

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

ANGELA JOAQUIN, on behalf of herself  
and others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

LONSTEIN LAW OFFICE, P.C., et al.,

Defendants.


Civil Action No. 15-8194 (MAS) (DEA)

**ORDER**

This matter comes before the Court on Motions to Dismiss filed by Defendants Lonstein Law Office, P.C., Julie Cohen Lonstein, and Wayne Lonstein (collectively, the “Lonstein Defendants”) (ECF No. 62), and Signal Auditing, Inc. and Steven Levine (collectively, the “Signal Defendants”) (the Lonstein Defendants and the Signal Defendants, collectively, “Defendants”) (ECF No. 68). Defendants also filed Motions to Strike Exhibit A of the Second Amended Complaint and Motions to Stay Discovery. (ECF Nos. 62, 68.) Plaintiff Angela Joaquin (“Plaintiff”) filed opposition (ECF No. 69) and Defendants replied (ECF Nos. 70, 71). Additionally, Plaintiff submitted correspondence objecting to a portion of the Lonstein Defendants’ Reply Brief (ECF No. 73) and the Lonstein Defendants filed correspondence in response (ECF No. 74). Upon the Court’s request, Plaintiff filed a Sur-Reply Brief solely concerning the Noerr-Pennington Doctrine. (ECF No. 78.) The Court has carefully considered the parties’ submissions and decides the motion without oral argument pursuant to Local Civil Rule 78.1. For the reasons set forth in the accompanying Letter Opinion, and other good cause shown,

IT IS on this 27<sup>th</sup> day of June 2017, **ORDERED** that:

1. Defendants' Motions to Dismiss (ECF Nos. 62, 68) are GRANTED without prejudice with respect to Count One of the Second Amended Complaint.
2. Defendants' Motions to Dismiss (ECF Nos. 62, 68) are DENIED with respect to Count Two of the Second Amended Complaint.
3. Defendants' Motions to Strike (ECF Nos. 62, 68) are DENIED.
4. Defendants' Motions to Stay Discovery (ECF Nos. 62, 68) are DENIED.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**MICHAEL A. SHIPP**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**