

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS

**BRIAN DOLEZAL and
LAURA DOLEZAL,**

Plaintiffs,

v.

**STARR HOMES, LLC; JERRY BAIN;
JENNIFER BAIN; and CASTROP DESIGN
GROUP, LLC,**

Defendants.

Case No. 2:18-CV-02524

MEMORANDUM & ORDER

Plaintiffs and Counterclaim Defendants Brian and Laura Dolezal (“Plaintiffs”) initiated this action for Copyright Infringement, 17 U.S.C. § 501, against Defendants and Counterclaim Plaintiffs Starr Homes, LLC, Jerry and Jennifer Bain, and Castrop Design Group, LLC (“Defendants”). This matter is before the Court on Plaintiffs’ Motion to Strike (Doc. 15). For the reasons set forth below, the motion is denied in its entirety.

I. Standard to Strike Pleading

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(f) provides that “[t]he court may strike from a pleading an insufficient defense or any redundant, immaterial, impertinent, or scandalous matter.”¹ Striking a pleading is a drastic measure, and may often be brought as a dilatory tactic, thus motions to strike under Rule 12(f) are generally disfavored.² Because motions to strike are disfavored, a court ““should decline to strike material from a pleading unless that material has no

¹ Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(f).

² *Nwakupda v. Falley’s, Inc.*, 14 F. Supp. 2d 1213, 1215 (D. Kan. 1998); *RMD, L.L.C. v. Nitto Ams., Inc.*, No. 09–2056, 2012 WL 1033542, at *2 (D. Kan. Mar. 27, 2012) (citing *Thompson v. Jiffy Lube Int’l, Inc.*, No. 05–1203, 2005 WL 2219325, at *1 (D. Kan. Sept. 13, 2005)).

possible relation to the controversy and may prejudice the opposing party.’’³ The decision to grant a motion to strike is within the district court’s sound discretion.⁴

Plaintiffs move to strike portions of Defendants’ Answer to Complaint, Affirmative Defenses, and Counterclaim (Doc. 11) on the grounds that (1) Paragraphs 59–106 describing individual features are redundant, immaterial, and impertinent; (2) Paragraphs 33–39 include scandalous, false statements which unfairly prejudice plaintiffs; (3) Defendants’ affirmative defenses are insufficient as a matter of law; and (4) Paragraphs 11, 13, and 14 are immaterial. Further, Plaintiffs move to strike, or in the alternative dismiss, Defendants’ counterclaim for copyright misuse for failure to state a claim. Defendants assert that Plaintiffs’ motion is merely a lengthy denial based on unsupported arguments of Plaintiffs’ counsel. The Court addresses Plaintiffs’ objections in turn.

II. Discussion

A. Motion to Strike Individual Features from Copyright Misuse Claim

Plaintiffs move to strike paragraphs 59–106. In each of these paragraphs, Defendants list a separate, individual feature of the Dolezal home. Plaintiffs assert that Defendants have “repeatedly attempted to confuse the issues of the case and separate Plaintiffs’ copyright infringement claims into individual features.”⁵ Defendants respond that prior to filing this lawsuit, Plaintiffs represented to Defendants that they had rights to various common architectural features, which are now named here in paragraphs 59–106, and the list is necessary to demonstrate the scope of Plaintiffs’ allegedly improper representations. The list of features is

³ *Falley v. Friends Univ.*, 787 F. Supp. 2d 1255, 1257 (D. Kan. 2011) (quoting *Wilhelm v. TLC Lawn Care, Inc.*, No. 07-2465, 2008 WL 474265, at *2 (D. Kan. Feb. 19, 2008)).

⁴ See *Kendall State Bank v. W. Point Underwriters, L.L.C.*, No. 10–2319–JTM, 2012 WL 3890264, at *2 (D. Kan. Sept. 7, 2012).

⁵ Doc. 16 at 6.

included as factual support for Defendants’ copyright misuse counterclaim. “Copyright misuse forbids the use of a copyright ‘to secure an exclusive right or limited monopoly not granted by the copyright office and is contrary to public policy to grant.’”⁶ “The court ‘should decline to strike material from a pleading unless that material has no possible relation to the controversy and may prejudice the opposing party.’”⁷ The list of features is factual support for Defendants’ claim that Plaintiffs attempted to secure an exclusive right over something beyond the rights granted in their copyright, and accordingly the material is plausibly related to the copyright dispute. Further, Plaintiffs have not shown prejudice from these paragraphs, an explicit consideration in a motion to strike.⁸ The Court finds that responding to paragraphs 59–106 is not an “undue burden”⁹ as Plaintiffs allege, but rather part and parcel of litigation. Accordingly, the Court denies Plaintiffs’ motion to strike paragraphs 59–106.

B. Motion to Strike Paragraphs 33–39

Plaintiffs move to strike Paragraphs 33–39 as “scandalous, false statements which unfairly prejudice Plaintiffs [and] disingenuously question the moral character of plaintiffs and plaintiffs’ counsel.”¹⁰ Defendants respond that the paragraphs are simply factual support for Defendants’ view of the case. “‘Scandalous’ matter is that which improperly casts a derogatory light on someone, most typically a party to the action.”¹¹ Scandalous allegations “degrade [a

⁶ *Energy Intelligence Grp., Inc. v. CHS McPherson Refinery, Inc.*, 300 F. Supp. 3d 1356, 1372 (D. Kan. 2018).

⁷ *Falley*, 787 F. Supp. 2d at 1257 (citing *Wilhelm*, 2008 WL 474265, at *2).

⁸ *See id.*

⁹ Doc. 22 at 8.

¹⁰ Doc. 16 at 8.

¹¹ 5A C. Wright and A. Miller, *Federal Practice and Procedure (Civil) 2d* § 1382, at 712 (1990).

party's] moral character, contain repulsive language, or detract from the dignity of the court."¹²

The court finds that these factual contentions do not rise to the level of scandalous matter.

The factual allegations in these paragraphs include:

33. Scott Bickford, the designer and architect of the Bickford technical drawings depicting the Dolezal home, reviewed the accused drawings and told the Dolezals and their attorneys that the accused drawings were not a copy of his drawings;

34. The Dolezals' attorneys were given unfettered access to the accused home under construction to openly show and prove to them and the Dolezals that their claims were unfounded and to avoid a costly and baseless lawsuit.

35. No reasonable person would claim copyright infringement of the Bickford technical drawings for a house after being advised by the architect for those plans that the accused plans were not a copy.

36. No reasonable person would claim copyright infringement of the architectural work built from the Bickford plans after walking through the accused home.

37. The Dolezals and their attorneys ignored Mr. Bickford, and disregarded the indisputable evidence, filing this suit for an improper purpose.

38. The Dolezals' and their attorneys' claim for copyright infringement is not warranted by existing law.

39. The Dolezals' and their attorneys' factual contentions are without evidentiary support.¹³

Plaintiffs assert that these statements are untrue, as well as irrelevant hearsay. Plaintiffs' conclusory assertion that these statements are untrue does not justify a motion to strike. As discussed above, "[t]he court 'should decline to strike material from a pleading unless that material has no possible relation to the controversy and may prejudice the opposing party.'"¹⁴

This is a copyright dispute, and these factual contentions regarding the validity of the dispute are clearly material. Further, hearsay is a statement that "a party offers in evidence."¹⁵ As

¹² *Miller v. Pfizer, Inc.*, CIV.A. 99-2326-KHV, 1999 WL 1063046, at *3 (D. Kan. Nov. 10, 1999).

¹³ Doc. 11 ¶¶ 33–39.

¹⁴ *Falley*, 787 F. Supp. 2d at 1257 (citing *Wilhelm*, 2008 WL 474265, at *2).

¹⁵ Fed. R. Evid. 801(c)(2).

Defendants have not attempted to enter this statement into evidence, a hearsay objection is improper. Accordingly, Plaintiffs' motion to strike paragraphs 33–39 is denied.

C. Defendants' Affirmative Defenses

Plaintiffs move for the court to strike Defendants' affirmative defenses as insufficient as a matter of law. Plaintiffs contend that under the “indisputable facts,”¹⁶ Defendants cannot show waiver, estoppel, acquiescence, or laches. Further, Plaintiffs state that because they have alleged facts supporting a claim of copyright infringement, Defendants' preserved affirmative defense of failure to state a claim should be stricken. Defendants respond that this request is both factually and legally unsound. The Court agrees.

“The court ‘should decline to strike material from a pleading unless that material has no possible relation to the controversy and may prejudice the opposing party.’”¹⁷ “Striking an affirmative defense is considered a ‘drastic remedy,’ and the court should only utilize the legal tool where the challenged allegations cannot succeed under any circumstances.”¹⁸

Here, Plaintiffs' conclusory assertion that there are “indisputable facts” which preclude waiver, estoppel, acquiescence, or laches is unconvincing. At the pleading stage, Defendants need not show that their affirmative defenses will succeed on the merits.¹⁹ Plaintiffs have not shown that Defendants' affirmative defenses—based on disputed factual allegations that occurred prior to the filing of the Complaint—“cannot succeed under any circumstance.”²⁰ Defendants allege that Plaintiffs made representations prior to the filing of the litigation which

¹⁶ Doc. 16 at 7.

¹⁷ *Falley*, 787 F. Supp. 2d at 1257 (citing *Wilhelm*, 2008 WL 474265, at *2).

¹⁸ *Id.* at 1259 (citing *Wilhelm*, 2008 WL 474265, at *2).

¹⁹ *Id.* (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(c)).

²⁰ *Id.*

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.