

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

---

PHILLIP TROYER and SHIRLEY  
TROYER,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Case No. 1:14-CV-166

UMAREX Sportwaffen GmbH & Co.  
KG, a German Corporation,

HON. GORDON J. QUIST

Defendant.

---

**OPINION**

Plaintiff, Phillip Troyer, alleges that he was injured by a firearm manufactured by the predecessor of Defendant, a German corporation. Troyer and his wife filed a complaint against Defendant in this Court. Defendant has moved to dismiss, arguing that the Court lacks personal jurisdiction over it. Plaintiffs have not responded to that motion. For the reasons that follow, the Court will grant Defendant's motion.

***Legal Standard***

A plaintiff bears the burden of establishing the existence of personal jurisdiction. *Air Prods. & Controls v. Safetech Int'l, Inc.*, 503 F.3d 544, 549 (6th Cir. 2007). In a diversity action, the exercise of jurisdiction is permissible if it is authorized under the state's long-arm statute and it comports with due process. *Id.* at 549. The exercise of jurisdiction over a non-resident defendant comports with due process if the defendant has "certain minimum contacts ... such that the maintenance of the suit does not offend traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice." *Int'l Shoe Co. v. Washington*, 326 U.S. 310, 316, 66 S.Ct. 154, 158 (1945) (internal quotation marks omitted). To satisfy the minimum contacts inquiry, the plaintiff must demonstrate that "the defendant's suit-related conduct ... create[s] a substantial connection with the forum State." *Walden v. Fiore*, 134 S. Ct. 1115, 1121 (2014).

