


**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION**

CYNTHIA LANCASTER,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Case No. 4:22-cv-00937-MTS
)	
PAUL RAMSEY, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff’s “Answers to Defendant Response and Response to Scheduling Plan,” Doc. [27]. In actuality, Plaintiff’s filing, if anything, is a Reply to Defendant’s Answer, and Plaintiff may not file such a pleading unless the Court orders it. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 7(a)(7). In addition, Plaintiff’s filing was not required by the Court’s Order Setting Rule 16 Conference. *See* Doc. [25]. For those reasons, the Court strikes it and directs the Clerk of Court to note on the docket text that Plaintiff’s “Answers to Defendant Response and Response to Scheduling Plan,” Doc. [27], has been stricken. As the Court already has informed Plaintiff, she must follow all applicable Rules and directives of the Court. Thus, Plaintiff still must abide by the Court’s Order Setting Rule 16 Conference.

So ordered.



MATTHEW T. SCHELP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated this 18th day of January 2023.