

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

Jane Doe et al. v. Ursuline High School et al.

Doe v. Ursuline High School · No. 4:25-CV-1822 · Decided March 4, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio grants in part the Coach Defendants’ motion for an extension of time to answer and strikes Plaintiffs’ Third Amended Complaint in its entirety. The court permits refileing subject to removal of previously stricken material, allows certain grammatical changes to remain, and warns counsel that further nonconforming or frivolous filings may result in sanctions.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, Eastern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Benita Y. Pearson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, Eastern Division
DECIDED	March 4, 2026
DOCKET	4:25-CV-1822
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court resolved the Coach Defendants' unopposed motion for an extension of time to answer the Third Amended Complaint after determining that the pleading did not comply with the court's prior order governing the permitted amendments.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A request to extend a deadline under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(b)(1), as identified in the opinion, requires good cause; generally, the movant must show that despite diligence the original deadline could not be met.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; memorandum opinion and order from a federal district court with no reporter citation.

TOPICS

- pleadings
- motion to amend
- sanctions
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil procedure

Pleading and amendment practice

Federal litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the Coach Defendants established good cause for an extension of time to answer the Third Amended Complaint.
2. Whether Plaintiffs' Third Amended Complaint complied with the court's order permitting only specified deletions and prohibiting other substantive amendments.
3. Whether minor grammatical and typographical changes constituted impermissible amendments.

HOLDINGS

1. The Third Amended Complaint did not comply with the court's order because Plaintiffs replaced stricken material with substantive legal argument and objections, and the pleading was therefore stricken in its entirety.
2. Minor grammatical, clerical, and typographical changes, including conforming terminology to the court's pseudonym order, were non-substantive and could remain in a conforming Third Amended Complaint.
3. The motion for an extension of time to answer was granted in part, and the Coach Defendants were permitted to respond to any conforming Third Amended Complaint within seven days after it was filed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“No other content may be amended therein.” (PageID #: 2025)

“As a result of their patently inappropriate response to an Order that was clearly understood but found objectionable, the Third Amended Complaint is stricken in its entirety.” (Section IV.A)

“If Plaintiffs choose to refile a Third Amended Complaint, it shall be filed in accord with this Order: paragraphs previously ordered stricken shall be removed and not replaced with objections or explanations.” (Section V)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The court had ordered Plaintiffs to remove specified paragraphs from their pleading and expressly prohibited amendment of any other content. Plaintiffs removed the specified paragraphs but also inserted substantive legal argument and objections, while making other changes that the court characterized as minor grammatical or typographical edits. The Coach Defendants sought an additional thirty days to answer the nonconforming pleading.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs filed their original Complaint on September 2, 2025, followed by an Amended Complaint and Second Amended Complaint. The court set February 6, 2026, as the deadline for filing a Third Amended Complaint and later ordered Plaintiffs to refile the Second Amended Complaint with specified paragraphs removed and no other

content amended. Plaintiffs filed a Third Amended Complaint that removed the specified paragraphs but also added substantive legal argument and other text. The Coach Defendants moved for an additional thirty days to answer, and the court granted the motion in part, struck the Third Amended Complaint, and established deadlines for any conforming refiling and response.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Shane v. Bunzl Distrib. USA, Inc., 275 F. App'x 535, 536 (6th Cir. 2008)
- Doe v. Ursuline High Sch., No. 4:25-CV-01822 (N.D. Ohio filed Sept. 2, 2025)

OPINION

PEARSON, J. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO EASTERN DIVISION JANE DOE et al.,) CASE NO. 4:25-CV-1822) Plaintiffs,)) JUDGE BENITA Y. PEARSON v.)) URSULINE HIGH SCHOOL et al.,) MEMORANDUM OF) OPINION AND ORDER Defendants.) [Resolving ECF No. 151] I. INTRODUCTION With great regret and lamentation, the Court considers an unopposed Motion for Extension of Time to Answer.

See ECF No. 151. Movants are Defendants Timothy McGlynn, Daniel Reardon, and Christian Syrianoudis (“Coach Defendants.”) They seek an additional thirty days to respond to the Third Amended Complaint because Plaintiffs allegedly made impermissible additions and edits therein. See ECF Nos. 150, 151 at PageID #: 2409.

The Court grants the Motion in part and advises counsel for all Parties to behave civilly in compliance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 11. More to the point, each counsel should pause, think, and only then act, as if their reputations depend on each word uttered. II. BACKGROUND Plaintiffs filed their Complaint on September 2, 2025. See ECF No. 1.

In compliance with Court Order, they filed an Amended Complaint on October 20, 2025, see ECF Nos. 19, 22, and a Second Amended Complaint on November 10, 2025, see ECF No. 45. At the Case Management Conference, the Court set a February 6, 2026 cutoff to file a Third Amended Complaint, if any. See Minutes of Proceedings [non-document] 12/17/2025.

As the Court reinforced in its Partial Case Management Order, “[t]he cutoff for amending or seeking leave to amend the pleadings and/or adding additional parties is February 6, 2026.” ECF No. 111 at PageID #: 1752, ¶ 14. Plaintiff did not file a Third Amended Complaint by that date, as was their right. See Doe v. Ursuline High Sch., No. 4:25-CV-01822 (N.D. Ohio filed Sept.

2, 2025). On February 12, 2026, the Court granted in part Coach Defendants’ Motion to Seal all three Complaints. See ECF Nos. 1, 22, 45, 115, 149. Therein, the Court ordered that: No later than February 18, 2026, Plaintiffs shall refile their second amended complaint with the following paragraphs stricken: ¶ 13 (including footnote), ¶ 7, ¶¶ 99–123, ¶ 146, ¶ 157, ¶ 169, ¶ 398. ¶¶ 412–13, ¶ 415, ¶ 418, ¶¶ 453–54, ¶ 520 (second sentence), ¶¶ 533–37, ¶ 552, ¶¶ 594–95, ¶ 750, ¶ 752 (sentences 2–4), ¶¶ 823–49, ¶¶ 851–54, ¶ 884, ¶ 946, ¶ 953, ¶¶ 955–57, and ¶¶ 959–67.

See ECF No. 45. No other content may be amended therein. ECF No. 149 at PageID #: 2025 (emphasis added). On February 18, 2026, Plaintiffs filed a Third Amended Complaint in feigned compliance with ECF No. 149. See ECF No. 150.

On March 3, 2026—the day before their responsive pleading was due—Coach Defendants filed the instant Motion for Extension. See ECF No. 151. Therein, they allege that “[w]hile Plaintiffs’ [Third Amended Complaint] removed the stricken paragraphs, Plaintiffs also added substantive legal argument and amended text within paragraphs, which this Court never permitted Plaintiffs to do.” ECF No. 141 at PageID #: 2410.

Coach Defendants ask for an extra month to answer; shifting the cutoff from March 4, 2026 to April 3, 2026. See ECF No. 151.¹ 1 Coach Defendants buried the lede: the Third Amended Complaint is plainly inappropriate, and they ought to have said so sooner. See Oscar Wilde, *An Ideal Husband*, act 1 (1895) (“Questions are never indiscreet, answers sometimes are.”) III.

LAW Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(b)(1), “[w]hen an act may or must be done within a specified time, the court may, for good cause, extend the time[.]” Generally, this requires a movant to show that “despite their diligence[,] they could not meet the original deadline[.]” See *Shane v. Bunzl Distrib. USA, Inc.*, 275 Fed. Appx. 535, 536 (6th Cir. 2008).

Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 11 By presenting to the court a pleading, written motion, or other paper—whether by signing, filing, submitting, or later advocating it—an attorney or unrepresented party certifies that to the best of the person's knowledge, information, and belief, formed after an inquiry reasonable under the circumstances... it is not being presented for any improper purpose, such as to harass, cause unnecessary delay, or needlessly increase the cost of litigation[.]” (cleaned up) (emphasis added).

IV. DISCUSSION A. Plain Meaning of Stricken Coach Defendants allegation that Plaintiffs impermissibly “added substantive legal argument” to ¶ 13 (including footnote), ¶ 7, ¶¶ 99–123, ¶ 146, ¶ 157, ¶ 169, ¶ 398. ¶¶ 412–13, ¶ 415, ¶ 418, ¶¶ 453–54, ¶ 520 (second sentence), ¶¶ 533–37, ¶ 552, ¶¶ 594–95, ¶ 750, ¶ 752 (sentences 2–4), ¶¶ 823–49, ¶¶ 851–54, ¶ 884, ¶ 946, ¶ 953, ¶¶ 955–57, and ¶¶ 959–67 is well taken.

Plaintiffs’ counsel well knew that stricken meant that they were ordered to remove the offending language and to not replace it with argument or objections—matters that have no place in a

complaint.² As a result of their patently inappropriate response to an Order that was clearly understood but found objectionable, the Third Amended Complaint is stricken in its entirety.

2 Had there been any question, the Court's instruction that: "No other content may be amended therein[]" should have clarified. ECF No. 149 at PageID #: 2025 (emphasis added). B. Grammar Coach Defendants contention that Plaintiffs impermissibly "amended text within paragraphs" in ¶ 8; ¶¶ 51 n.2, ¶ 53, ¶¶ 770-75, ¶¶ 777-79, ¶ 795, ¶ 1149, ¶ 1412, ¶ 1414, and ¶ 1423 is not well taken.

ECF No. 151 at PageID #: 2410, n 3-4. The alleged amendments include: (1) changing "Daughter Chef" to "Daughter Doe"; (2) changing "Mother Chef" to "Jane Doe"; (3) removing a blank space after a closing parens; (4) changing two vertical apostrophes to typographer's apostrophes; (5) changing a closing apostrophe to an opening apostrophe; and (6) changing "social media" to "social-media." See ECF No. 150 at PageID ##: 2032-311.

These changes—some in compliance with the Court's pseudonym Order, see ECF No. 19—are minor, inconsequential, and non-substantive. To characterize clerical and typographical conformance across the docket as unauthorized amendment is an overstep.

V. CONCLUSION Coach Defendants' Motion for Extension of Time to Answer is granted in part. See ECF No. 151. Plaintiff's Third Amended Complaint is Stricken in its entirety. If Plaintiffs choose to refile a Third Amended Complaint, it shall be filed in accord with this Order: paragraphs previously ordered stricken shall be removed and not replaced with objections or explanations.

Those amendments considered grammatical may persist. Failure to adhere to this Order will result in an Order to Show Cause why Plaintiffs' counsel should not be held in contempt. Any conforming Third Amended Complaint shall be filed within seven days of this Order. Coach Defendants shall respond to any conforming Third Amended Complaint not later than seven days after it is filed.

Finally, all counsel are reminded that filing a nonconforming pleading, frivolous motion, or opposition is sanctionable conduct under Local Rule 7.1(i) and the Court's inherent authority to command its docket. Sanctions will be limited only by those boundaries established by law. IT IS SO ORDERED. March 4, 2026 /s/ Benita Y. Pearson Date Benita Y. Pearson United States District Judge