

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY
(Newark Vicinage)**

DR. MICHAEL B. MORGAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

QUEST DIAGNOSTICS
INCORPORATED,

Defendant.

CIVIL ACTION No. 2:20-cv-00430

MOTION RETURN DATE:
SEPTEMBER 8, 2020

**MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO DISMISS
PLAINTIFF'S AMENDED COMPLAINT**

BRESSLER, AMERY & ROSS
A Professional Corporation
325 Columbia Turnpike
Florham Park, New Jersey 07932
P.O. Box 1980
Morristown, New Jersey 07962
(973) 514-1200
Attorneys for Defendant
Quest Diagnostics Incorporated

On the Brief:

Lauren Fenton-Valdivia

Michael T. Hensley

Jorkeell Echeverria

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	Error! Bookmark not defined.
PRELIMINARY STATEMENT	1
STATEMENT OF FACTS	4
LEGAL ARGUMENT	9
POINT I	9
PLAINTIFF’S AMENDED COMPLAINT SHOULD BE DISMISSED PURSUANT TO FED. R. CIV. P 12(b)(6) AS THE COMPLAINT FAILS TO STATE A CLAIM	9
A. Standard.....	9
POINT II	10
PLAINTIFF’S AMENDED COMPLAINT FAILS TO STATE A CLAIM FOR BREACH OF CONTRACT.....	10
A. Plaintiff’s knowing and voluntary resignation nullifies as a matter of law his claim that Quest breached his contract by terminating him without cause	10
B. Even if Plaintiff’s resignation does not bar his claim, Plaintiff’s breach of contract claim still fails as a matter of law.....	13
1. As conceded in the Amended Complaint and its attachments, Quest properly terminated Plaintiff for cause in accordance with his Employment Agreement	13
2. Plaintiff’s Complaint fails to state a breach of contract claim because he has not alleged any facts that plausibly showing that the alleged breach caused any damages.....	16
POINT III.....	17

PLAINTIFF’S COMPLAINT FAILS TO STATE A CLAIM
FOR MISAPPROPRIATION OF LIKENESS UNDER
FLORIDA STATUTE § 540.08 AND FLORIDA COMMON
LAW17

 A. Plaintiff’s Complaint fails to state a claim for violation
 of Florida Statute § 540.08.....17

 B. Plaintiff failed to state a claim under Florida common
 law for the same reasons that he failed to state a Florida
 Statute § 540.08 claim.....24

POINT IV.....25

PLAINTIFF’S COMPLAINT FAILS TO STATE A CLAIM
FOR UNJUST ENRICHMENT25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Abbott Laboratories, Inc. v. General Elec. Capital,</i> 765 So.2d 737 (Fla. 5th DCA 2000).....	14
<i>Almeida v. Amazon.com, Inc.,</i> 456 F.3d 1316 (11th Cir. 2006)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Arcand v. Brother Int’l Corp.,</i> 673 F. Supp. 2d 282 (D.N.J. 2009).....	7, 15
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal,</i> 556 U.S. 662 (2009).....	10, 17, 23
<i>Barrick v. Weis Mkts., Inc.,</i> No. 4:18-CV-0362, 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 137331 (M.D. Pa. Aug. 13, 2018)	7
<i>Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly,</i> 550 U.S. 544, 127 S. Ct. 1955, 167 L. Ed. 2d 929 (2007)	9, 10, 13
<i>Commerce Partnership 8098 Ltd. Partnership v. Equity Contracting Co.,</i> 695 So.2d 383 (Fla. 4th DCA 1997).....	25
<i>Dantzler Lbr. & Export Co. v Defreitas,</i> 544 So. 2d 1135 (Fla. 4th DCA 1989).....	10
<i>Epic Metals Corp. v Condec, Inc.,</i> 867 F. Supp. 1009 (M.D. Fla 1994).....	18
<i>Evancho v. Fisher,</i> 423 F.3d 347 (3d Cir. 2005)	10
<i>Faulkner Press, L.L.C. v. Class Notes, L.L.C.,</i> 756 F. Supp. 2d 1352 (N.D. Fla. 2010)	24

Friedman v. New York Life Ins. Co.,
985 So.2d 56 (Fla. 4th DCA 2008).....14

Fuentes v. Mega Media Holdings, Inc.,
721 F. Supp. 2d 1255 (S.D. Fla. 2010).....21

Knowles v. C.I.T. Corp.,
346 So.2d 1042 (Fla. 1st DCA 1977)14

Lane v. MRA Holdings,
LLC, 242 F. Supp. 2d 1205 (M.D. Fla. 2002)22, 23, 24

McLaughlin v State, Dept. of Natural Resources,
526 So.2d 934 (Fla. 1st DCA 1988)10

Mele v. Fed. Reserve Bank of N.Y.,
359 F.3d 251 (3d Cir. 2004)7, 16

Mettler, Inc. v. Ellen Tracy, Inc.,
648 So.2d 253 (Fla. 2d DCA 1994).....14

Miller v Anheuser Busch, Inc.,
348 F. App'x 547 (11th Cir. 2009)18, 19, 20

MPS Entm't, LLC v. Abercrombie & Fitch Stores, Inc.,
No. 11-24110-CIV, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 91193 (S.D. Fla. June
28, 2013)23

Murciano v. Garcia,
958 So.2d 423 (Fla. 3d DCA 2007).....14

Nat'l Educ. Ctrs., Inc. v. Kirkland,
635 So.2d 33 (Fla. 4th DCA 1993).....16

Nova Info. Sys., Inc. v. Greenwich Ins. Co.,
365 F.3d 996 (11th Cir. 2004)25, 26

Phillips v. County of Allegheny,
515 F.3d 224 (3d Cir. 2008)9

Putnam Berkley Group, Inc. v Dinin,
734 So.2d 532 (Fla Dist Ct App 1999).....19

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.