

**STATE OF MICHIGAN  
IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE COUNTY OF OAKLAND  
BUSINESS COURT**

**RANJEV BERI,  
Plaintiff,**

v.

**Case No. 16-153629-CB  
Hon. James M. Alexander**

**JAMES THOMPSON and  
THOMPSON MARBLE & TILE CO.,  
Defendants.**

---

**OPINION AND ORDER REMOVING CASE FROM BUSINESS COURT**

The present Complaint was filed on June 22, 2016, wherein Plaintiff is alleging that Defendants failed and refused to perform certain construction services on his residential property in Northville, Michigan. Contemporaneous with the filing of the Complaint, Plaintiff filed a Notice of Assignment to the Business Court – claiming that this is a business or commercial dispute because “one or more of the parties is a business enterprise and the other parties are its or their present or former owners, managers, shareholders, members, directors, officers, agents, employees, suppliers, or competitors, and the claims arise out of those relationships.” See MCL 600.8031(1)(c)(ii).

This Court has an obligation to question sua sponte its jurisdiction over the subject matter of an action. *Yee v Shiawassee Co Bd of Comm'rs*, 251 Mich App 379, 399; 651 NW2d 756 (2002). Subject matter jurisdiction is determined by the allegations in the pleadings. *Trost v Buckstop Lure Co, Inc*, 249 Mich App 580, 587-588; 644 NW2d 54 (2002).

Business court jurisdiction is limited to actions involving a “business or commercial dispute.” MCL 600.8035(3). The statute defines a business or commercial dispute as:

- (i) An action in which all of the parties are business enterprises.

- (ii) An action in which 1 or more of the parties is a business enterprise and the other parties are its or their present or former owners, managers, shareholders, members, directors, officers, agents, employees, suppliers, or competitors, and the claims arise out of those relationships.
- (iii) An action in which 1 of the parties is a nonprofit organization, and the claims arise out of that party's organizational structure, governance, or finances.
- (iv) An action involving the sale, merger, purchase, combination, dissolution, liquidation, organizational structure, governance, or finances of a business enterprise. [MCL 600.8031(1)(c)].

In the present action, Plaintiff has not provided any factual allegations to support his contention that he is a present or former owner, manager, shareholder, member, director, officer, agent, employee, supplier, or competitor of Thompson Marble & Tile Co. under MCL 600.8031(1)(c)(ii). Rather, Plaintiff personally entered into an agreement with Defendants for construction renovation services to a residence. As such, the Court finds that this action does not qualify as a business or commercial dispute as defined by MCL 600.8035(1) or as claimed by Plaintiff under MCL 600.8031(1)(c)(ii). Moreover, there are no allegations in the Complaint from which the Court could conclude that jurisdiction is proper under § 8031(1)(c)(i), (iii) or (iv).

For all of these reasons, this action is excluded from business court jurisdiction and the Court orders the case reassigned to the general civil docket.

The case code will be changed to CZ unless the parties stipulate otherwise.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

June 29, 2016  
Date

/s/ James M. Alexander  
Hon. James M. Alexander, Circuit Court Judge