

paucity of discussion regarding the proposed joinder of additional Defendants and seek reconsideration on grounds that joinder is proper, which would remove this Court of subject matter jurisdiction over the case. (Mem. of Law in Supp. of Mot. for Reconsideration, ECF No. 77-1, at 1.) The motion for reconsideration is DENIED.

The Court enforced the forum selection clause and found dismissal proper under the doctrine of *forum non conveniens*. This made all of Plaintiffs other objections to the Report moot. (Decision at 9 n.3.) This Court found that this was not the right forum to bring an action, Israel was. Therefore, there was no need to address the merits of Plaintiffs other objections, especially those seeking to make amendments to a complaint filed in the incorrect forum.¹

Therefore, Plaintiffs' Motion for Reconsideration, (ECF No. 77), is DENIED. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close the motion and this case accordingly.

Dated: **JUN 14 2022**
New York, New York

JUN 14 2022

SO ORDERED.

George B. Daniels

GEORGE B. DANIELS
United States District Judge

¹ To the extent Plaintiffs are arguing that this Court should have found that it lacked subject matter jurisdiction because joinder was proper, the Plaintiffs misapprehend the Court's procedure in making its decision. Remand was originally proper because of the Defendants listed in the operative complaint. Once Remand was proper, this Court decided to enforce the forum selection clause of the LOI and not entertain any further amendments to the complaint.