

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

| | | |
|-------------------------|---|-----------------|
| LOUIS ROSSI, |) | |
| |) | Civil Action |
| Plaintiff |) | No. 12-cv-07270 |
| |) | |
| vs. |) | |
| |) | |
| JOHN QUARMLEY; |) | |
| JAMES MORTON, III; and |) | |
| PRINCIPIA VENTURES LLC, |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants |) | |

O R D E R

NOW, this 25th day of March, 2014 upon consideration of the following documents:

- (1) Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Amended Complaint, which motion was filed July 1, 2013 (Document 22); together with

Memorandum of Law in Support of
Defendants' Motion to Dismiss
Plaintiff's Amended Complaint
(Document 22-1);
- (2) Response in Opposition to Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint, which response was filed July 15, 2013 (Document 23); together with

Memorandum of Law in Support of
Response in Opposition to Motion to
Dismiss Amended Complaint
(Document 23-2);
- (3) Reply Brief in Support of Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Amended Complaint, which reply brief was filed August 5, 2013 (Document 27);
- (4) Sur-Reply in Opposition to Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint, which sur-reply was filed August 6, 2013 (Document 29); and

(5) Amended Complaint filed June 17, 2013
(Document 21),

and for the reasons expressed in the accompanying Opinion,

IT IS ORDERED that Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Amended Complaint is granted.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Count I of plaintiff's Amended Complaint is dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Counts II through VII of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint are dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of Court shall mark this case closed for statistical purposes.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ JAMES KNOLL GARDNER
James Knoll Gardner
United States District Judge