

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
PENNSYLVANIA**

Admiral Insurance Company v. Comly Road Holdings, LLC, et al.

No. No. 25-279-KSM, United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania (December 17,
2025)

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania denied Defendants' motion to dismiss Admiral Insurance Company's interpleader action. The Court entered declaratory judgment that a \$100,000 AB Sublimit was the maximum coverage available under the identified policy for two underlying suits and enjoined Defendants from future claims that Admiral improperly paid the policy limits, subject to the interpleaded res.

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA ADMIRAL INSURANCE COMPANY, CIVIL ACTION Plaintiff, NO. 25-279-KSM v. COMLY ROAD HOLDINGS, LLC, et al., Defendants. ORDER AND NOW, this 17th day of December, 2025, upon consideration of Plaintiff Admiral Insurance Company's interpleader complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1335 (Doc. No. 1), Defendants Comly Road Holdings, LLC, and Roman Jamera's Motion to Dismiss (Doc.

No. 40), and Plaintiff's opposition brief (Doc. No. 44); following oral argument on October 23, 2025 (Doc. No. 57); and for the reasons explained in the accompanying Memorandum, it is ORDERED as follows: 1. The Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 40) is DENIED. 2. Judgment is ENTERED in favor of Plaintiff. Admiral is entitled to declaratory judgment that the \$100,000 AB Sublimit is the maximum coverage available under Admiral Policy CA000045657-01 for both the Corona and Pedraza-Zayas Suits.¹ 1 The Court limits the declaratory judgment to the interpleaded res covering policy period June 12, 2022, through June 12, 2023.

See N.J. Sports Prods. v. Don King Prods., Inc., 15 F. Supp. 2d 534, 545 (D.N.J. 1998) ("Section 2361 authorizes a district court to enter an order restraining all claimants from instituting a proceeding in any state or federal court affecting the interpleaded res.") (citing Provident Mut. Life Ins. Co. of Phila. v. Ehrlich, 508 F.2d 129 (3d Cir. 1975)) (emphasis added).

3. All Defendants to this case are enjoined under 28 U.S.C. § 2361 from all future claims that Admiral improperly paid the limits of Admiral Policy CA000045657-01.² IT IS SO ORDERED.
/s/ Karen Spencer Marston KAREN SPENCER MARSTON, J. 2 This injunction, like the declaratory judgment, is limited to the interpleaded res.

