

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

University Mall, LLC v. Okorie

University Mall v. Okorie · No. 2:24-cv-91-TBM-MTP · Decided May 27, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi ruled on University Mall, LLC’s motion for attorney fees and Dr. Ikechukwu Okorie’s motion for leave to seek limited fee discovery. The court denied the attorney-fee motion without prejudice to refiling and denied the motion for limited fee discovery.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi, Eastern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Taylor B. McNeel
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi, Eastern Division
DECIDED	May 27, 2026
DOCKET	2:24-cv-91-TBM-MTP
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court ruled on University Mall, LLC's motion for attorney fees and Dr. Okorie's motion for leave to seek narrow, limited fee discovery.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown

TOPICS

- attorney fees
- discovery dispute
- commercial litigation
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- attorney fees
- discovery
- commercial litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether University Mall, LLC's motion for attorney fees should be granted.

2. Whether Dr. Okorie should be granted leave to seek narrow, limited discovery concerning attorney fees.

HOLDINGS

1. The motion for attorney fees was denied without prejudice to refiling.
2. The motion for leave to seek narrow, limited fee discovery was denied.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“IT IS ORDERED that University Mall, LLC’s Motion for Attorney Fees [294] is DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE to refiling.” (Order)

“IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Dr. Okorie’s Motion for Leave to Seek Narrow Limited Fee Discovery [301] is DENIED.” (Order)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The opinion concerns a dispute in which University Mall, LLC sought attorney fees and Dr. Okorie sought leave to conduct limited discovery concerning fees. The court noted Dr. Okorie’s extensive litigation history and referenced prior sanctions-related proceedings, but the written order does not state the underlying merits facts or the court’s detailed fee analysis.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court considered the parties’ pleadings, the record, oral argument, and legal authority at a hearing on May 27, 2026. The court stated that its detailed findings and legal conclusions were announced from the bench and contained in the hearing transcript. It denied the attorney-fee motion without prejudice to refiling and denied the motion for limited fee discovery.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- University Mall, LLC v. Okorie, No. 2:24-cv-91-KS, 2025 WL 2978874 (S.D. Miss. Oct. 22, 2025)
- In re Okorie, No. 19-50379-KMS, 2024 WL 5688801 (Bankr. S.D. Miss. Mar. 25, 2024)
- 2024 WL 4186937 (S.D. Miss. Sep. 9, 2024)
- 2024 WL 4867073 (5th Cir. Nov. 22, 2024)