

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 DEBORAH HULBERT, )  
4 )  
5 Plaintiff, )  
6 vs. )  
7 AINSWORTH GAME TECHNOLOGY, INC., )  
8 et al., )  
9 Defendants. )

Case No.: 2:16-cv-01552-GMN-CWH


ORDER

10 Pending before the Court is the Motion to Dismiss, (ECF No. 4), filed by Defendants  
11 Ainsworth Game Technology, Inc., Mike Dreitzer, John Glaser, and Lisa Nappi (collectively  
12 “Defendants”). After Defendants filed the motion, Plaintiff Deborah Hulbert properly filed an  
13 amended complaint. (ECF No. 8). “[A]n amended complaint supersedes the original, the latter  
14 being treated thereafter as non-existent.” Ramirez v. County of San Bernardino, 806 F.3d 1002,  
15 1008 (9th Cir. 2015). Here, Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss pertains to the original complaint  
16 rather than the operative amended complaint.

17 Accordingly,

18 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss, (ECF No. 4), is  
19 **DENIED** as moot.

20  
21 **DATED** this 27 day of February, 2017.

22  
23   
24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 Gloria M. Navarro, Chief Judge  
United States District Judge