

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

BRYAN ANTHONY REO,

Plaintiff,

v.

MARTIN LINDSTEDT.,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:19-cv-02589-CAB

Hon. Christopher A. Boyko

Mag. Thomas M. Parker

REO LAW, LLC

Bryan Anthony Reo (#0097470)

P.O. Box 5100

Mentor, OH 44061

(T): (440) 313-5893

(E): reo@reolaw.org

Pro se Plaintiff

MARTIN LINDSTEDT

338 Rabbit Track Road

Granby, MO 64844

(T): (417) 472-6901

(E): pastorlindstedt@gmail.com

Pro se Defendant

**PLAINTIFF BRYAN ANTHONY REO'S MOTION TO
STRIKE DEFENDANT'S DOCUMENT DOCKET ENTRY 17 DATED 2/3/2020
AND/OR FOR A MORE DEFINITE STATEMENT**

NOW COMES Bryan Anthony Reo ("Plaintiff"), *pro se*, and hereby propounds upon Martin Lindstedt ("Defendant") and this Honorable Court Plaintiff Bryan Anthony Reo's Motion to Strike Defendant's Document Docket Entry 17 Dated 2/3/2020 and/or for a More Definite Statement:

1. For the reasons previously set forth in Plaintiff Bryan Anthony Reo's Brief in Support of Plaintiff's Motion to Strike Defendant's Answer and Counterclaim (Doc. 6), "Defendants Amended Answer As Ordered..." (Doc. 17) should be stricken pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(f)(2), insofar as Defendant's pleadings contain redundant, immaterial, impertinent, and scandalous matters, Defendant's pleadings were not drawn in conformity with Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2),

8(b)(1)(A), 8(b)(1)(B), 8(b)(2), (8)(c)(1), and (8)(d)(1), and Defendant is again illegally practicing law on behalf of a corporate entity despite Defendant not being a licensed attorney admitted to practice law before this Court and the being told in other cases to stop practicing law on behalf of corporate entities. (1:19-CV-02103-SO, Doc. 19, PageID ## 195-195) (“But the court grants Plaintiff’s Second Motion to the extent it asks the court to strike Defendant’s assertion that he represents not only himself but also his Church of Jesus Christ Christian/Aryan Nations of Missouri. Ohio law forbids a non-lawyer like Defendant from representing a corporate entity. *See Disciplinary Counsel v. Givens*, 832 N.E.2d 1200, 1202 (Ohio 2005).”).

2. Defendant engages in unauthorized practice of law by including a corporate entity in the signature block and stating that he is appearing “of and for” the behalf of that corporate entity. He captions the pleading “DEFENDANTS” and references “DEFENDANTS” and ambiguously claims he dropped the corporate entity Church of Jesus Christ Christian Aryan Nations of Missouri from the case but alleges he is appearing “of and for” said entity. Lindstedt begins his latest “Amended Answer” with “DEFENDANTS [plural] AMENDED ANSWER AS ORDERED” and states that the parties are “Defendant Pastor Martin Lindstedt (hereinafter in person described as Pastor Lindstedt) OF THE Church of Jesus Christ Christian Aryan Nations of Missouri (hereafter described as Pastor Lindstedt’s Church).” (Doc. 17, pg 1). Lindstedt then references this Court’s previous orders, which he presumably read. The orders from this Court included pleadings being stricken and Lindstedt being told he would be expected to abide by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which among other things prohibit the unauthorized practice of law by a non-attorney individual such as Lindstedt on behalf of a corporate entity such as Church of Jesus Christ Christian Aryan Nations of Missouri, i.e. Lindstedt’s “Church.”

3. Alternatively to the Court striking “Defendants Amended Answer as Ordered” (Doc. 17), for the reasons set forth within Plaintiff’s previous brief (Doc. 8 and Doc. 15), and this motion, the Court should order Defendant to provide a more definite statement—pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(e)—insofar as both of Defendant’s pleadings are vague and ambiguous to such an extent that Plaintiff cannot make sense of Defendant’s factual averments, Defendant’s affirmative defenses, Defendant’s counterclaims, or what appears to be some sort of third-party complaint against third-parties Defendant wants to implead into the instant civil action.

4. Nothing in the Doc. 17 reads like an Answer or a Counterclaim, the title block references Plaintiff as a “Counter-Defendant” but while vague causes of action are provided, a jumbled and tangled mess of facts are alleged, numbered paragraphs are finally used, once again no pleading standards are adhered to, no pretense of compliance with Twombly and Iqbal is even attempted, are any averments or admissions in the “Answer” portion of the document and it is equally unclear, what, if any, counterclaims are possibly being pled against Plaintiff Bryan Anthony Reo or a dozen other potentially joined [mis-joined?] third parties. Lindstedt’s document is a rambling incoherent narrative. It isn’t clear if Defendant Lindstedt has affirmative defenses, counter-claims arising under common law, counter-claims arising under statute, and if so what is the factual basis of any such claims. Defendant has not even met notice pleading standards let alone the burdens of Twombly and Iqbal. Plaintiff Reo is not on fair notice as to the nature, basis, and type of claims that Lindstedt might potentially be trying to plead against Reo. The document cannot be intelligibly responded to, and is violative of Plaintiff’s due process rights. The document is vague, ambiguous, confusing, and frankly incoherent. Is the Defendant alleging some counterclaim that Plaintiff has to file a timely answer to? It is not clear by any measure. Lindstedt’s recent attempt to bog down another case involving Plaintiff Bryan Anthony Reo against Martin Lindstedt with the attempted

joinder of a dozen irrelevant third parties was recently stricken sua sponte by the court via their inherent authority under F.R.C.P 12(f). See 1:19-CV-02103-SO, Doc. 35.

5. Defendant appears unwilling to conform his pleadings to the standards required by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure despite his having bragged about being an alleged expert in litigation in the federal courts and his touting his credentials as a litigant in over 40 cases in United States District Courts in Missouri and the 8th Circuit. Defendant appears to be using the instant action as a means to engage in grand-standing, gamesmanship, while filing long-winded incoherent rambling nonsense, that simply baffles and confounds Plaintiff and leaves Plaintiff guessing as to what sort of document Defendant has filed, how it should be viewed, and what if any response might be required. It isn't clear that Defendant has a counterclaim against Plaintiff, and if a counterclaim exists, the basis and nature is also unclear. At best it seems the Defendant is alleging some sort of conspiracy involving the Federal government, Lake County Ohio, Lake County Court of Common Pleas, Judge Patrick Condon, a half-dozen or so attorneys, and a similarly absurd number of other unrelated third parties. But if this is even being alleged it isn't clear, and it isn't clear what the nature and basis is. Plaintiff shouldn't have to guess as to what is possibly being pleaded against him. Defendant's documents, docket entry 17 should be stricken. At this stage Defendant, who has taken multiple chances and been generous given latitude and additional chances by this Court, should simply default Defendant for persistent and willful non-compliance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the orders of this Court.

A claim must be stated with sufficient clarity to enable a court or opposing party to determine whether a claim has been alleged. See *Elliott v. Foufas*, 867 F.2d 877.880 (5th Cir. 1989).

A district court and opposing parties are not required to sift through pleadings that are essentially incomprehensible. See *Old Time Enterprises v. International Coffee Corp.*, 862 F.2d 1213, 1219 (5th Cir. 1989).

Lindstedt's claims, whatever they are, if indeed there are any, are absurd, patently frivolous, and are pled in an incomprehensible rambling narrative that hints at a conspiracy involving judges, lawyers, the entire Federal government, the state of Ohio, and other irrelevant third parties that Defendant wants to attempt to join.

6. It is time for this Court to end Defendant's shenanigans in this case and simply default the Defendant as a sanction.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that this Honorable Court will:

- A. Strike Defendants Amended Answer as Ordered (Doc. 17) and enter default against Defendant as a sanction due to Defendant's steadfast refusal to stop practicing law on behalf of third-parties and for using virulently offensive language in Defendant's pleading;
or
- B. Alternatively order Defendant to provide a more definite statement by requiring Defendant to submit a pleading in conformity with Fed. R. Civ. P. 8; and
- C. Award Plaintiff any and all further relief which is warranted by law or equity.

Respectfully submitted,

REO LAW, LLC

/s/ Bryan Anthony Reo
Bryan Anthony Reo (#0097470)
P.O. Box 5100
Mentor, OH 44061
(T): (440) 313-5893

(E): reo@reolaw.org
Pro se Plaintiff

Dated: February 5, 2020

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION**

BRYAN ANTHONY REO,

Plaintiff,

v.

MARTIN LINDSTEDT.,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:19-cv-02589-CAB

Hon. Christopher A. Boyko

Mag. Thomas M. Parker

REO LAW, LLC

Bryan Anthony Reo (#0097470)

P.O. Box 5100

Mentor, OH 44061

(T): (440) 313-5893

(E): reo@reolaw.org

Pro se Plaintiff

MARTIN LINDSTEDT

338 Rabbit Track Road

Granby, MO 64844

(T): (417) 472-6901

(E): pastorlindstedt@gmail.com

Pro se Defendant

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Bryan Anthony Reo, affirm that I am a party to the above-captioned civil action, and on February 5, 2020, I served a true and accurate copy the foregoing document upon Martin Lindstedt, 338 Rabbit Track Road, Granby, MO 64844, by placing the same in a First Class postage-prepaid, properly addressed, and sealed envelope and in the United States Mail located in City of Mentor, Lake County, State of Ohio.

/s/ Bryan Anthony Reo

Bryan Anthony Reo (#0097470)

P.O. Box 5100

Mentor, OH 44061

(T): (440) 313-5893

(E): reo@reolaw.org

Pro se Plaintiff

Dated: February 5, 2020