

1 KEKER & VAN NEST LLP
 ROBERT A. VAN NEST - #84065
 2 rvannest@kvn.com
 R. JAMES SLAUGHTER - #192813
 3 rslaughter@kvn.com
 MICHAEL S. KWUN - #198945
 4 mkwun@kvn.com
 DAN JACKSON - #216091
 5 djackson@kvn.com
 633 Battery Street
 6 San Francisco, CA 94111-1809
 T: 415-391-5400/F: 415-397-7188

7 JONATHAN BAND - #122369
 8 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
 KAREN J. PETRULAKIS - #168732
karen.petrulakis@ucop.edu
 ERIC K. BEHRENS - #79440
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

14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 15 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, WESTERN DIVISION

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

20 Plaintiffs,

v.

21 THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY
 OF CALIFORNIA, a California
 22 corporation; MARK G. YUDOF, an
 individual; DR. GENE BLOCK,
 23 CHANCELLOR OF THE UNIVERSITY
 OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES, an
 24 individual; DR. SHARON FARB, an
 individual; LARRY LOEHER, an
 25 individual; PATRICIA O'DONNELL, an
 individual; and John Does 1-50,

26 Defendants.

Case No. 10-cv-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 majority of the claims asserted. As to any remaining claims, Plaintiffs have failed to state a plausible claim for relief.

The Court finds that permitting leave to amend would be futile. Plaintiffs have already amended their complaint twice and failed to cure its flaws.

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