

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION AT DAYTON**

KEESYA D. ROSS,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	Case No. 3:13cv00038
	:	
vs.	:	District Judge Timothy S. Black
	:	Chief Magistrate Judge Sharon L. Ovington
TELEPERFORMANCE USA,	:	
INC., et al.,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	
	:	

ORDER

This case is presently before the Court upon *pro se* Plaintiff Keesya D. Ross’s Motion for Extension of Time to Answer Defendant’s Answer (Doc. #64), and the record as a whole. Plaintiff requests additional time to respond to Defendant’s Answer “due to . . . suffering [an] economic crisis and [being] under a lot of distress” (Doc. #64, *PageID# 706*).

Defenses asserted in an answer, even affirmative defenses, do not warrant a response. *Crosky v. Ohio Dep’t of Rehab. & Corr.*, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS *8 (S.D. Ohio 2010) (citing *Schultea v. Wood*, 47 F.3d 1427, 1433 (5th Cir. 1995)). Even without a response, the opposing party is nonetheless considered to have denied the validity of such defenses. *Id.* A reply to an answer is only permitted if the court orders one. Fed. R. Civ. P. 7(a)(7). The Court has not ordered a reply to Defendant’s Answer, nor does it deem

one is necessary.

Accordingly, Plaintiff's Motion for Extension of Time to Answer Defendant's Answer lacks merit. In addition, any such reply that is filed despite this Order will be stricken by the Court.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED THAT:

Plaintiff's Motion for Extension of Time to Answer Defendant's Answer (Doc. #64) is DENIED.

January 27, 2014

s/Sharon L. Ovington
Sharon L. Ovington
Chief United States Magistrate Judge