Altergott v. Senn et al

Doc. 64

It is true that Defendants' filed the subject documentation as well as their supplemental response a day later than the court-imposed deadlines; however, Plaintiff's supplemental response (which Defendants' supplemental brief was to address) was also filed four days late. Both parties are admonished to comply with the court's filing deadlines in the future or risk that the court will not consider their filings. In this instance, however, there was no prejudice as a result of the late filings, and the court exercised its discretion to consider the late filings of both Defendants and Plaintiff. Therefore, Plaintiff's motion to strike (ECF No. 60) is **DENIED**. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: September 29, 2016. Willen G. Cobb WILLIAM G. COBB UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE