president of AR. The complaint asserts five causes of action: (1) breach of contract as to the Manna note; (2) breach of guaranty as to the Manna note; (3) breach of contract as to the AR note; (4) fraudulent inducement as to both notes; and (5) promissory estoppel as to both notes. Defendants move to dismiss plaintiffs' claims of fraudulent inducement and promissory estoppel as insufficiently pled and all claims asserted against the individual defendants on the basis that they are not personally liable for payment of the notes.

While plaintiff opposes defendants' motion, he also requests leave to amend his complaint to the extent it is deficient.

Accordingly, plaintiff shall have up to and including February 12, 2013, in which to file an amended complaint to assert any claim of alter ego, to plead a basis for his breach of guaranty claim, and to set forth the "the who, what, when, where, and how of the misconduct charged" in his fraudulent inducement and promissory estoppel claims. See Ebeid ex rel. U.S. v. Lungwitz, 616 F.3d 993, 998 (9th Cir. 2010). Should the plaintiff fail to file an amended complaint by February 12, 2013, the defendants' pending motion to dismiss shall stand submitted.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: This 22nd day of January, 2013.

Howard & Mikilles

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE