

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

VERNARD BROOKS,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 17-CV-659

**COMMUNITY MEMORIAL HOSPITAL
OF MENOMONEE FALLS, INC., et al.,**

Defendants.

ORDER

In connection with their motion for summary judgment, in addition to filing a reply brief (ECF No. 27) and a reply to plaintiff's additional proposed findings of fact (ECF No. 29), defendants filed a reply to plaintiff's response to defendants' proposed findings of fact (ECF No. 30). Although Civil Local Rule 56(b)(3)(B) authorizes a reply to any additional proposed findings of fact submitted by a party opposing the summary judgment motion, it does not allow for the moving party to reply to the opposing party's response to the moving party's proposed findings of fact.

Under Rule 12(f) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure the court may upon motion or upon its own initiative strike from a pleading any redundant, immaterial,

impertinent, or scandalous matter. Because defendants are not authorized to reply to plaintiff's response to defendants' proposed findings of fact, defendants' reply (ECF No. 30) will be stricken.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Defendants' Reply to Plaintiff's Response to Defendants' Proposed Findings of Fact (ECF No. 30) is stricken.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin this 9th day of April, 2018.


WILLIAM E. DUFFIN
U.S. Magistrate Judge