

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

Staci Carney v. West Coast Self Storage Group; James McNamee;
Steve Tangrey; Mike Spaulding; and John Eisenbarth

Carney v. West Coast Self Storage Group, No. 3:25-cv-00377-AB (D. Or. May 19, 2026) · No. 3:25-cv-00377-AB · Decided May 19, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Oregon dismissed Staci Carney’s amended complaint because it was not a short and plain statement and failed to comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 and Local Rule 10-1 formatting requirements. The court granted leave to file a second amended complaint subject to page, spacing, margin, pagination, and signature requirements. The court further advised that any second amended complaint was limited to curing the claims in the initial complaint against West Coast Self Storage Group unless additional leave or consent was obtained.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Oregon
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Amy M. Baggio
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Oregon
DECIDED	May 19, 2026
DOCKET	3:25-cv-00377-AB
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant moved for a more definite statement under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(e) or, alternatively, to strike the amended complaint under Rule 12(f). The court dismissed the amended complaint under Rule 8 and granted leave to amend.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 and Local Rule 10-1 to determine whether the pleading was sufficiently short, plain, and properly formatted. It described Rule 12(e) as directed to unintelligible pleadings and evaluated whether the complaint provided a sufficient basis for the defendant to frame a responsive pleading.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court opinion

PARTIES

Staci Carney v. West Coast Self Storage Group, James McNamee,
Steve Tangrey, Mike Spaulding, John Eisenbarth

TOPICS

motion for a more definite statement

pleadings

motion to amend

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

pleadings

contracts

torts

consumer protection

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the amended complaint violated Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 and the District of Oregon's formatting requirements.
2. Whether the court should grant a more definite statement under Rule 12(e) or strike the amended complaint under Rule 12(f).
3. Whether Plaintiff's prior limited leave to amend permitted her to add new claims and defendants without written consent or further court leave.

HOLDINGS

1. The amended complaint was subject to dismissal because it was not a short and plain statement and failed applicable formatting requirements, including paragraph numbering, pagination, spacing, and margins.
2. Rule 12(e) was less applicable than Rule 8 because the amended complaint was intelligible, even though it failed to provide a short, plain, and properly formatted statement.
3. Because the prior order granted leave only to cure specified deficiencies, Plaintiff could not add new claims or defendants without the opposing party's written consent or the court's leave under Rule 15(a) (2).

KEY QUOTATIONS

"The problem is not that the Amended Complaint is unintelligible but that it is not a "short and plain statement" and fails formatting requirements under both the Federal and Local Rules."

"In other words, this was a specific and limited grant of leave to amend, not a general or limitless one."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff filed a ninety-one-page handwritten amended complaint against West Coast Self Storage Group and four newly added individual defendants. The pleading lacked comprehensive pagination and paragraph numbering, used single spacing, lacked margins, contained varying signatures and dates, and included text that overlapped the electronic filing header. It also asserted new claims and added defendants beyond the scope of the court's prior limited leave to amend.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court previously granted Defendant's first motion to dismiss and permitted Plaintiff to amend her complaint to cure specified deficiencies. Plaintiff filed a lengthy handwritten amended complaint that added claims and defendants. Defendant then moved for a more definite statement or to strike. The court granted the motion on alternative Rule 8 grounds, dismissed the amended complaint without prejudice, and granted leave to file a second amended complaint within thirty days.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Cafasso v. Gen. Dynamics C4 Sys., Inc., 637 F.3d 1047, 1059 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Sheffield v. Orius Corp., 211 F.R.D. 411, 414 (D. Or. 2002)
- Resolution Trust Corp. v. Gershman, 829 F. Supp. 1095, 1103 (E.D. Mo. 1993)
- Harrell v. Bd. of Trs. of Cal. State Univ., 710 F. Supp. 3d 742, 746 (N.D. Cal. 2024)
- Federal Sav. & Loan Ins. Corp. v. Musacchio, 695 F. Supp. 1053, 1060 (N.D. Cal. 1988)
- Cellars v. Pac. Coast Packaging, Inc., 189 F.R.D. 575, 578 (N.D. Cal. 1999)
- Castle v. Teaney, No. CV 16-09411-JVS (JDE), 2017 WL 11635873, at *1 (C.D. Cal. July 18, 2017)
- Hearn v. San Bernardino Police Dep't, 530 F.3d 1124, 1131 (9th Cir. 2008)
- Ashton v. State of Montana, No. CV 15-96-M-DWM-JCL, 2015 WL 12714408, at *2 (D. Mont. Nov. 13, 2015)
- Long v. JP Morgan Chase Bank, Nat'l Ass'n, 848 F. Supp. 2d 1166, 1173 (D. Haw. 2012)
- Foman v. Davis, 371 U.S. 178, 182 (1962)
- Nacarino v. Chobani, LLC, 668 F. Supp. 3d 881, 900-01 (N.D. Cal. 2022)
- Jameson Beach Prop. Owners Ass'n v. United States, No. 2:13-cv-01025-MCE-AC, 2014 WL 4925253, at *3 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 29, 2014)
- Ketab Corp. v. Mesriani & Assocs., 2:14-cv-07241-RSWL (MRW), 2015 WL 8022874, at *8 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 4, 2015)
- Kelley v. Rambus, Inc., 384 F. App'x 570, 572 (9th Cir. 2010)