

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

_____)	
JOHN W. BRENNAN,)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 17-12475-LTS
)	
42 TECHNOLOGY LTD, et al.,)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

ORDER ON MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

May 11, 2018

SOROKIN, J.

The Court made the following statement in its Order denying the motion to dismiss:

[A]lthough the Defendants did not publish the alleged defamatory statements in Massachusetts (but rather in England), the Defendants controlled the contents, form , and tone of the statements published in Massachusetts, i.e. the cause of Brennan’s alleged injury, because they wrote them.

Doc. No. 25 at 7.

Plainly, no allegedly defamatory statements were published in Massachusetts. The Complaint contains no such allegation. See Doc. No. 1-1. The Court so stated in the above noted sentence, and other portions of the Order establish this understanding. See Doc. No. 25 at 7; see also id. at 3, 5 n. 6, at 6 n.7, and at 6-8. Accordingly, the Court STRIKES from its Order (Doc. No. 25) the above quoted words “in Massachusetts” that appear immediately after the word “published” and before the words “i.e. the cause.” Id. at 7. The deletion of these words has no effect on the reasoning of the Court’s opinion or the resolution of the motion to dismiss.

In addition, the Court has reviewed and considered the arguments advanced in the motion for reconsideration. The Motion (Doc. No. 26) is DENIED.

SO ORDERED.

/s/ Leo T. Sorokin
Leo T. Sorokin
United States District Judge