing disagreement  
78 with the Court’s substantive reasoning is an appeal on the merits,” and the Court  
79 declines to address Plaintiffs’ “allegations of substantive errors” in deciding the  
80 instant motion. *Doshi v. General Cable Corp.*, 2015 WL 2229233, at \*2 n.2 (E.D.  
81 Ky. May 12, 2015). As discussed in the January 23, 2017 Opinion and Order, it

82 would not make sense to allow Gucwa to recover where Marusza – the injured  
83 party – cannot. Gucwa’s claimed damages are too intimately connected with  
84 Marusza’s personal injury underlying his workers’ compensation claim to  
85 constitute an injury to business or property that is recoverable under RICO. *See*  
86 *Lewis v. Drouillard*, 788 F. Supp. 2d 567, 570 (E.D. Mich. 2011); *Jackson v.*  
87 *Sedgwick Claims Management Services*, 731 F.3d 556, 566 (6th Cir. 2013) (en  
88 banc) (explaining that “an award of benefits under a workers’ compensation  
89 system *and any dispute over those benefits are inextricably intertwined with a*  
90 *personal injury giving rise to the benefits.*”) (emphasis added).

91 **B. Marusza’s MSPA Claim**

92 Plaintiff Marusza alleges, for the first time, that he suffered financial loss  
93 because Medicare stepped in to pay \$15,000 for medical bills related to his  
94 traumatic brain injury when Accident Fund (“AF”) refused to do so. He also claims  
95 in an affidavit that he made co-pays which he would not have paid had AF paid the  
96 bills.

97 It is well established that “a motion for reconsideration may not be used to  
98 raise issues that could have been raised in the previous motion.” *Aero-Motive Co.*  
99 *Great Am. Ins.*, 302 F.Supp. 2d 738, 740 (W.D. Mich. 2003). Plaintiff, perhaps  
100 recognizing the futility of raising this new argument at this stage in the

101 proceedings, claims that the Court did not ask about financial harm during the  
102 December 2, 2016 hearing, nor did it give him the opportunity to amend the  
103 complaint to allege financial harm. To the contrary, the Court engaged in a lengthy  
104 discussion with Plaintiffs' counsel regarding Marusza's MSPA claim. *See* Tr.  
105 35:15-39:9. That Plaintiffs' counsel chose not to mention Marusza's financial harm  
106 is no fault of the Court's. Furthermore, in none of the three versions of Plaintiffs'  
107 complaint does Marusza mention the financial harm he suffered, notwithstanding  
108 the fact that Plaintiffs amended their complaint twice. *See* Dkt. 1, 2, 75.

109 Marusza's affidavit is also unhelpful. It provides, in relevant part:

110 [Marusza] has suffered financial harm because Medicare has paid bills which  
111 Accident Fund should have paid for treatment of injuries arising out of his  
112 work-related accident. Because Accident Fund refused to pay the bills, he has  
113 been required to pay co-pays because Medicare does not pay the entire bill.  
114 Whereas under the workers' compensation system, when Accident Fund pays  
115 his bill, he does not have to pay a co-pay.

116  
117 (Dkt. 112-1).

118  
119 Plaintiff Marusza does not provide the Court with any information about the  
120 amounts of these alleged co-pays or bills, when the payments were made, or the  
121 type and extent of medical services that were rendered. He also does not submit  
122 any documentary evidence – such as receipts or billing statements – in support of  
123 his claims. *See Baker v. Gerdenich Realty Co.*, 2009 WL 997262, at \*1 (N.D. Ohio  
124 Apr. 14, 2009) (the “self-serving conclusions” in plaintiff's affidavit, to which he

125 cited in support of his motion for reconsideration, were insufficient to “overcome  
126 the extrinsic corroborating evidence Defendant supplied in support of its Motion  
127 for Summary Judgment.”); *Worley v. Perfect Equipment Co., LLC*, 2006 WL  
128 17333, at \*5-6 (M.D. Tenn. Jan. 3, 2006) (on a motion for reconsideration, the  
129 plaintiff’s affidavit, which contained “conclusory and unsupported allegations” and  
130 was “completely unsubstantiated and not corroborated by any other evidence in the  
131 record,” was “insufficient to create a genuine issue of material fact to defeat  
132 summary judgment.”).

133         The substance of Plaintiffs’ argument also fails. A private plaintiff may  
134 invoke the MSPA if two conditions precedent are met: “[f]irst, Medicare must have  
135 actually made payments on the claimant’s behalf . . . second, the primary insurer  
136 must be ‘responsible’ for paying the benefits at issue.” *Geer v. Amex Assur. Co.*,  
137 2010 WL 2681160, at \*4 (E.D. Mich. July 6, 2010). As AF points out, Marusza  
138 has not pled specific facts alleging that AF is responsible for the payments to  
139 Medicare. In fact, it is the Court’s understanding that Medicare has not issued a  
140 final determination letter as to the amount that AF is responsible for. *See* Tr. at  
141 35:11-14; Dkt. 118-7. It is not clear that AF actually owes Medicare anything.  
142 Plaintiff cannot simply make conclusory statements when there is no evidence that  
143 AF is even required to make any payments on Marusza’s behalf.

144 **C. Tortious Interference**

145 In its January 23, 2017 Opinion and Order, the Court dismissed Plaintiffs’  
146 claims for tortious interference against Doctors Baker, Ager, and Rubin. To  
147 succeed on a claim for tortious interference with a contract, Plaintiffs must show  
148 “(1) the existence of a contract, (2) a breach of the contract, and (3) an unjustified  
149 instigation of the breach by the defendant.” *Knight Enterprises v. RPF Oil Co.*, 829  
150 N.W.2d 345, 348 (Mich. Ct. App. 2013). Plaintiffs’ claims were dismissed  
151 because:

152 AF allegedly had a pre-existing intent to deny workers’ compensation  
153 benefits and hired the doctor defendants to effectuate that intent by  
154 providing a pretext for the denial. In other words, Plaintiffs have alleged that  
155 the doctor defendants did *not* induce the breach; rather, AF intended to  
156 breach the contract all along.

157  
158 Dkt. 110 at 14.

159  
160 Plaintiffs’ argument with respect to the dismissal of their claims for tortious  
161 interference is confusing. The gist of their argument seems to be that the Court  
162 impermissibly relied on Count I of the Second Amended Complaint – the RICO  
163 cause of action – to support its dismissal of Count III – tortious interference with  
164 contract and business expectancy. According to Plaintiffs,

165 [E]ven if Plaintiffs alleged elsewhere in the [Second Amended Complaint]  
166 that the doctors were AF’s puppets – handing over “cut-off” reports like  
167 puppets whose strings were pulled – plaintiffs made no such allegations in

168 Count III. Plaintiffs were free to allege puppet doctors in Count I and not  
169 allege puppet doctors in Count III: this is permitted by FRCP 8(d)(3).  
170  
171 (Dkt. 112 at 7-8).

172 Essentially, Plaintiffs argue that they can and have set forth two inconsistent  
173 claims pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(d)(3): first, in Count I, that  
174 AF knowingly chose to take part in the fraudulent scheme with the doctor  
175 defendants, and second, in Count III, that AF was not part of the conspiracy and in  
176 fact, the individual doctor defendants induced AF to deny Marusza benefits.

177 Plaintiffs are incorrect for a number of reasons. First, Plaintiffs have not  
178 shown that they could not have previously raised this argument as to pleading  
179 inconsistent claims. “[A] motion for reconsideration is not properly used as a  
180 vehicle . . . to advance positions that could have been argued earlier but were not.”  
181 *Smith ex rel. Smith v. Mount Pleasant Public Schools*, 298 F. Supp. 2d 636, 637  
182 (E.D. Mich. 2003).

183 Plaintiffs’ claims also fail on the merits. “[A] pleader may assert  
184 contradictory statements of fact only when legitimately in doubt about the facts in  
185 question.” *Am. Int’l Adjustment Co. v. Galvin*, 86 F.3d 1455, 1461 (7th Cir. 1996).  
186 “A party is not free to plead any and all facts that might entitle it to relief simply  
187 because inconsistency of factual allegations is permissible under Rule 8.” *Emkey v.*

188 *Sec’y of Health & Human Servs.*, 2009 WL 3683390, at \*15 (Fed. Ct. Cl. Oct. 20,  
189 2009).

190 Count I of Plaintiffs’ Second Amended Complaint – the RICO claim –  
191 provides:

192 Accident Fund hired the defendant doctors to examine allegedly injured  
193 persons, to write dishonest, biased and otherwise fraudulent reports, and if  
194 needed to give dishonest testimony based on the reports, all to deceive the  
195 Workers’ Compensation Agency, its magistrates, and appellate bodies in the  
196 Michigan workers compensation system.

197  
198 (Dkt. 75 at 18-19).

199 Count III of Plaintiffs’ Second Amended Complaint – tortious interference  
200 with contract or business expectancy – contains the following language:

- 201
- 202 • *Plaintiffs incorporate all allegations of this complaint.*
  - 203 • The acts of bias, fraud and dishonesty are described in Count I,  
204 incorporated herein.
  - 205 • Dr. Lawley’s report that Marusza suffered no pathology or disability . .  
206 . was biased, dishonest, fraudulent and contained material and  
207 misleading omissions, as described in Count I, *the allegations of which*  
208 *are incorporated here.*

209 (Dkt. 75, ¶¶ 51, 55, 58) (emphasis added).

210  
211 Comparing the two counts, it is clear that Plaintiffs themselves recognize  
212 that Count III is implicated by Count I, as Count III explicitly states – twice – that  
213 it “incorporate[s] all allegations of this complaint.”

214 In a similar case, *Haber v. Rabin*, 2016 WL 3217869, at \*3 (N.D. Ohio June  
215 10, 2016), the court examined an amended complaint that contained multiple  
216 inconsistencies. The plaintiff, relying on Rule 8(d)(3), attempted to plead a  
217 Lanham Act claim as an alternative to his breach of contract claim. The court  
218 found that the Lanham Act claim was improperly pled because the plaintiff “re-  
219 alleges paragraphs 1 through 60 [which centered on state-law breach of contract  
220 theories] and incorporates them [into the Lanham Act count] by reference.” *Id.*  
221 (internal quotations omitted). Because the plaintiff incorporated specific  
222 allegations from the breach of contract claims into his Lanham Act claim, the two  
223 claims – which were “crucial[ly] inconsisten[t]” – were improperly pled and  
224 subject to dismissal. *Id.* at \*2, \*4.

225 The same thing has occurred here: Plaintiffs’ tortious interference claims  
226 against Doctors Baker, Ager, and Rubin expressly “incorporate all allegations of  
227 this complaint,” including the RICO claims. (Dkt. 75, ¶ 51). “While Rule 8(d)(3)  
228 allows inconsistent claims . . . it does not allow what Plaintiffs are attempting to do  
229 here – namely, to make ‘clashing factual assertions . . . in the context of the same  
230 claim.” *Aaron v. Medtronic, Inc.*, 209 F. Supp. 3d 994 (S.D. Ohio 2016).

231 Moreover,

232 While Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(d)(2) permits a party to plead in the  
233 alternative and Rule 8(d)(3) permits separate claims regardless of consistency,

234 a court “need not feel constrained to accept as truth conflicting pleadings that  
235 make no sense, or that would render a claim incoherent, or that are  
236 contradicted either by statements in the complaint itself or by documents upon  
237 which its pleadings rely.”

238  
239 *Miles v. Federal Insurance Company*, 2017 WL 559582, at \*4 (E.D. Ky. Feb. 10,  
240 2017) (quoting *Williams v. CitiMortgage, Inc.*, 498 Fed. Appx 532, 536 (6th Cir.  
241 2012) (per curiam)).

242 Contrary to what they now argue in their motion for reconsideration,  
243 Plaintiffs have consistently maintained that “[a]ll causes of action turn on the  
244 existence of a scheme . . . by Accident Fund acting with Drs. Baker, Ager, and  
245 Rubin to deny that Marusza suffered TBI and related conditions.” (Dkt. 96 at 1);  
246 *see also* Dkt. 94 at 12 (the allegations that “AF used Baker’s, Ager’s and Rubin’s  
247 reports as grounds to deny Gucwa and Marusza payment . . . are at the heart of the  
248 RICO claim . . . and the tortious interference claims.”); Dkt. 75 at 62 (Count III of  
249 Plaintiffs’ Second Amended Complaint – the tortious interference claims –  
250 expressly states: “Plaintiffs incorporate all allegations of this complaint.”).

## 251 CONCLUSION

252 Plaintiffs have not met their heavy burden of showing that the Court should  
253 reverse its January 23, 2017 Opinion and Order [110]. Accordingly,

