

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

FM INDUSTRIES, INC.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	Civil Action No.: 07 C 1794
v.)	
)	Suzanne B. Conlon, Judge
CITICORP CREDIT SERVICES, INC.,)	
CITIGROUP, INC., CITIBANK (SOUTH)	
DAKOTA), N.A., and LAW OFFICE OF)	
ROSS GELFAND, LLC)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

BACKGROUND

FMI Industries, Inc. ("FMI") is the claimed owner of TUCANS, a computer software program used in the debt collection industry. TUCANS was developed by FM Ware Industries, Inc. ("FM Ware"), which dissolved in 2004. Michael Friedman was FM Ware's president, and is presently FMI's president and chief executive officer. Friedman, who is not an attorney, has participated in this lawsuit as a paralegal and law clerk for FMI's attorney, Wayne Rhine, by typing Rhine's draft pleadings, then filing FMI's pleadings under Rhine's electronic signature and his electronic filing password. Friedman is also chief financial officer of Friedman & Wexler, Rhine's law firm.

Before the court are two post-judgment FMI motions belatedly challenging summary judgment rulings. In January 2008, FMI's motion for partial summary judgment against defendant Law Office of Ross Gelfand, LLC ("Gelfand") for copyright infringement was denied because of a genuine issue of material fact concerning FMI's ownership of the TUCANS

copyright; its summary judgment motion for breach of contract against Gelfand was denied because FMI failed to provide evidence that it suffered any damages. In March 2008, the summary judgment motions of defendants Citicorp Credit Services, Inc., Citigroup, Inc., and Citibank (South Dakota), N.A. ("Citi defendants") were granted, *inter alia*, because FMI failed to raise a genuine issue of material fact that the Citi defendants knew of or participated in copyright infringement. FMI's Rule 59(e) motion for reconsideration of judgment for the Citi defendants was denied in April 2008.

All that remained for a bench trial was FMI's claim for equitable and declaratory relief against Gelfand for copyright infringement. However, due to FMI's failure to cooperate in preparing and submitting a joint final pretrial order, the surviving claim against Gelfand was dismissed with prejudice. Dkt. No. 455 (May 6, 2008). The court denied FMI's motion to vacate the dismissal order because of its continued failure to submit a joint final pretrial order and its bad faith in repeatedly failing to incorporate Gelfand's materials and objections in FMI's unilateral draft pretrial orders. Dkt. No. 495 (July 23, 2008). The day after FMI's motion to reconsider the dismissal order was denied, FMI filed the present motions challenging the January and March summary judgment rulings under Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) in an attempt to change the record with respect to four summary judgment motions resolved months earlier. Dkt. Nos. 496, 498 (July 24, 2008). The Rule 60(b) motions conclusively lack merit, and reflect a continuing pattern of abusive litigation tactics.

FMI's Partial Summary Judgment Motion

FMI moves to vacate denial of its summary judgment motion on the copyright ownership issue, but does not challenge the basic insufficiency of its breach of contract claim. More than

six months after the summary judgment ruling, FMI attempts to vacate the ruling by introducing a document purportedly establishing its TUCANS ownership. FMI contends a transfer document proffered as an exhibit to its Rule 60(b) motion constitutes newly discovered evidence for relief from judgment under Rule 60(b)(2). However, it is clear from the motion that the document is newly created for purposes of litigation, not newly discovered evidence. FMI acknowledges that Friedman signed the document on February 19, 2008, a month after the summary judgment ruling; indeed, Friedman signed the document as president of FM Ware, a company that was dissolved four years earlier. Mot. at 2, Ex. A. FMI mischaracterizes the Friedman document as a *nunc pro tunc* transfer of the TUCANS copyright to memorialize the allegedly lost original. *Nunc pro tunc* implies the retroactive effect of a document, not the creation of a new document purportedly memorializing a “lost” original seven years after claimed execution.

Friedman’s transfer document was obviously created to change the summary judgment record after an adverse ruling. Moreover, FMI fails to make even a rudimentary showing that the Friedman document is admissible. The document is clearly inauthentic evidence of a transfer of the TUCANS copyright, nor does it purport to be a true and accurate copy of the alleged original. Foundation is also lacking. There is no evidence that FM Ware’s board of directors actually authorized the alleged original transfer agreement seven years ago, nor is there any evidence the dissolved company ratified the recently created version. The circumstances under which the Friedman document was created suggest the document is unreliable, as well as inauthentic and lacking foundation.

FMI’s argument that the Friedman document is newly discovered evidence is frivolous; the document, created for this litigation, is not evidence at all. But even if the Friedman

document were deemed admissible, a disputed issue of material fact would remain as to whether there was a valid transfer of the TUCANS copyright from FM Ware to FMI. There are credibility and reliability issues concerning Friedman's various statements, and adverse inferences may be drawn from the absence of authorization or execution of the "lost" TUCANS agreement in FMI's contemporaneous January 2001 board of directors minutes, as well as from the absence of the "lost" transfer document itself. *See* Memorandum Opinion at 2-3, 4-5, Dkt. No. 375 (January 14, 2008). Viewing the record in a light most favorable to Gelfand, a trier of fact could have reasonably resolved the TUCANS ownership issue in Gelfand's favor. Summary judgment was inappropriate with or without Friedman's document.

Finally, FMI has failed to show that the extraordinary relief of vacating the order denying its summary judgment motion is in the interest of justice under Rule 60(b)(6).

The Citi Defendants' Summary Judgment Motions

FMI moves to vacate the order granting the Citi defendants' summary judgment motions. FMI seeks to file a new set of summary judgment responses four months after the motions were granted, invoking Rule 60(b)(1). FMI asserts that the wrong draft responses were initially filed due to counsel's excusable neglect in failing to comply with the requirements of Local Rule 56.1. However, the neglect specified in the present motion is not counsel's, but rather the error is attributed to Friedman in his role as Rhine's paralegal. FMI attempts to justify the mistake because Friedman's mother-in-law was seriously ill during the period just before the filing deadline (which had been extended at FMI's request). FMI explains that Friedman electronically signed Rhine's name and then electronically filed preliminary draft responses to one of Citi defendants' three summary judgment motions and Rule 56.1 statements instead of a final version,

failed to file a response to another Rule 56.1 statement, and failed to file a Rule 56.1 supplemental statement of facts.

The court found FMI's responsive pleadings were inadequate to raise a material issue of fact concerning the Citi defendants' knowledge of or participation in infringement of the TUCANS copyright. FMI fails to explain why Friedman, a non-lawyer, was delegated the responsibility of signing and filing FMI's summary judgment responses under Rhine's name during a period when Friedman was involved in a stressful family medical crisis. FMI has three attorneys of record: Rhine, Mitchell Asher and William McGrath. FMI fails to offer any explanation for the failure of any of its attorneys to supervise the final preparation and filing of responses to potentially dispositive motions. As the attorney who authorized his signature and electronic filing number to be used on court-filed documents, Rhine had a professional responsibility to review these pleadings before the wrong drafts were filed under his name and the wrong drafts were provided to the court.

The unfortunate illness of Friedman's mother-in-law is immaterial to Rhine's inexplicable failure to review court filings bearing his electronic signature. Rhine's neglect, particularly at a time when he knew his paralegal/law clerk/client had a family crisis, was not reasonable or excusable. There is no basis for vacating the summary judgment order under Rule 60(b)(1). *Pioneer Investment Servs. Co. v. Brunswick Assocs.*, 507 U.S. 380, 388 (1993).

It should be noted this is not the first time FMI has attempted to change its response to the Citi defendants' summary judgment motions. Five days after Friedman's erroneous filing and the day before the Citi defendants' replies were due, FMI filed an emergency motion to correct its summary judgment responses. Dkt. No. 412 (February 24, 2008). FMI's summary judgment

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.