

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

ANTHONY COLEMAN,  
Plaintiff,  
vs.  
THE BANK OF NEW YORK MELLON FKA  
BANK OF NEW YORK AS TRUSTEE FOR  
AMERICAN HOME MORTGAGE  
INVESTMENT TRUST 2004-4 MORTGAGE-  
BACKED NOTES, SERIES 2004-4; *et al.*,  
Defendants.

Case No. 2:16-cv-01339-RFB-GWF

**ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on Defendants Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc., Ocwen Loan Servicing LLC, and the Bank of New York Mellon’s Motion to Strike Plaintiff’s Verified First Amended Complaint (ECF No. 16), filed on November 7, 2016. Plaintiff filed his Opposition (ECF No. 18) on November 21, 2016.

Plaintiff filed his Complaint (ECF No. 1) on June 15, 2016. Defendants filed their Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 8) on September 26, 2016. Plaintiff filed his Verified First Amended Complaint (ECF No. 13) on October 18, 2016. Defendants request that the Court strike Plaintiff’s Verified First Amended Complaint as untimely pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 15 and as impermissible and redundant pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 12(f).

Under Rule 12(f) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Court may strike from a pleading an insufficient defense or any redundant, immaterial, impertinent, or scandalous matter. Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(f). The essential function of a Rule 12(f) motion is to avoid the expenditure of time and money that must arise from litigating spurious issues by dispensing with those issues prior to trial. *Fantasy, Inc. v. Fogerty*, 984 F.2d 1524, 1527 (9th cir. 1993), *rev’d on other grounds*, 510 U.S. 517, 114 S. Ct. 1023. Striking material pursuant to Rule 12(f) is considered a “drastic remedy”

1 that is “generally disfavored.” *Nevada Fair Housing Center, Inc. V. Clark County*, 565 F. Supp.2d  
2 1178 (D. Nev. 2008). Whether to grant a motion to strike lies within the sound discretion of the  
3 district court. *Id.*

4 Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 15(a)(1) states:

5 A party may amend its pleading once as a matter of course within:

6 (A) 21 days after serving it, or

7 (B) if the pleading is one to which a responsive pleading is required, 21 days after  
8 service of a responsive pleading or 21 days after service of a motion under Rule  
12(b), (e), or (f), whichever is earlier.

9 In all other cases, a party may amend his pleading only with the opposing party’s written  
10 consent or the court’s leave. Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 15(a)(2). Plaintiff did not comply with this  
11 procedure when he filed his First Amended Complaint because Plaintiff did not file his amended  
12 pleading within 21 days of service of Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss. Defendants filed their  
13 Motion to Dismiss on September 26, 2016, which gave Plaintiff until October 17, 2016 to amend  
14 his Complaint once as a matter of course under Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 15(a)(1)(B). Albeit Plaintiff filed  
15 his First Amended Complaint on October 18, 2016, one day after the deadline expired, Plaintiff did  
16 not obtain written consent from Defendants or leave of Court before he filed it.

17 Plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint alleges the same causes of action as Plaintiff’s  
18 Complaint. Upon review of the two pleadings, the Court finds that Plaintiff’s First Amended  
19 Complaint and Complaint are substantially similar. The Court therefore grants Defendants’ Motion  
20 to Strike Plaintiff’s Verified First Amended Complaint as redundant. Accordingly,

21 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Defendants’ Motion to Strike Plaintiff’s Verified First  
22 Amended Complaint (ECF No. 16) is **granted**.

23 DATED this 12th day of December, 2016

24  
25   
26 GEORGE FOLEY, JR.  
27 United States Magistrate Judge  
28