## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS AMARILLO DIVISION

DONALD J. TRUMP, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

2:24-CV-236-Z

CBS BROADCASTING INC., et al.,

Defendants.

## **ORDER**

Before the Court are Defendants' Motions to Dismiss ("Motions") (ECF Nos. 22 and 24), filed December 6, 2024. Since the filing of these Motions, Plaintiffs have filed an Amended Complaint (ECF No. 36) on February 7, 2025. "An amended complaint supersedes [an] original complaint and renders it of no legal effect . . . ." King v. Dogan, 31 F.3d 344, 346 (5th Cir. 1994). Thus, motions to dismiss complaints that are of no legal effect are generally moot. See Bridgestone Ams. Tire Operations, LLC v. Speedways Tyres Ltd., No. 4:22-CV-0145, 2023 WL 2574576, at \*2 (N.D. Tex. Mar. 20, 2023) ("An amended complaint generally renders pending motions moot."); Garza-Selcer v. 1600 Pac. Subtenant, LLC, No. 3:15-CV-03791, 2016 WL 11474103, at \*2 (N.D. Tex. Aug. 30, 2016) ("When a motion to dismiss is filed against a superseded complaint, courts ordinarily deny the motion as moot.").

Plaintiffs add a Defendant, a Plaintiff, and a litary of factual allegations and legal claims in their Amended Complaint. Accordingly, the Motions (ECF Nos. 22 and 24) are **DENIED AS**MOOT. Nothing in this Order shall be construed as a determination on the merits of either Plaintiffs' or Defendants' substantive arguments and claims in the Motions or Amended Complaint.

SO ORDERED.

February <u>10</u>, 2025

MATTHEW J. KACSMARYK

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE