UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

-----

PROCOM SUPPLY, INC.,

Case No. 1:13-cv-2665

Plaintiff,

VS.

OPINION & ORDER

[Resolving Doc. 37]

MECHEL LANGNER, et al.,

Defendants.

JAMES S. GWIN, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE:

On April 24, 2014, the Court entered default judgment against each of the Defendants in this matter.<sup>1</sup> On September 21, 2018, Plaintiff filed—without a corresponding motion or argument—a Proposed Writ of Continuing Garnishment for Defendant Aharon Mann's wages earned from a corporation in Lakewood, Colorado.<sup>2</sup>

Based on the face of the proposed writ, the Court seriously doubts that it has jurisdiction over the Colorado employer and, therefore, will deny Plaintiff's request.<sup>3</sup> If Plaintiff believes the Court has jurisdiction over the Colorado employer, it can file a motion with the Court that shows jurisdiction. Alternatively, Plaintiff could register the Court's original judgment with the United States District Court for the District of Colorado<sup>4</sup> and seek the writ there.

For the foregoing reasons, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff's requested writ of garnishment.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 2, 2018

s/ James S. Gwin

JAMES S. GWIN

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE** 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Doc. 21.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Doc. 37

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> See Daimler AG v. Bauman, 571 U.S. 117, 137–38 (2014) (holding that, generally, a corporation is only subject to the general jurisdiction of the courts of the state where it is incorporated or principally conducts business).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> 28 U.S.C. § 1963.