1		
2		
3 4		
4 5		
6		
7	UNITED STAT	TES DISTRICT COURT
8	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
9		
10	COLTON BRAUER, et al.,	
11	Plaintiffs,	Case No. 2:10-cv-00283-LDG (GWF)
12	v.	<u>ORDER</u>
13	PENSKE TRUCK LEASING CO., LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, <i>et al</i> .,	
14	Defendants.	
15		
16		
17	Defendant Penske Truck Leasing Co., L.P. ("Penske") moves to dismiss (#5) the	
18	plaintiffs' claim for punitive damages. Plaintiffs Colton and Nicole Brauer oppose (#8). The	
19	Court will grant the motion.	
20	Motion to Dismiss	
21	The defendant's motion to dismiss, brought pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6),	
22	challenges whether the plaintiff's complaint states "a claim upon which relief can be	
23	granted." In ruling upon this motion, the court is governed by the relaxed requirement of	
24	Rule 8(a)(2) that the complaint need contain only "a short and plain statement of the claim	
25	showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." As summarized by the Supreme Court, a	
26	plaintiff must allege sufficient factual mat	tter, accepted as true, "to state a claim to relief that
	1	

1 is plausible on its face." Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570, 127 S.Ct. 1955, 2 1974 (U.S. 2007). Nevertheless, while a complaint "does not need detailed factual 3 allegations, a plaintiff's obligation to provide the 'grounds' of his 'entitle[ment] to relief' requires more than labels and conclusions, and a formulaic recitation of the elements of a 4 cause of action will not do." Id., at 555 (citations omitted). In deciding whether the factual 5 6 allegations state a claim, the court accepts those allegations as true, as "Rule 12(b)(6) 7 does not countenance . . . dismissals based on a judge's disbelief of a complaint's factual 8 allegations." Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 327 (1989). Further, the court "construe[s] the pleadings in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party." Outdoor Media Group, 9 10 *Inc. v. City of Beaumont*, 506 F3.d 895, 900 (9th Cir. 2007).

However, bare, conclusory allegations, including legal allegations couched as
factual, are not entitled to be assumed to be true. *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555. "[T]he tenet
that a court must accept as true all of the allegations contained in a complaint is
inapplicable to legal conclusions." *Ashcroft v. lqbal* 556 U.S. ____, 129 S.Ct. 1937, 1949
(2009). "While legal conclusions can provide the framework of a complaint, they must be
supported by factual allegations." *Id.*, at 1950. Thus, this court considers the conclusory
statements in a complaint pursuant to their factual context.

To be plausible on its face, a claim must be more than merely possible or
conceivable. "[W]here the well-pleaded facts do not permit the court to infer more than the
mere possibility of misconduct, the complaint has alleged-but it has not 'show[n]'-'that the
pleader is entitled to relief." *Id.*, (citing Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 8(a)(2)). Rather, the factual
allegations must push the claim "across the line from conceivable to plausible." *Twombly.*550 U.S. at 570. Thus, allegations that are consistent with a claim, but that are more likely
explained by lawful behavior, do not plausibly establish a claim. *Id.*, at 567.

The Plaintiffs argue that they can maintain their claim against Penske for acting with a conscious disregard toward them. In support of this argument, the Plaintiffs argue that a

2

third-party informed them that it was "well known" that practically any key that could fit into
 the ignition switch could start the vehicle. The Plaintiffs then argue that it is reasonable to
 <u>assume</u> this information was well known to Penske. The argument, itself, reveals that the
 Plaintiffs failed to allege sufficient facts to support a claim for punitive damages against
 Penske. Accordingly,

THE COURT **ORDERS** that Defendant Penske Truck Leasing Co., L.P.'s Motion to
Dismiss Plaintiffs' Claim for Punitive Damages (#5) is GRANTED. Plaintiffs' Claim for
Punitive Damages is DISMISSED.

DATED this 3 day of March, 2011.

Lloyd D. George United States District Judge