Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc. v. Grischkan et al

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO EASTERN DIVISION 05 FEB -3 AMM: 26

CASE NO. 1:06 CV 264

Doc.

IN RE: GLORIA GRISCHKAN

MORTGAGE ELECTRONIC REGISTRATION SYSTEMS, INC.,

Plaintiff/Appellee

-vs-

GLORIA GRISCHKAN and MICHAEL GRISCHKAN.

Defendants/Appellants

MEMORANDUM OF OPINION AND ORDER DENYING
DEFENDANTS/APPELLANTS' MOTION TO STAY EXECUTION OF THE BANKRUPTCY COURT'S DEFAULT JUDGMENT AND DENYING DEFENDANTS/APPELLANTS' MOTION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE LESLEY WELLS

This matter is before the Court on defendants-appellants' motion to stay execution of the bankruptcy court's default judgment and motion for temporary restraining order enjoining plaintiff-appellee from proceeding with the eviction of defendants-appellants from their home.

This Court has reviewed all of the defendants-appellants' submissions to this Court, including its motion to stay and for a temporary restraining order and United States Bankruptcy Judge Pat E. Morgenstern-Clarren's Memorandum of Opinion and Orders granting judgment in favor of plaintiff-appellee and denying defendants/appellants' motion to vacate and for temporary restraining order. Upon review of such materials, and in view of the requirements for granting a temporary

restraining order under Rule 65 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, this Court denies defendant-appellant's request.

Defendants-appellants' have not addressed or satisfied the requirements of Rule 65. Defendants-appellants' have not certified that they have attempted to provide notice to the plaintiff-appellees' as required by Rule 65. Nor have defendants-appellants' shown that irreparable harm is imminent or that they have meritorious grounds for reversal of Bankruptcy Judge Morgenstern-Clarren's judgment in this matter. Indeed defendants-appellants' have not even referenced the four requirements for granting the injunctive relief they request. See Blue Cross & Blue Shield Mut. Of Ohio v. Columbia/HCA Healthcare Corp., 110 F.3d 318, 322 (6th Cir. 1997) (setting forth four requirements).

Accordingly, defendants-appellants' motion for emergency stay and for a temporary restraining order is **denied**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE