

USDS SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC #: _____
DATE FILED: _____

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

WORLD WRESTLING ENTERTAINMENT, INC.,

Plaintiff,

-v-

JAKKS PACIFIC, INC., JAKKS PACIFIC (H.K.)
LTD., ROAD CHAMPS LTD., THQ, INC.,
THQ/JAKKS PACIFIC L.L.C., STANLEY
SHENKER & ASSOCS., INC., BELL LICENSING,
L.L.C., JACK FRIEDMAN, STEPHEN BERMAN,
JOEL BENNETT, BRIAN FARRELL, STANLEY
SHENKER, AND JAMES BELL,

Defendants.

Case No. 04-CV-8223 (KMK)

ORDER

KENNETH M. KARAS, District Judge:

Pending before the Court are several motions. First, Defendants have filed motions, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6), seeking dismissal of the remaining claims against them. Second, Plaintiff has filed a motion, pursuant to Local Rule 6.3, for reconsideration of the Court's Opinion and Order, dated March 31, 2006, granting Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Sherman Act cause of action.

Subsequent to the briefing and argument on these motions, Plaintiff has filed a motion to amend a complaint it previously filed in Connecticut Superior Court. In particular, the proposed amendment seeks to add the defendants in this action and to include state causes of action that arise from the allegations Plaintiff has brought before this Court. (Letter of Jerry S. McDevitt, Esq. to the Court, April 19, 2007.) Defendants thereafter sought a stay of the Connecticut action in light of the pending motions before this Court, and a stay was granted until November 30,

2007. (Letter of Jonathan J. Lerner, Esq. to the Court, October 23, 2007.)

The motions pending before this Court involve complex questions of law and have generated hundreds of pages of briefing (and a few colorful letters), and the Court has dutifully attempted to resolve the motions in a comprehensive opinion. Unfortunately, the opinion will not be completed before the close of business today. However, rather than force the Parties to wait in limbo, and in light of the reasonable deadline set by the Connecticut Superior Court, the Court, after careful consideration of the Parties' submissions and lengthy oral argument, has determined that it will grant Defendants' motions to dismiss Plaintiff's Amended Complaint. The reasons for this decision are explained in detail in an opinion that will be issued in short order.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 30, 2007
White Plains, New York



KENNETH M. KARAS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE