

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION**

TERRY LEE HINDS,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 4:25-cv-00047-AGF
)	
JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

This matter is before the Court upon review of the file. In response to Defendants’ motion to dismiss, pro se Plaintiff Terry Lee Hinds has filed a 94-page brief (ECF No. 15) without obtaining leave of Court to do so. This filing violates the Court’s Local Rule 4.01(D), which provides: “No party shall file any motion, memorandum, or brief which exceeds fifteen (15) numbered pages, exclusive of the Table of Contents, Table of Authorities, signature page, and attachments, without leave of Court.” E.D.Mo. L.R. 4.01(D).

A self-represented litigant such as Petitioner is not excused from complying with Court orders or substantive and procedural law, “even without affirmative notice of the application of the rules to his case.” *Bennett v. Dr. Pepper/Seven Up, Inc.*, 295 F.3d 805, 808 (8th Cir. 2002). Petitioner’s self-represented status does “not excuse h[im] from following the local rules.” *Bunch v. Univ. of Ark. Bd. of Trs.*, 863 F.3d 1062, 1067 (8th Cir. 2017).

Local Rule 4.01(D) exists for good reason. The page limitation requires parties to focus and hone their arguments, omit unnecessary material, and emphasize the strongest points of their arguments. The limitation also protects the Court from a deluge of excessively long briefs, which

would consume a disproportionate share of scarce judicial resources, while giving the Court flexibility to ensure that a party can adequately present its position.

If Plaintiff had sought leave of Court to file the overlength brief he has now filed, the Court would have denied that request. Plaintiff's brief is more than six times over the Court's limit,¹ is rambling and incoherent at times, and is largely unresponsive to Defendants' relatively straightforward motion. Indeed, Defendants' memorandum in support of their motion is only 14 pages, and their arguments are not overly complex. Plaintiff simply does not need more than 15 pages to respond to Defendants' motion. However, in light of Plaintiff's pro se status, the Court will grant Plaintiff leave to file a response brief that is double the page limit.

Therefore, the Court will strike Plaintiff's response brief from the record for filing error because it violates E.D. Mo. Local Rules 4.01(D) and 2.01(A)(1). On the Court's own motion, Plaintiff will be granted leave to file a response brief that is no longer than 30 pages, exclusive of any Table of Contents, Table of Authorities, and signature page; and that is in 12-point font and double spaced.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's response to the motion to dismiss (ECF No. 15) is **STRICKEN** from the record for filing error, and the Clerk of the Court shall delete it from the record.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff is granted until **May 21, 2025** to file a

¹ Large swaths of the brief are also single-spaced, so his filing is even longer than the page count indicates. Local Rule 2.01(A)(1) requires, among other things, that all filings "shall be in 12-point or larger font, [and] double-spaced."

response brief that does not exceed 30 pages (not counting any Table of Contents, Table of Authorities, and signature page) and is in 12-point font or larger, double-spaced.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if Plaintiff does not comply fully and timely with this Order, his right to file a response brief will be deemed waived.

Dated this 5th day of May, 2025.



AUDREY G. FLEISSIG
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE