IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

LEENA V. TRIPATHI,)		
Plaintiff,)		
V •)	No.	09 C 7339
LINCOLN NATIONAL CORPORATION,)		
Defendant.)		

MEMORANDUM ORDER

Lincoln National Corporation ("Lincoln National") has filed its Answer and Defenses ("ADs") to the Amended Complaint of Employment Discrimination ("AC") brought against it by pro se plaintiff Leena Tripathi ("Tripathi"). This sua sponte memorandum order has been triggered by a few problematic aspects of that responsive pleading.

For example, Answer ¶8 follows an appropriate disclaimer that tracks Fed. R. Civ. P. ("Rule") 8(b)(5) with the language "and therefore denies same." That is of course oxymoronic—how can a party that asserts (presumably in good faith) that it lacks even enough information to form a <u>belief</u> as to the truth of an allegation then proceed to <u>deny</u> it in accordance with Rule 11(b)? Accordingly the quoted phrase is stricken.

As for the asserted ADs, it appears that some do not pay full heed to the underlying concept of Rule 8(c) and the caselaw applying it (see also App'x ¶5 to State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. v. Riley, 199 F.R.D. 276, 278 (N.D. Ill. 2001)). But this Court

will not take action in that respect on its own, leaving it to Tripathi to address what she may view as any questionable ADs.

Milton I. Shadur

Senior United States District Judge

Willen D Shaden

Date: March 30, 2010