IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

IMAGOS FILMS, LLC :

d/b/a IMAGOS SOFTWORKS, : CIVIL ACTION

and DON THACKER, :

Plaintiffs,

:

v.

:

ALEX THOMAS MAUER, : No. 17-2964

Defendant. :

ORDER

AND NOW, this 17th day of **October**, 2017, upon consideration of Plaintiffs' Motion to Strike the Answer of Alex Mauer and/or Motion for Contempt, it is **ORDERED** that the motion (Document No. 17) is **DENIED**.¹

Berle M. Schiller, J.

THE COUR

The Court also declines to hold Mauer in criminal contempt or impose Rule 11 sanctions, either of which would be a draconian sanction here.

¹ Plaintiffs' motion was prompted by Mauer's one-day-late filing of the Answer. The Court is putting Mauer on notice that it expects deadlines to be met. *See Naughton v. Harmelech*, Civ. A. No. 09-5450, 2015 WL 12835620, at *3 n.4 (D.N.J. Jan. 30, 2015). Litigants representing themselves are entitled to a certain degree of latitude in their pleadings, but they are not free to ignore deadlines.

The Court will not, however, strike a pro se litigant's answer—or sanction that pro se litigant—because the Answer was filed a day late. Plaintiffs are not going to achieve victory by default here against a Defendant who is clearly interested in defending herself. Moreover, the Court disagrees with Plaintiffs' contention that the one-day delay has prejudiced their claims. Plaintiffs assert that they are "in genuine need of prompt relief" because they cannot develop their video game while this litigation is ongoing. But Plaintiffs are not unique in asserting they need a quick resolution to litigation. And there is no order from this Court which is keeping Plaintiffs from developing their video game. Finally, if Plaintiffs believe that this litigation will be sped up by having a default entered, possibly followed by a motion to set aside the default, with its attendant briefing and potential appeal, Plaintiffs have miscalculated.