

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

---

SENIOR SETTLEMENTS, LLC,  
Plaintiff,

v.

GROWTH TRUST FUND, et al.,  
Defendants.

---

HONORABLE JEROME B. SIMANDLE  
Civil No. 05-777 (JBS)

**OPINION**

APPEARANCES:

Michael O. Kassak, Esq.  
WHITE AND WILLIAMS, LLP  
457 Haddonfield Road  
Suite 400  
Cherry Hill, New Jersey 08002  
Attorney for Plaintiff

Howard S. Feintuch, Esq.  
FEINTUCH, PORWICH & FEINTUCH  
721 Newark Avenue  
Jersey City, New Jersey 07306  
Attorney for Defendants

**SIMANDLE**, U.S. District Judge:

Plaintiff brought this action in state court seeking, among other things, a declaration that certain Life Insurance Policy Purchase and Sale Agreements are valid and enforceable as between the parties. The case was subsequently removed to this Court, and Defendants now move for dismissal based on improper venue or, alternatively, to have this matter transferred to either the Eastern District of New York or the Newark Vicinage of this District. For the reasons now stated, the Court will deny the motion in its entirety.

**I. BACKGROUND**

According to the Complaint, on or about January 4, 1992, Defendants Bernat and Margit Steinmatz created the Defendant Growth Trust Fund ("Growth Trust" or "Trust") for the purpose of transferring ownership of various life insurance policies owned by, and covering, Bernat Steinmatz.<sup>1</sup> (Compl. ¶¶ 19, 20.) The remaining trustees of the Growth Trust included individual defendants Michael Steinmetz, Leah Cohen, and Abraham and Fay Weingarten (collectively "Trustees"). (Id. ¶¶ 3-8.) Plaintiff Senior Settlements is a New Jersey Limited Liability Company primarily in the business of investing in "senior settlements" such as the Growth Trust Fund. (Id. ¶¶ 1, 17.)

On or about June 25, 2004, Senior Settlements allegedly presented the Trust with offers to buy the Policies. (Id. ¶ 21.) According to Plaintiff, the parties executed three separate Life Insurance Policy Purchase and Sale Agreements ("Agreements") conveying ownership of the Policies from the Trust to Plaintiff. (Pl. Ex. A.) According to the Complaint, on or about October 28, 2004, Defendant Michael Steinmetz stated that the Steinmetz family did not wish to proceed with the Agreements. (Compl. ¶ 29.)

---

<sup>1</sup> The three policies at issue are: (1) North American Company Policy No. LN00534750; (2) American General Policy No. 24002141L; and (3) American General Policy No. 24002079L (collectively the "Policies"). (Compl. ¶ 18.)

Plaintiff subsequently instituted this suit in the Superior Court of New Jersey, Camden County, seeking a declaration that the Agreements are valid and enforceable and asserting a claim for breach of contract. The matter was removed to this Court on February 7, 2005, and Defendants subsequently filed the instant motion.

## II. DISCUSSION

\_\_\_\_\_ Defendants have moved, in the first instance, for dismissal of the Complaint under Rule 12(b)(3), Fed. R. Civ. P., and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and 1406, asserting improper venue.

Alternatively, Defendants seek to transfer this matter to either the Eastern District of New York or the Newark Vicinage of the District of New Jersey pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404. The parties, through counsel, have submitted briefs in support and opposition to the motion, which this Court has considered. The Defendants are residents of Brooklyn, New York, while Plaintiff is a New Jersey Limited Liability Company with its principal place of business in Cherry Hill, New Jersey, located in Camden County. (Compl. ¶¶ 1-8.) This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332.

### A. Duty of Disclosure

Preliminarily, the Court notes that Defendants' written submission omits any reference to the forum selection clause contained in the Agreements. (Pl. Ex. A. ¶ 17.) That provision

identifies New Jersey as the exclusive forum for any legal proceedings "arising out of or in connection with" the Agreement. (Id.) The Court would like to remind Defendants' counsel of his "continuing duty to inform the Court of any development which may conceivably affect the outcome" of the litigation. Fusari v. Steinberg, 419 U.S. 379, 391 (1975) (Burger, C.J., concurring). This is so even where the information may be unfavorable to the interests of the litigant. See In re Universal Minerals Inc., 755 F.2d 309, 313 (3d Cir. 1985). Cf. Model Rules of Professional Conduct, Rule 3.3 (2002) (candor toward tribunal). This obligation is designed to promote respect for the judicial process as well as the just resolution of juridical disputes. Counsel's failure here to bring to the Court's attention the forum selection provision serves only to frustrate these twin aims. Arguing that the contract is not binding is not a substitute for ignoring the forum selection clause for disputes concerning the alleged contract. The Court hereby admonishes counsel to avoid such conduct in the future.

B. Forum Selection Provision

As already noted, the Agreements at issue contain a forum selection clause choosing New Jersey. That provision states, in pertinent part:

The parties hereto irrevocably and unconditionally agree that any suit, action, or other legal proceeding arising out of or in connection with this Agreement, or the transactions contemplated hereby, shall be brought

in the courts of record of the State of New Jersey or the courts of the United States located in said state, consent to the jurisdiction of each such court in any such suit, action or proceedings, and waive any objection to the venue of any such suit, action or proceedings in any of such courts.

(Pl. Ex. A at ¶ 17.) The instant dispute unquestionably “aris[es] out of or in connection with th[e] Agreement,” thereby triggering the above provision. The issue, then, is whether that clause is valid. For the reasons now explained, the Court holds that it is.<sup>2</sup>

In The Bremen v. Zapata Off-Shore Co., the United States Supreme Court held that forum selection clauses are “prima facie valid and should be enforced unless enforcement is shown by the resisting party to be ‘unreasonable’ under the circumstances.”

---

<sup>2</sup> Under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(a):

A civil action wherein jurisdiction is founded only on diversity of citizenship may, except as otherwise provided by law, be brought only in (1) a judicial district where any defendant resides, if all defendants reside in the same State, (2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of the property that is the subject of the action is situated, or (3) a judicial district in which any defendant is subject to personal jurisdiction at the time the action is commenced, if there is no district in which the action may otherwise be brought.

(Emphasis added). In the present case, venue would ordinarily lie in New York unless a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred in New Jersey. The forum selection clause, however, displaces the statutory venue selection unless unreasonable under the circumstances, as discussed in the text which follows.

# 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.