

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

<p><b>ERIC NYCE,</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><b>Plaintiff,</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;"><b>v.</b></p> <p><b>STERLING CREDIT CORPORATION,</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><b>Defendant.</b></p>	<p>⋮</p> <p>⋮</p> <p>⋮</p> <p>⋮</p> <p>⋮</p> <p>⋮</p> <p>⋮</p> <p>⋮</p> <p>⋮</p>	<p><b>CIVIL ACTION</b></p> <p><b>NO. 11-cv-5066</b></p>
--	--	--

**ORDER**

**AND NOW**, this 2nd day of April, 2013, upon consideration of Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment as to All Claims and Memorandum of Law in Support Thereof (Document No. 28, filed September 28, 2012), Plaintiff’s Response in Opposition to Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment (Document No. 29, filed October 19, 2012), and Defendant Sterling Corporation’s Reply Brief in Support of Its Motion for Summary Judgment (Document No. 32, filed November 2, 2012), for the reasons set forth in the Memorandum dated April 2, 2013, **IT IS ORDERED** that Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment as to All Claims and Memorandum of Law in Support Thereof is **GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART** as follows:

1. The Motion is **GRANTED** with respect to Nyce’s §1692c(c) claim to the extent the claim is based on communications that occurred before August 8, 2010. The Motion is **DENIED** to the extent the claim is based on communications that occurred on or after August 8, 2010;
2. The Motion is **DENIED** with respect to Nyce’s §1692d claim;
3. The Motion is **GRANTED** with respect to Nyce’s §1692c(a)(1) claim; and

4. The Motion is **GRANTED** with respect to Nyce's §1692f claim.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that a scheduling conference will be convened in due course.

**BY THE COURT:**

/s/ Hon. Jan E. DuBois

---

**JAN E. DuBOIS, J.**