Gieselman v. Jackson et al Doc. 121

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI EASTERN DIVISION

GARY GIESELMAN,)	
Plaintiff,)	
,)	Case No. 4:10CV1619 RWS
VS.)	Case No. 4.10C v 1019 KWS
VALERIA WILSON JACKSON, et al.,)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before me on defendants' motion for leave. Although the motion claims to seek leave to amend or correct the motion for summary judgment, the memorandum in support seeks to amend defense counsel's entry of appearance. Defense counsel does not represent defendants Parks and Wallace, even though the docket sheet states otherwise. Because the entry of appearance states that Mark Zoole is entering his appearance on behalf of defendants Washington County, Missouri, Jackson, Wilson, Schroeder, Mason, Thompson, Hahn, and the Missouri Public Entity Risk Management Fund, defense counsel could have just contacted the Clerk's Office and informed the Court of the error instead of filing a motion. To further complicate matters, plaintiff's counsel has filed a response to the motion pointing out that plaintiff "does not know if he will be prejudiced" if the motion is granted because defendants did not attach a copy of the amended document they seek leave to file. Of course, if plaintiff's counsel had bothered to read the motion he would have discerned, as did the Court, that defense counsel is really asking the Court to correct the docket sheet to reflect that they do not represent defendants Parks and Wallace. This case is already complicated enough. The Court frowns upon the lawyers' unnecessary filings.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the motion for leave [#118] is granted to this extent: the Clerk of the Court shall amend the docket sheet to reflect that defense counsel does not represent defendants Parks and Wallace; to the extent the motion seeks any other relief, it is denied without prejudice.

RODNEY W. SIPPEL

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated this 31st day of August, 2011.