



the insufficiency of the defense is clearly apparent.” *Cipollone v. Liggett Group, Inc.*, 789 F.2d 181, 188 (3d Cir. 1986). “An affirmative defense is insufficient if ‘it is not recognized as a defense to the cause of action.’” *F.T.C. v. Hope Now Modifications, LLC*, No. 09–1204, 2011 WL 883202, \*2 (D. N.J. Mar. 10, 2011) (citing *Tonka Corp. v. Rose Art Indus., Inc.*, 836 F. Supp. 200, 217 (D. N.J. 1993)); see also *Signature Bank v. Check–X–Change, LLC*, No. 12–2802, 2013 WL 3286154, at \*2 (D. N.J. June 27, 2013). In deciding the present motion, the Court must also bear in mind that generally, “motions to strike under Rule 12(f) are highly disfavored.” *Hope Now*, 2011 WL 883202, at \*1 (citing *Garlanger v. Verbeke*, 223 F.Supp.2d 596, 609 (D. N.J. 2002)) (“Because of the drastic nature of the remedy, ... motions to strike are usually ‘viewed with disfavor’ and will generally ‘be denied unless the allegations have no possible relation to the controversy and may cause prejudice to one of the parties, or if the allegations confuse the issues.’”) (citing *Tonka*, 836 F. Supp. at 218.)

However, ““even where the challenged material is redundant, immaterial, impertinent, or scandalous, a motion to strike should not be granted unless the presence of the surplusage will prejudice the adverse party.”” *Hope Now*, 2011 WL 883202, at \*1 (citing *Symbol Techs., Inc. v. Aruba Networks, Inc.*, 609 F.Supp.2d 353, 359 (D. Del. 2009)); see also 5C Charles Alan Wright & Arthur R. Miller, *Federal Practice and Procedure*, § 1381 (3d ed. 2004) (explaining that “even when technically appropriate and well-founded, Rule 12(f) motions often are not granted in the absence of a showing of prejudice to the moving party.”) Finally, the Court's determination on a “motion to strike under Rule 12(f) is discretionary.” *Hope Now*, 2011 WL 883202, at \*1; see also *Signature Bank*, 2013 WL 3286154, at \*2 (observing that ““a court possesses considerable discretion in disposing of a motion to strike under Rule 12(f).””) (citing *Tonka*, 836 F. Supp. at 218).

Plaintiff has not set forth a sufficient argument which would warrant striking the affirmative defenses at this early juncture. The parties have not yet conducted discovery and the factual record has yet to be developed, and any possible insufficiency of the defenses is not clearly apparent. Accordingly, his Motion to Strike Answer (ECF No. 50) will be denied.

Dated: October 24, 2017

s/ Cynthia Reed Eddy  
Cynthia Reed Eddy  
United States Magistrate Judge

cc: all registered users of CM-ECF