

Georgia State University College of Law
Reading Room

Georgia Business Court Opinions

2-26-2007

Order of Clarification for Previous Summary
Judgment Order (MICROBILT
CORPORATION)

Elizabeth E. Long
Superior Court of Fulton County

Follow this and additional works at: <http://readingroom.law.gsu.edu/businesscourt>


Institutional Repository Citation

Long, Elizabeth E., "Order of Clarification for Previous Summary Judgment Order (MICROBILT CORPORATION)" (2007).
Georgia Business Court Opinions. Paper 102.
<http://readingroom.law.gsu.edu/businesscourt/102>

This Court Order is brought to you for free and open access by Reading Room. It has been accepted for inclusion in Georgia Business Court Opinions by an authorized administrator of Reading Room. For more information, please contact jgermann@gsu.edu.

COPY

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF FULTON COUNTY
STATE OF GEORGIA



MICROBILT CORPORATION,

Plaintiff,

v.

FIDELITY NATIONAL FINANCIAL INC.,
et al.

Defendants,

*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*

Civil Action No. 2003-CV-79446
(Business Division Two—EL)

ORDER OF CLARIFICATION FOR PREVIOUS SUMMARY JUDGMENT ORDER

The above-styled case is before the Court on Defendants' Motion for Reconsideration or Clarification ("Motion for Reconsideration") of this Court's January 17, 2007, Summary Judgment Order.


Defendants' Motion for Reconsideration requests the Court to recognize that the parties are in agreement with respect to CPU-to-CPU connections and to award summary judgment in favor of Defendants for amounts claimed under recoupment. After reviewing the briefs submitted on these issues, the Court finds as follows:

The parties are in agreement that CPU-to-CPU connections are outside of the scope of the Exclusive Access Agreement entered into by the parties. Thus, this issue is resolved and does not require jury determination.

With respect to recoupment, Defendants allege that NMC erroneously paid Plaintiff over \$70,000 for Tower Loan credit reports that were outside of the scope of the Contract (i.e., CPU-to-CPU connections and after the termination date), not subject to the voluntary payment doctrine, and thus require summary judgment. See Edmond v. State Farm Mutual Auto. Ins. Co., 175 Ga. App. 548 (1985). In Edmond, the trial court's determination to recoup and

reallocate State Farm's previous erroneous payments hinged upon the defendant's misinterpretation of no-fault law, which constituted payment under a mistake of the law. Id. at 550. Defendants, here, have alleged no facts that they were mistaken as to what the law was or required under the Exclusive Access Agreement. See, Wallis v. B & A Const. Co., Inc., 273 Ga. App. 68, 74 (2005). At this stage the issue remains unresolved and the recoupment of such payments shall be determined by a jury.

SO ORDERED this 26th day of February, 2007.


ELIZABETH E. LONG, SENIOR JUDGE
Superior Court of Fulton County
Atlanta/Judicial Circuit

Copies to:

Kevin Harrison Hudson, Esq.
Mary Lillian Walker, Esq.
Foltz Martin LLC
3525 Piedmont Road NE
Five Piedmont Center
Suite 750
Atlanta, GA 30305-1541

David L. Pardue, Esq.
Alycia K. Jastrebski, Esq.
Hartman, Simons, Spielman & Wood LLP
6400 Powers Ferry Road NW
Suite 400
Atlanta, GA 30339