

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

Eric Hildebrandt et al. v. siParadigm LLC; Health Lynks, LLC; Aziz Saad; Chris Weidman; John and Jane Does 1-10; and ABC Corps. 1-10

Hildebrandt · No. 23-21835 · Decided December 31, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of New Jersey dismissed, without prejudice, Plaintiffs’ 229-page consolidated complaint under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 because it was excessively prolix, unclear, repetitive, internally contradictory, and failed to provide adequate notice of the claims. The court denied Defendants’ motion to strike and alternative motion to dismiss as moot. Plaintiffs were granted thirty days to file an amended pleading, with failure to do so resulting in dismissal with prejudice.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of New Jersey
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jamel K. Semper
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of New Jersey
DECIDED	December 31, 2025
DOCKET	23-21835
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendants moved to strike the consolidated complaint under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 12(f) and 8(a)(2), or alternatively to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6). The court sua sponte dismissed the consolidated complaint for failure to comply with Rule 8 and denied defendants' motions as moot.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	For purposes of evaluating pleading sufficiency, the court accepts well-pleaded allegations as true and draws reasonable inferences in plaintiffs' favor. Whether a pleading satisfies Rule 8 is a context-dependent determination committed to the district court's discretion.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Eric Hildebrandt, Paul Christian Burk, Laina Dutton, Lawrence LaMaina, Samantha Libby, Efthimios Mariakakis, Michael

McDonough, Lindsey Forbus, AJ Holderman, Edward Dix, Peter Franzone, John Berry, Ryan Miller, Hank Swank, John Ferrazza, Charles Taylor, Virginia Lee v. siParadigm LLC, Health Lynks, LLC, Aziz Saad, Chris Weidman, John and Jane Does 1-10, ABC Corps. 1-10

TOPICS

pleadings

civil procedure

motions to dismiss

employment law

contracts

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

employment law

contracts

civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the consolidated complaint complied with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2)'s requirement that a pleading contain a short and plain statement showing entitlement to relief.
2. Whether the complaint was so prolix, contradictory, vague, ambiguous, and unintelligible that dismissal under Rule 8 was appropriate.
3. Whether plaintiffs should be granted leave to amend after dismissal for failure to comply with Rule 8.

HOLDINGS

1. The consolidated complaint did not comply with Rules 8(a)(2) and 8(d)(1) because it was excessively prolix, unclear, contradictory, repetitive, and failed to provide defendants fair notice of the claims and comprehensible factual allegations.
2. The court could dismiss the consolidated complaint on its own initiative for failure to comply with Rule 8.
3. Plaintiffs were granted thirty days to file an amended pleading, and the dismissal was without prejudice.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Here, Plaintiffs’ Consolidated Complaint, which is 229 pages and contains 1,734 paragraphs, is “unnecessarily complicated and verbose.”” (Section II.A)

“The Court dismisses Plaintiffs’ Consolidated Complaint without prejudice. Plaintiffs have thirty (30) days to file an amended pleading. If Plaintiffs do not file an amended pleading within that time, this action will be dismissed with prejudice.” (Conclusion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiffs were employed by defendants as sales managers and sales specialists and alleged claims involving unpaid commissions, contract breaches, fraud, retaliation, age and disability discrimination, and sexual harassment. They filed a 229-page consolidated complaint containing 1,734 paragraphs and numerous subparagraphs. The complaint contained contradictory employment timelines and damages allegations, repetitive

allegations, unclear references to potentially applicable statutes, and citations to irrelevant or fabricated authorities.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs filed an initial complaint, amended complaint, and second amended complaint asserting numerous employment, contract, wage, discrimination, retaliation, and related claims. After the court consolidated filings from this action and case number 24-cv-00265, plaintiffs filed a 229-page consolidated complaint containing 1,734 paragraphs. The court concluded that the pleading was excessively prolix, contradictory, repetitive, unclear, and failed to give defendants fair notice of the claims. The complaint was dismissed without prejudice, with thirty days to amend; failure to amend would result in dismissal with prejudice.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- *Rocks v. City of Phila.*, 868 F.2d 644, 645 (3d Cir. 1989)
- *In re Burlington Coat Factory Sec. Litig.*, 114 F.3d 1410, 1426 (3d Cir. 1997)
- *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007)
- *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 47 (1957)
- *In re Westinghouse Sec. Litig.*, 90 F.3d 696, 702-03 (3d Cir. 1996)
- *Salahuddin v. Cuomo*, 861 F.2d 40, 42-43 (2d Cir. 1988)
- *Garrett v. Wexford Health*, 938 F.3d 69, 93 (3d Cir. 2019)
- *Peay v. Sager*, 801 F. App'x 66, 68 (3d Cir. 2020)
- *Wynder v. McMahon*, 360 F.3d 73, 80 (2d Cir. 2004)
- *Muhammad v. United States Bd. of Governors Postal Sys.*, 574 F. App'x 74, 74 (3d Cir. 2014)
- *Simmons v. Abruzzo*, 49 F.3d 83, 86 (2d Cir. 1995)
- *Kamdem-Ouaffo v. Huczko*, 810 F. App'x 82, 83-84 (3d Cir. 2020)
- *Good v. I.R.S.*, 629 F. App'x 185, 186 (3d Cir. 2015)
- *Okogun v. Trs. of Princeton Univ.*, 2024 WL 1427585, at *2 (3d Cir. Apr. 3, 2024)
- *Okogun v. Trs. of Princeton Univ.*, 2023 WL 4408274, at *3 (D.N.J. July 7, 2023)
- *Parker v. Learn the Skills Corp.*, 2004 WL 2384993, at *2 (E.D. Pa. Oct. 25, 2004)
- *Karupaiyan v. Atl. Realty Dev. Corp.*, 827 F. App'x 165, 168 (3d Cir. 2020)
- *Chemtech Int'l v. Chem. Injections Techs., Inc.*, 247 F. App'x 403, 404-05 (3d Cir. 2007)
- *In re Rockefeller Ctr. Props. Sec. Litig.*, 311 F.3d 198, 216 (3d Cir. 2002)
- *Jakes v. Youngblood*, No. 24-1608, 2025 WL 2371007, at *5 (W.D. Pa. June 26, 2025)
- *Kertesz v. Colony Tire Corp.*, No. 20-12364, 2025 WL 2779094, at *6 n.12 (D.N.J. Sept. 30, 2025)
- *Zunzurovski v. Fisher*, No. 23-10881, 2024 WL 1434076, at *1-2, 5 (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 3, 2024)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-new-jersey/2025/eric-hildebrandt-et-al-v-siparadigm-llc-health-lynks-llc-oqsn5io0>