CLARKE et al v. LANE et al Doc. 95

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

JAMES CLARKE, et al., : CIVIL ACTION : NO. 08-468

Plaintiffs, :

:

V.

BERNON LANE, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

AND NOW, this 31st day of March, 2010, for the reasons provided in the accompanying Memorandum, it is hereby ORDERED as follows:

- 1. Moving Defendants' first motion to dismiss

 Plaintiffs' amended complaint (doc. no. 83) is **DENIED in part and GRANTED in part**. It is **granted** with respect to Plaintiffs

 Anderson, Clarke, Charles, Taylor, Coleman, Chapolini and Cruz

 and **denied** with respect to Plaintiff Pastrana;
- 2. CEC Defendants' second motion to dismiss or, in the alternative, for summary judgment (doc. no. 85) is **DENIED in part and GRANTED in part**. The motion to dismiss is **granted** with respect to Plaintiffs Anderson, Clarke, Charles, Taylor, Coleman, Chapolini and Cruz and **denied** with respect to Plaintiff Pastrana. The motion for summary judgment, in the alternative, is **DENIED**

without prejudice.

3. Plaintiffs' motion for class certification (doc. no. 72) is **GRANTED**. It is further ordered that Plaintiff is designated as class representative.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Eduardo C. Robreno
EDUARDO C. ROBRENO, J.