

1 KEKER & VAN NEST LLP  
 ROBERT A. VAN NEST - #84065  
 2 [rvannest@kvn.com](mailto:rvannest@kvn.com)  
 R. JAMES SLAUGHTER - #192813  
 3 [rslaughter@kvn.com](mailto:rslaughter@kvn.com)  
 MICHAEL S. KWUN - #198945  
 4 [mkwun@kvn.com](mailto:mkwun@kvn.com)  
 ANDREW F. DAWSON - #264421  
 5 [adawson@kvn.com](mailto:adawson@kvn.com)  
 710 Sansome Street  
 6 San Francisco, CA 94111-1704  
 T: 415-391-5400/F: 415-397-7188

7 JONATHAN BAND - #122369  
 8 [jband@policybandwidth.com](mailto:jband@policybandwidth.com)  
 21 Dupont Circle NW, 8th Floor  
 9 Washington, DC 20036  
 T: 202-296-5675/F: 202-872-0884

CHARLES F. ROBINSON - #113197  
[charles.robinson@ucop.edu](mailto:charles.robinson@ucop.edu)  
 KAREN J. PETRULAKIS - #168732  
[karen.petrulakis@ucop.edu](mailto:karen.petrulakis@ucop.edu)  
 ERIC K. BEHRENS - #79440  
[eric.behrens@ucop.edu](mailto:eric.behrens@ucop.edu)  
 University of California  
 Office of the General Counsel  
 1111 Franklin Street, 8th Floor  
 Oakland, CA 94607-5200  
 T: 510-987-9800/F: 510-987-9757

13 Attorneys for Defendants  
 The Regents of the University of California  
 14 and Dr. Gene Block

15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 16 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 17 WESTERN DIVISION

18 ASSOCIATION FOR INFORMATION  
 19 MEDIA AND EQUIPMENT, an  
 Illinois nonprofit membership  
 20 organization; and AMBROSE VIDEO  
 PUBLISHING, INC., a New York  
 21 corporation,

Plaintiffs,

v.

23 THE REGENTS OF THE  
 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, a  
 24 California corporation; DR. GENE  
 BLOCK, CHANCELLOR OF THE  
 25 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,  
 LOS ANGELES, an individual,

Defendants.

Case No. CV10-09378 CBM (MANx)

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING  
 MOTION TO DISMISS  
 COMPLAINT FOR LACK OF  
 SUBJECT MATTER  
 JURISDICTION AND FAILURE TO  
 STATE A CLAIM**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**[PROPOSED] ORDER**

Defendants have moved under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6) for dismissal of Plaintiffs' complaint in its entirety.

The Court has reviewed the moving, opposition, and reply papers and heard argument from counsel. After considering the submissions and arguments, the Court finds that it lacks subject matter jurisdiction to adjudicate the claims asserted. Moreover, the Court finds that permitting leave to amend would be futile, as no amendment could cure the jurisdictional flaws in Plaintiffs' suit.

Good cause appearing, Defendants' motion is therefore GRANTED in its entirety and Plaintiffs' complaint is dismissed with prejudice.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Date: \_\_\_\_\_, 2011

\_\_\_\_\_  
Hon. Consuelo B. Marshall  
United States District Court