

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

BETTIE MONTGOMERY,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 11 C 9196
)	
AMERICA'S SERVICING COMPANY,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

MEMORANDUM ORDER

After some false starts, attorney Sidney Smith, who had really prepared the Complaint filed by nominally pro se plaintiff Bettie Montgomery ("Montgomery"), finally filed an appearance on Montgomery's behalf along with a motion seeking more time to file a new version of the Complaint that would conform to the directives of Fed. R. Civ. P. ("Rule") 8. This Court granted that motion, with the amended pleading due on or before May 8 and the next status hearing scheduled for May 14.

But it is painfully obvious that attorney Smith is unfamiliar with practice in this District Court (and perhaps federal courts generally). For example, at the status hearing earlier this week he asked for leave to file an "oversize brief" on the mistaken assumption that this District Court's LR 7.1, which does impose such a limitation in the course of briefing contested motions, somehow cabins pleadings such as complaints.¹

¹ That said, this Court hopes that the mistaken motion does not presage still another needlessly prolix version of Montgomery's Complaint.

But what prompts this memorandum order is attorney Smith's April 16 filing, the Judge's Copy of which has been delivered to this Court's chambers, of some 120 pages of evidentiary material that play no proper role at all in the federal pleading process. Hence all of Dkt. Nos. 23-1, 23-2 and 23-3 are stricken from the file. Attorney Smith is expected to familiarize himself promptly with the standards applicable to practice in federal courts generally, and in this District Court particularly.



Milton I. Shadur
Senior United States District Judge

Date: April 23, 2012