

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
FLORIDA, ORLANDO DIVISION

**Advanced Medical Group of Central Florida LLC and Vinay
Katukuri, MD v. BTL Industries, Inc., MMP Capital, Inc., Amur
Equipment Finance, Inc., Banleaco, Inc., Leaf Capital Funding, LLC
and North Mill Credit Trust**

Advanced Medical Group · No. 6:25-cv-1132-ACC-LHP · Decided January 5, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida denied as moot the plaintiffs’ renewed motion for default against Leaf Capital Funding, LLC. The court explained that the motion concerned a pleading that had been dismissed after claims were transferred and the remaining claims were dismissed with leave to amend.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida, Orlando Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Leslie Hoffman Price
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida, Orlando Division
DECIDED	January 5, 2026
DOCKET	6:25-cv-1132-ACC-LHP
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiffs filed a renewed motion for default against Defendant Leaf Capital Funding, LLC. After the motion was filed, the presiding district judge transferred several claims to the District of Massachusetts and dismissed the remainder of the complaint with leave to amend. The magistrate judge denied the motion for default as moot because it related to the dismissed pleading.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Advanced Medical Group of Central Florida LLC, Vinay Katukuri, MD v. BTL Industries, Inc., MMP Capital, Inc., Amur Equipment

TOPICS

default civil procedure commercial litigation

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure commercial litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether a motion for default directed to a pleading that has been dismissed is moot.

HOLDINGS

1. A motion for default based on a pleading that has been dismissed is moot and must be denied.

KEY QUOTATIONS

*“[A] default cannot be entered on a dismissed pleading, and therefore Plaintiff’s motions are necessarily moot.” (*3)*

*“As the original complaint is no longer the operative complaint, Plaintiff’s motions for default due to Defendants’ failure to respond to the initial complaint are now moot.” (*1)*

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiffs filed a renewed motion for default against Leaf Capital Funding, LLC. Before the court ruled on that motion, the presiding district judge transferred several claims to the District of Massachusetts and dismissed the remainder of the complaint with leave to amend. The motion for default therefore concerned a pleading that was no longer operative.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs sought entry of default against Leaf Capital Funding, LLC based on the original complaint. The presiding district judge subsequently transferred several claims to the District of Massachusetts and dismissed the remaining claims with leave to amend by January 6, 2026. Because the motion concerned the now-dismissed pleading, the court denied it as moot.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Allston v. Desantis, No. 6:24-cv-1085-CEM-DCI, 2025 WL 3484765, at *3 (M.D. Fla. Dec. 4, 2025)

- Vanstralen v. Tampa Bay Radiology Assocs., P.A., No. 8:20-cv-2445-T-36CPT, 2020 WL 7054687, at *1 (M.D. Fla. Dec. 2, 2020)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA ORLANDO DIVISION ADVANCED MEDICAL GROUP OF CENTRAL FLORIDA LLC and VINAY KATUKURI, MD, Plaintiffs, v. Case No: 6:25-cv-1132-ACC-LHP BTL INDUSTRIES, INC., MMP CAPITAL, INC., AMUR EQUIPMENT FINANCE, INC., BANLEACO, INC., LEAF CAPITAL FUNDING, LLC and NORTH MILL CREDIT TRUST, Defendants ORDER Before the Court is Plaintiffs' Renewed Motion for Default Against Defendant Leaf Capital Funding, LLC and Memorandum of Law in Support Thereof.

Doc. No. 101. However, after Plaintiffs' filed the present motion, the Presiding District Judge transferred several claims to the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts, and dismissed the remainder of Plaintiffs' complaint with leave to file an amended complaint by January 6, 2026. Doc. No. 102.

Because Plaintiffs' motion for default related to the now-dismissed pleading, the motion (Doc. No. 101) is DENIED as moot. See Allston v. Desantis, No. 6:24-cv-1085-CEM- DCI, 2025 WL 3484765, at *3 (M.D. Fla. Dec. 4, 2025) (“[A] default cannot be entered on a dismissed pleading, and therefore Plaintiff's motions are necessarily moot.”); Vanstralen v. Tampa Bay Radiology Assocs., P.A., No. 8:20-cv-2445-T-36CPT, 2020 WL 7054687, at *1 (M.D.

Fla. Dec. 2, 2020) (“As the original complaint is no longer the operative complaint, Plaintiff's motions for default due to Defendants' failure to respond to the initial complaint are now moot.”). DONE and ORDERED in Orlando, Florida on January 5, 2026. LESLIE 3 AN PRICE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE Copies furnished to: Counsel of Record