

1 In this case, Defendant asserts that Plaintiff (who is proceeding *pro se*) filed an improper response
2 to his answer. Docket No. 31 at 2; *see also* Docket No. 29 (“Opposition” to answer). Defendant asserts
3 that Plaintiff’s filing is not in compliance with Rule 7(a)(7) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *Id.*
4 Regardless of whether Defendant is correct on that point, however, he has failed to show any prejudice in
5 not striking that document. Especially with respect to filings of *pro se* litigants who may be unfamiliar with
6 the technical aspects of the applicable rules, the Court does not find it be a useful expenditure of resources
7 to entertain motions to strike without any showing of prejudice. *Cf. Russell Road Food & Bev., LLC v.*
8 *Galam*, 2013 WL 6684631, at *2 (D. Nev. Dec. 17, 2013) (“Modern litigation is too protracted and
9 expensive for the litigants and the court to expend time and effort pruning or polishing the pleadings”
10 (quoting 5C Wright & Miller, FEDERAL PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE, § 1382, at 457-58 (2004)).

11 Accordingly, the pending motion to strike is **DENIED** without prejudice.

12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 DATED: April 17, 2017

14 
15 _____
16 NANCY J. KOPPE
17 United States Magistrate Judge
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28