

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA  
INDIANAPOLIS DIVISION**

RICHARD N. BELL,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Case No. 1:13-cv-00800-TWP-DKL
	)	
MARK ARRUDA,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	


**ENTRY AND NOTICE**

“Before deciding any case on the merits, a federal court must ensure the presence of both subject-matter jurisdiction and personal jurisdiction. . . . [U]nless both subject-matter and personal jurisdiction have been established, a district court must dismiss the suit without addressing the substance of the plaintiff’s claim.” *Kromrey v. U.S. Dept. of Justice*, 423 F. App’x 624, 626 (7th Cir. 2011). Based on the foregoing, it is evident that the Court should not have ruled on the Rule 12(b)(6) portion of the Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. 6). That ruling is now **RESCINDED**, and as a result, (1) Part III.C. of the Entry issued on May 7, 2014 is **VACATED**, and (2) the action is **DISMISSED without prejudice**.

An Amended Judgment consistent with this Entry and Notice shall now issue.

**SO ORDERED.**

Date: 03/12/2014

  
Hon. Tanya Walton Pratt, Judge  
United States District Court  
Southern District of Indiana

DISTRIBUTION:

Richard N. Bell  
BELL LAW FIRM  
richbell@comcast.net

David F. Hurley  
HURLEY & HURLEY PC  
dhurley@hurley-legal.net