

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

Michael Griffith and Detrick Curtis
Conerly,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Paran, LLP,

Defendants.

Case No. 19-51078

Judith E. Levy
United States District Judge

Mag. Judge Anthony P. Patti

_____ /

**OPINION AND ORDER DISMISSING CASE FOR
LACK OF SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION AND
DENYING MOTION FOR FULL FAITH AND CREDIT [3] AND
MOTION TO EXPEDITE [5] AS MOOT**

On July 9, 2019, Plaintiffs Michael Griffith and Detrick Curtis Conerly, proceeding pro se, instituted a proceeding in this District seeking to register a foreign judgment from the Court of Common Pleas of Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania under 28 U.S.C. § 1963. *See Griffith v. Paran LLP*, No. 19-12030, ECF No. 1 (E.D. Mich. July 9, 2019) (Lawson, J.). On July 22, 2019, this matter was opened based on an “Affidavit of Fact” filed by Plaintiff Conerly. (ECF No. 1.) Both cases

include the same parties and address the same subject matter. (See ECF No. 4 (requesting that “this Court . . . consider the . . . confession of judgment filed in the 19-12030” case).) As such, the Court concludes that this case and the 19-12030 case are companion cases.¹

On January 16, 2020, Judge David M. Lawson issued an Order in the 19-12030 case, adopting a Report and Recommendation from Magistrate Judge R. Steven Whalen, overruling Plaintiffs’ objections, and dismissing the case for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. See *Griffith*, No. 19-12030, ECF No. 15. As Judge Lawson explained, the Sixth Circuit has long held that federal district courts lack jurisdiction to register judgments from state courts under 28 U.S.C. § 1963. See *id.* at PageID.119 (citing *Fox Painting Co. v. NLRB*, 16 F.3d 115, 117 (6th Cir. 1994)). The Court has carefully reviewed Judge Whalen’s Report and Recommendation and Judge Lawson’s Order and concurs in their reasoning and result.

¹ E.D. Mich. LR 83.11(b)(7)(D) provides that companion cases are normally reassigned to the Judge with the earlier case number “upon consent of the Judge having the earlier case number.” However, in the interest of judicial economy and because the Court agrees with Judge Lawson that federal district courts lack subject matter jurisdiction, the Court will not reassign the case.

Accordingly, the Court finds that under the facts of this case it does not have subject matter jurisdiction over this action, and the case is hereby DISMISSED. Plaintiff Conerly's Motion for Full Faith and Credit Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1738 (ECF No. 3) and Motion to Expedite (ECF No. 5) are DENIED as moot.²

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 22, 2022
Ann Arbor, Michigan

s/Judith E. Levy
JUDITH E. LEVY
United States District Judge

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that the foregoing document was served upon counsel of record and any unrepresented parties via the Court's ECF System to their respective email or first-class U.S. mail addresses disclosed on the Notice of Electronic Filing on August 22, 2022.

s/William Barkholz
WILLIAM BARKHOLZ
Case Manager

² A plaintiff proceeding pro se may not represent anyone other than himself. *Derrick v. Heyns*, No. 2:14-11601, 2014 WL 2743415, at *2 (E.D. Mich. June 17, 2014). As these motions are signed only by Plaintiff Conerly, they cannot be attributed to Plaintiff Griffith.