

v.

KAUSHIK PATEL, *et al.*,

Defendants.

ORDER

This matter comes before the Court upon Defendants Kaushik Patel, Ashwin Chaudhary, Dipen Patel, Yogesh Patel, Vipul Patel, Gulu Puri, Nilesh Patel, Danny Saparia, the Estate of Suresh Patel, and Atul Patel's (collectively, "Defendants") Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 28), and Plaintiff Central Jersey, CML's ("Plaintiff" or "Central CML") Amended Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 40). In opposition to Defendants' Motion, Plaintiff submitted a Statement of Material Facts in Opposition (ECF No. 32) and an Opposition Brief (ECF No. 33), to which Defendants replied (ECF No. 35.) Defendants opposed Plaintiff's Motion. (ECF No. 44.) Plaintiff did not reply to Defendants' opposition.¹

For the reasons set forth in the accompanying Memorandum Opinion, and for good cause shown,

IT IS on this 31st day of May 2020, **ORDERED** that:

1. Plaintiff's Amended Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 40) is **DENIED**.
2. Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 28) is **GRANTED**.

¹ Plaintiff submitted an informal Letter Brief in reply to Defendants' opposition to Plaintiff's original motion for summary judgment. (ECF No. 36.) Plaintiff, however, did not file a reply to Defendants' opposition to Plaintiff's Amended Motion for Summary Judgment. The Court also notes that Plaintiff's Letter Brief, apart from briefly referencing a case cited by Defendants, contains no citation to legal authority. (*Id.*)

