

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA, NORTHERN DIVISION

CHARLES WILSON,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	CIVIL ACTION NO.
v.)	2:07cv560-MHT
)	(WO)
ALABAMA DEPARTMENT OF)	
HUMAN RESOURCES, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

It is ORDERED that the motions to strike (doc. nos. 74 and 88) are denied.

In resolving the pending summary-judgment motion, the court has implicitly considered the motions to strike as notices of objections to the submissions described and has considered any related briefs as arguments on the objections. See Norman v. Southern Guar. Ins. Co., 191 F. Supp. 2d 1321, 1328 (M.D. Ala. 2002); Anderson v. Radisson Hotel Corp., 834 F. Supp. 1364, 1368 n. 1 (S.D. Ga. 1993). The court is capable of sifting evidence, as required by the summary-judgment standard, without resort

to an exclusionary process, and the court will not allow the summary-judgment stage to degenerate into a battle of motions to strike.

DONE, this the 26th of March, 2010.

/s/ Myron H. Thompson
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE