

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
MICHIGAN, SOUTHERN DIVISION

Mohamad Charafeddine, et al. v. Carson Freight, LLC, et al.

Charafeddine · No. 24-cv-11266 · Decided March 10, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan granted in part and denied in part defendants’ motion for summary judgment in a motor-vehicle accident case. The court held that judicial estoppel did not bar plaintiffs from relying on injuries allegedly caused by the later accident and that a material factual dispute existed regarding whether the plaintiff suffered a serious impairment of body function under Michigan law. The court granted summary judgment on the direct negligence claims against the employer for negligent hiring, retention, training, and supervision, while leaving the vicarious-liability claim based on the driver’s alleged negligence unresolved.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Robert J. White
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division
DECIDED	March 10, 2026
DOCKET	24-cv-11266
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendants moved for summary judgment on Plaintiffs' negligence-based claims arising from a motor-vehicle accident.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Summary judgment is proper under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56 when there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. The evidence must be viewed in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party, and a material factual dispute concerning the nature and extent of a motor-vehicle injury precludes resolving the serious-impairment issue as a matter of law.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; persuasive rather than precedential

PARTIES

Mohamad Charafeddine, Wadad Charafeddine v. Carson Freight, LLC,
Jesus Odilfo Orduno

TOPICS

summary judgment

negligence

negligent hiring

negligent supervision

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

torts

civil procedure

motor vehicle negligence

bankruptcy

employer liability

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether judicial estoppel barred Plaintiffs from relying on Mohamad Charafeddine's disc herniations as the alleged threshold injury because he had previously reported spinal injuries and loss of his trucking business in a bankruptcy proceeding.
2. Whether a material factual dispute concerning the nature and extent of Mohamad Charafeddine's injuries precluded summary judgment on whether he suffered a serious impairment of body function under Michigan law.
3. Whether Plaintiffs presented sufficient evidence to proceed on direct negligence claims against Carson Freight for negligent hiring, retention, training, and supervision of Orduno.

HOLDINGS

1. Judicial estoppel did not bar Plaintiffs from relying on disc herniations allegedly caused or aggravated by the 2024 accident because that cause of action did not exist when Mohamad Charafeddine filed for bankruptcy, and the bankruptcy court therefore did not accept the same position concerning the current claim.
2. Summary judgment was inappropriate because the parties presented a material factual dispute concerning the nature and extent of Mohamad Charafeddine's injuries. The jury must decide whether the 2024 accident caused an objectively manifested serious impairment of body function that affected his general ability to lead his normal life.
3. Carson Freight was entitled to summary judgment on Plaintiffs' direct negligence claims because Plaintiffs offered no evidence creating a material factual dispute regarding negligent hiring, retention, training, or supervision.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“But “[i]f there is a material factual dispute regarding the nature and extent of the person’s injuries, the court should not decide the issue as a matter of law.”” (at 8)

“As a result, the jury must decide whether Mr. Charafeddine suffered a threshold injury.” (at 10)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

On February 9, 2024, Jesus Odilfo Orduno was driving a Carson Freight truck in the course of his employment when he rear-ended Mohamad Charafeddine's truck, which was parked along the side of the road. Charafeddine did not report an injury at the scene but sought medical treatment several days later and identified neck and back injuries. The parties offered conflicting evidence regarding the nature and extent of his spinal injuries, including competing interpretations of MRI images and medical records.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs brought the action in Michigan state court after a February 9, 2024 collision involving Mohamad Charafeddine and Carson Freight employee Jesus Odilfo Orduno. Plaintiffs asserted claims against Carson Freight for negligent entrustment, hiring, retention, training, and supervision, as well as vicarious liability for Orduno's alleged negligence. Defendants removed the case to the Eastern District of Michigan and moved for summary judgment. The court granted the motion in part as to the direct negligence claims against Carson Freight and denied it in part as to whether Plaintiffs established a Michigan no-fault threshold injury.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Himes v. United States, 645 F.3d 771, 784 (6th Cir. 2011)
- U.S. S.E.C. v. Sierra Brokerage Servs., Inc., 712 F.3d 321, 327 (6th Cir. 2013)
- Tysinger v. Police Dep't of City of Zanesville, 463 F.3d 569, 572 (6th Cir. 2006)
- Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 247-48, 251-52 (1986)
- New Hampshire v. Maine, 532 U.S. 742, 749-50 (2001)
- Edwards v. Aetna Life Ins. Co., 690 F.2d 595, 598-99 (6th Cir. 1982)
- Am. Guarantee and Liab. Ins. Co. v. Norfolk S. Ry. Co., 278 F. Supp. 3d 1025, 1048 (E.D. Tenn. 2017)
- Stanley v. FCA US, LLC, 51 F.4th 215, 219 (6th Cir. 2022)
- Kimberlin v. Dollar Gen. Corp., 520 F. App'x 312, 314 (6th Cir. 2013)
- Davis v. Fiat Chrysler Autos. U.S., LLC, 747 Fed. App'x 309, 313, 315-16 (6th Cir. 2018)
- Bone v. Taco Bell of Am., LLC, 956 F. Supp. 2d 872, 881-86 (W.D. Tenn. 2013)
- McCormick v. Carrier, 487 Mich. 180, 193-94, 196 (2010)
- Chouman v. Home Owners Ins. Co., 293 Mich. App. 434, 444 (2011)
- Zsigo v. Hurley Med. Ctr., 475 Mich. 215, 227 (2006)
- Muller v. Brannigan Bros. Rests. and Taverns LLC, 323 Mich. App. 566, 572, 574-75 (2018)
- Case v. Consumers Power Co., 463 Mich. 1, 6 (2000)