

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

Nicholas Spaeth,

Plaintiff,

v.

Georgetown University, et al.,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 11-1376 (ESH)

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Plaintiff Nicholas Spaeth has sued six law schools and various officers at those schools alleging that they unlawfully discriminated against him based on his age when they declined to interview him for tenure-track teaching positions after he applied to them in advance of the 2010 American Association of Law Schools Faculty Recruitment Conference in Washington, D.C. (*See* Amended Complaint, Nov. 7, 2011 [Dkt. No. 10].) In a prior order, this Court described the relevant background, severed Spaeth’s claims against four out-of-state institutions and their corresponding officers into separate suits, and transferred those suits to those defendants’ home forums. (*See* Memorandum Opinion, Feb. 17, 2012 [Dkt. No. 58] (“Mem. Op. I”); Order, Feb. 17, 2012 [Dkt. No. 59].) Remaining in this action are Spaeth’s claims against the University of Maryland School of Law and University of Maryland, Baltimore President Jay A. Perman¹ (collectively, “Maryland”), and Georgetown University.

¹ Spaeth’s Amended Complaint names Wallace D. Loh, President of the University of Maryland. (*See* Am. Compl. at 2 (caption).) By consent of the parties, Jay A. Perman, president of the University of Maryland, Baltimore, was substituted for Loh on January 30, 2012. (*See* Minute Order Granting Consent Motion, Jan. 30, 2012.)

Before the Court is Maryland's motion to sever Spaeth's claims against it pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 21 and transfer them to the District of Maryland pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a), and Spaeth's response. (*See* Defendants University System of Maryland, University of Maryland Francis King Carey School of Law, and Jay A. Perman, M.D., President of the University of Maryland, Baltimore's Motion to Sever and Transfer Venue, Feb. 23, 2012 [Dkt. No. 61] ("Maryland Mot."); Plaintiff's Response to University of Maryland Defendants' Motion to Sever and Transfer Venue, March 7, 2012 [Dkt. No. 66] ("Pl.'s Response").²)

In his response, Spaeth states that only he "recognizes that this Court's grant of the motions to sever and transfer venue as to several other defendants . . . has set forth this Court's determination on this issue, which also applies to the Maryland defendants' motion to sever and transfer venue." (Pl.'s Response at 1.) Spaeth therefore does not raise any new arguments in response to Maryland's motion. Accordingly, the Court will grant Maryland's motion for the reasons stated in its prior Opinion. (*See* Mem. Op. I at 5–11 (severance); *id.* at 12–19 (transfer).) A separate order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

/s/
ELLEN SEGAL HUVELLE
United States District Judge

Date: March 8, 2012

² This Memorandum Opinion does not address any other pending motion.