

University of Pittsburgh School of Law  
**Scholarship@PITT LAW**

---

Cases

Roz Litman Archive

---

6-9-1992

**Selph v. Nelson, Reabe and Snyder, Inc.**

Westlaw

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.law.pitt.edu/roz-litman-cases>



Part of the Law Commons

---

**Recommended Citation**

1992 WL 123361

This Case Brief is brought to you for free and open access by the Roz Litman Archive at Scholarship@PITT LAW. It has been accepted for inclusion in Cases by an authorized administrator of Scholarship@PITT LAW. For more information, please contact [leers@pitt.edu](mailto:leers@pitt.edu), [shephard@pitt.edu](mailto:shephard@pitt.edu).



KeyCite Yellow Flag - Negative Treatment

Distinguished by [In re Mansfield Corp.](#), Bankr.D.Minn., March 16, 2006

966 F.2d 411  
United States Court of Appeals,  
Eighth Circuit.

Benjamin H. SELPH, individually; Bryan W. Selph, individually; Selco, Inc., Benjamin H. Selph and Bryan W. Selph d/b/a Days Inn Hotel of Clarion, Pennsylvania, Appellants,  
v.

NELSON, REABE AND SNYDER, INC., Appellee.

No. 91-2255.  
|  
Submitted Jan. 7, 1992.  
|  
Decided June 9, 1992.

### Synopsis

Insureds brought suit against their insurance broker. The United States District Court for the Western District of Missouri, [Dean Whipple](#), J., dismissed complaint on ground that insureds had previously filed an identical complaint in federal district court of another state. Insureds appealed. The Court of Appeals held that district court should have stayed action.

Reversed and remanded with instructions.

West Headnotes (1)

[1] **Action** Actions in different jurisdictions in general

**Federal Courts** Particular Cases, Contexts, and Questions

[13 Action](#)

[13IV Commencement, Prosecution, and Termination](#)

[13k67 Stay of Proceedings](#)

[13k69 Another Action Pending](#)

[13k69\(2\) Actions in different jurisdictions in general](#)

[170B Federal Courts](#)

[170BX Personal Jurisdiction](#)

[170BX\(A\) In General](#)

[170Bk2707 Particular Cases, Contexts, and Questions](#)

[170Bk2708 In general](#)

(Formerly 170Bk76.1, 170Ak1742(2),

170Ak1742.1)

District court should have stayed, rather than dismissed, complaint which was identical to plaintiffs' complaint filed in another state, where defendants had refused to stipulate to personal jurisdiction in other court and plaintiffs had filed complaint in forum court in order to ensure federal forum in which to litigate their cause of action.

[11 Cases that cite this headnote](#)

### All Citations

966 F.2d 411