

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS  
TEXARKANA DIVISION

MICHAEL CHESSHIR; and  
JENNIFER CHESSHIR

PLAINTIFFS

v.

Case No. 4:14-cv-04140

BRADLEY TAYLOR d/b/a TAYLOR &  
TAYLOR DEVELOPMENT, LLC;  
MOLLY TAYLOR d/b/a TAYLOR &  
TAYLOR DEVELOPMENT, LLC;  
JANELLE WHITE d/b/a TAYLOR &  
TAYLOR DEVELOPMENT, LLC;  
TAYLOR & TAYLOR DEVELOPMENT,  
LLC; BRADLEY TAYLOR; MOLLY  
TAYLOR; and JANELLE WHITE

DEFENDANTS

**ORDER**

Before the Court is Plaintiffs' Motion to Strike Bradley Taylor's Answer to Complaint (ECF No. 22); Motion to Strike Janelle White's Answer to Complaint (ECF No. 23); Motion to Strike Molly Taylor's Answer to Complaint (ECF No. 24); and Motion to Strike Taylor & Taylor Development, LLC's Answer to Complaint (ECF No. 25). Defendants have responded to these Motions. (ECF No. 32). The Court finds these matters ripe for its consideration.

The Plaintiffs have divided their filings into a "Motion to Strike" and an alternative "Response to the Answer." The Court first notes that Plaintiffs' Motions to Strike Defendants' Answers are exactly the same and will consider those together. The Motions to Strike assert arguments that have already been before the Court numerous times. *See, e.g.*, Motion to Remand (ECF No. 19); Motion to Strike Notice of Removal (ECF No. 20); Alternative Response to Notice of Removal (ECF No. 20). Because the Court has already addressed these arguments, it will not address them again now. Plaintiffs' argument that the answers should be stricken due to Arkansas Code Annotated § 18-44-118 will be denied, as their argument that Defendants did not comply with filing deadlines was denied by the Court's Order denying their Motion to Remand.

Next, Plaintiffs have included an alternative Response to Defendants' Answers. At the end of their response, they again ask the Court to "grant the Motion to Remand to Arkansas State Court." The Court has already addressed the Motion to Remand and will not do so again here. Other than a reiteration of their arguments, the Court is confused as to what purpose the Responses to Defendants' Answers has served.

Accordingly, Plaintiffs' Motion to Strike Bradley Taylor's Answer to Complaint (ECF No. 22); Motion to Strike Janelle White's Answer to Complaint (ECF No. 23); Motion to Strike Molly Taylor's Answer to Complaint (ECF No. 24); and Motion to Strike Taylor & Taylor Development, LLC's Answer to Complaint (ECF No. 25) are hereby **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED**, this 20th day of March, 2015.

/s/ Susan O. Hickey  
Susan O. Hickey  
United States District Judge