IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

VIRBAC CORPORATION,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Case No. 1:05CV01128 (RMU)
	)	
CHANELLE PHARMACEUTICALS MANUFACTURING LTD., *et al.*,	)	
	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

ORDER

Upon consideration of Defendants The Hartz Mountain Corporation, Albert Ahn and Ian Cottrell (collectively, the "Hartz Defendants")'s Motion to Dismiss for Improper Venue, Plaintiff's Opposition thereto, the Hartz Defendants' Reply, and the applicable law, and for the reasons stated in the accompanying Memorandum Opinion, it is hereby **ORDERED** that:

1. The Hartz Defendants' Motion is **GRANTED**; and

2. Pursuant to Rule 12(b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, this action is hereby **DISMISSED** for improper venue.

Entered this _____ day of _____, 2005.

_____
RICARDO M. URBINA
United States District Judge

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

VIRBAC CORPORATION,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Case No. 1:05CV01128 (RMU)
	)	
CHANELLE PHARMACEUTICALS MANUFACTURING LTD., *et al.*,	)	
	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

ORDER

Upon consideration of Defendants The Hartz Mountain Corporation, Albert Ahn and Ian Cottrell (collectively, the "Hartz Defendants")'s Motion to Transfer for Improper Venue, Plaintiff's Opposition thereto, the Hartz Defendants' Reply, and the applicable law, and for the reasons stated in the accompanying Memorandum Opinion, it is hereby **ORDERED** that:

1. The Hartz Defendants' Motion is **GRANTED**; and

2. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a), this action is hereby **TRANSFERRED** to the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey.

Entered this _____ day of _____, 2005.

_____
RICARDO M. URBINA
United States District Judge

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

VIRBAC CORPORATION,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Case No. 1:05CV01128 (RMU)
	)	
CHANELLE PHARMACEUTICALS MANUFACTURING LTD., *et al.*,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

ORDER

Upon consideration of Defendants The Hartz Mountain Corporation, Albert Ahn and Ian Cottrell (collectively, the "Hartz Defendants")'s Motion to Dismiss Counts I, II, III for Failure to State a Claim Upon Which Relief can be Granted, Plaintiff's Opposition thereto, the Hartz Defendants' Reply, and the applicable law, and for the reasons stated in the accompanying Memorandum Opinion, it is hereby **ORDERED** that:

1. The Hartz Defendants' Motion is **GRANTED**; and

2. Pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Counts I, II and III of the Complaint are dismissed as to the Hartz Defendants with prejudice.

Entered this _____ day of _____, 2005.

_____
RICARDO M. URBINA
United States District Judge

Copies to:

Richard D. Horn, Esq.
BRACEWELL & GUILIANI LLP
2000 K Street, N.W., Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20006

L. Barrett Boss, Esq.
COZEN O'CONNOR, PC
1667 K Street, N.W., Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20006

Timothy C. Bass, Esq.
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
800 Connecticut Ave., Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20006

Todd L. Schleifstein
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
200 Campus Drive, P.O. Box 677
Florham Park, New Jersey 07932