

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

BRUCE L. CLARK,	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	No. 5:21-cv-03358
	:	
RATCHFORD LAW GROUP, PC and	:	
GALAXY INTERNATIONAL	:	
PURCHASING, LLC,	:	
Defendant.	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 29th day of June, 2022, upon consideration of pro se Plaintiff Bruce L. Clark’s Motion to Remove Ratchford Law Group as a co-Defendant to this case, ECF No. 44, this Court’s Order dated April 12, 2022, which ordered Clark to clarify the relief sought in his motion, ECF No. 45,¹ Clark’s Clarification, ECF No. 47,² this Court’s Order dated May 20, 2022, in which this Court denied Clark’s Motion for Reconsideration and again provided him with an opportunity to indicate whether he wished to proceed in his request to have Ratchford removed as a party,³ ECF No. 50, having received no response to this Court’s most recent Order,

¹ In this Order, the Court reminded Clark that Defendant Galaxy International Purchasing had already been dismissed with prejudice from this action. *See* ECF No. 45; ECF No. 39. Accordingly, this Court notified Clark that removal of Ratchford, the only remaining Defendant, would result in closure of his case. In light of that notice, this Court provided Clark with an opportunity to indicate whether he wished to proceed with his motion to remove Ratchford.

² In his clarification, Clark indicated that he still wished to remove Ratchford as a Defendant to the matter. *See* ECF No. 47 at 15. During the pendency of his motion to remove Ratchford, Clark filed a Motion for Reconsideration, asking this Court to reconsider its prior decision to dismiss his claims against Galaxy with prejudice. Clark’s motion for reconsideration was denied on May 20, 2022. *See* ECF Nos. 49, 50.

³ Similar to this Court’s Order dated April 12, 2022, this Order again reminded Clark that Galaxy was dismissed with prejudice and further indicated that reconsideration on that issue was denied. *See* ECF No. 50. The Order provided Clark ten days to indicate whether, in light of that

and for the reasons set forth in this Court's Opinions issued this date, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:**

1. Clark's Motion to Remove Ratchford, ECF No. 44, is **GRANTED**.
2. Ratchford Law Group, PC is **TERMINATED** as a party to this action.
3. There being no remaining Defendants to this case, this matter is **CLOSED**.
4. The Clerk of Court is directed to **MAIL** a copy of this Order to Clark.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Joseph F. Leeson, Jr.

JOSEPH F. LEESON, JR.

United States District Judge

information, he wished to proceed with his Motion to Remove Ratchford. *See id.* To date, no response has been received from Clark.