

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

CLAXTON H. WILLIAMS, JR.	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	No. 06-772-MJR-CJP
	)	
ROD R. BLAGOJEVICH, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**ORDER**

Before the Court is “Plaintiff’s Response to Defendant’s Response to Plaintiff’s Response to Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgement[sic]”(Doc. 99), filed in relation to defendant Dr. Ahmed’s motion for summary judgment (Doc. 79). Defendant Ahmed objects that the pleading is an impermissible sur-reply that should be stricken in accordance with Local Rule 7.1. (Doc. 100). Plaintiff counters that Local Rule 7.1 permits sur-replies in exceptional circumstances; his situation constitutes exceptional circumstances; and, “he is simply clarifying for the Court his arguments set forth in his ‘Response’, which his attached exhibits clearly support, and which his original complaint clearly describes, but which the defendants completely failed to address” [sic]. (Doc. 102, p. 2).

Effective December 1, 2009, Local Rule 7.1 was amended to strictly prohibit sur-replies. **ILSD L.R. 7.1(c)**. Plaintiff’s sur-reply was filed December 7, 2009. Furthermore, by his own admission, plaintiff is merely reiterating arguments and highlighting points from his prior response, which does not constitute the exceptional circumstance contemplated by the former verison of Local Rule 7.1.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that defendant Ahmed's motion to strike plaintiff's sur-reply (**Doc. 100**) is **GRANTED**. The Clerk of Court shall **STRIKE** plaintiff's sur-reply (**Doc. 99**).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**DATED: February 1, 2010**

**s/ Clifford J. Proud**  
**CLIFFORD J. PROUD**  
**U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE**