

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
CHARLESTON DIVISION

County of Charleston South Carolina,
Plaintiff,
v.
AT&T Corp, et. al.,
Defendants.

Case No.: 2:17-cv-02534

ORDER AND OPINION

RECEIVED CLERK'S OFFICE
2018 MAR - 11 A 8:25
DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
CHARLESTON, SC


This matter is before the Court on Defendants' Joint Motion for a More Definite Statement. (Dkt. No. 17.) On October 3, 2017, this Court entered an order to stay briefing on Defendants' Motion for a More Definite Statement until this Court ruled on Plaintiff's anticipated motion to remand. The Court ordered Plaintiff to move to remand no later than October 20, 2017. (Dkt. No. 24.)

Plaintiff moved to remand on October 20, 2017. (Dkt. No. 32.) On March 1, 2018, Plaintiff withdrew its motion to remand (Dkt. No. 58), conceding that there is now complete diversity in this action due to (1) the full settlement of Plaintiff's claims against McClellanville and (2) a stipulation by defendants Comcast Phone of South Carolina, Inc. and Comcast IP Phone, LLC that Plaintiff may amend its Complaint to include Comcast IP Phone, LLC as a Defendant and to remove Comcast Phone of South Carolina, Inc. (Dkt. No. 58 at 2).

The parties then filed a joint stipulation agreeing that Plaintiff County of Charleston shall file an Amended Complaint on or before April 2, 2018 reflecting these changes and alleging federal subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a). (Dkt. No. 59.) As the parties have

filed a motion consenting to Plaintiff's filing an amended complaint, Defendants' motion for a More Definite Statement (Dkt. No. 17) is denied as moot.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.



Richard Mark Gergel
United States District Court Judge

March 6, 2018
Charleston, South Carolina