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

KARLA STEIMEL,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
VS.	)	1:13-cv-957-JMS-MJD
	)	
DEBRA MINOTT, IN HER OFFICIAL CAPACITY	)	
AS SECRETARY OF THE INDIANA FAMILY AND	)	
SOCIAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION, ET AL.,	)	
Defendants,	)	
	)	
VS.	)	
	)	
THOMAS MAERTZ, COLTON COLE, CODY	)	
COLE, AND TIMOTHY KEISTER,	)	
Intervenor Plaintiffs.	)	
00		

## **ORDER**

Presently pending before the Court is Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff Karla Steimel's claims for lack of Jurisdiction pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1). [Filing No. 120.] Defendants contend that Ms. Steimel has conceded in previous briefing in this case that her claims are moot. [Filing No. 121 at 1-2.] Because Ms. Steimel has conceded the mootness of her claims, say Defendants, this Court lack subject-matter jurisdiction over her claims. [Filing No. 121 at 2.]

Ms. Steimel agrees that, in light of the Court's earlier denial of her Motion to Certify a Class, [see Filing No. 112], "her individual claims are moot and that she may be dismissed as a plaintiff." [Filing No. 123 at 2.] In so conceding, however, "Ms. Steimel reserves her right to appeal the denial of her [Motion to Certify a Class] following final judgment in this cause." [Filing No. 123 at 2 (citing *U.S. Parole Comm'n v. Geraghty*, 445 U.S. 388, 404 (1980)).]

The Court agrees with the parties that Ms. Steimel's claims are moot, and therefore that this Court lack subject-matter jurisdiction over her claims. *See <u>Pakovich v. Verizon LTD Plan</u>*, 653 F.3d 488, 492 (7th Cir. 2011) ("Federal courts lack subject matter jurisdiction when a case becomes moot."). Accordingly, Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Ms. Steimel's claims is **GRANTED**. [Filing No. 120.] No partial final judgment shall issue at this time.

06/26/2014

Hon. Jane Magnus-Stinson, Judge United States District Court Southern District of Indiana

Distribution via ECF only to all counsel of record