


Cir. Mar. 11, 2016) (quoting *id.*). In determining whether dismissal is proper, the Court “must accept the allegations of the complaint as true and construe those allegations, and any reasonable inferences that might be drawn from them, in light most favorable to the plaintiff.” *Id.* (citations and quotations omitted). The standard of review for dismissals under § 1915(e) is the same as Rule 12(b)(6) motions to dismiss for failure to state a claim. *Id.*; *see also Nunn*, 2016 WL 929672, at *2 (10th Cir. Mar. 11, 2016) (quoting *id.*)

Here, dismissal of Plaintiff’s claims against the Unserved Defendants is proper. Plaintiff’s claims in his Amended Complaint against the Unserved Defendants mirror those against MVM, Inc. and Brent Wiechman. The Court dismissed those claims for failure to state a claim under Rule 12(b)(6). Doc. No. 66. Accordingly, for the reasons set forth in the Court’s Order dated February 18, 2016 (Doc. No. 66), Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint against the Unserved Defendants is DISMISSED.

IT IS SO ORDERED, this 21st day of March, 2016.



DAVID L. RUSSELL
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE