

TRULINCS 07405510 - LYNCH, JASON M - Unit: ERE-D-A

RECEIVED
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS

2026 MAR 23 A 10:32

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS

CENTRAL DIVISION

JASON MATTHEW LYNCH
Plaintiff

FILED
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS

MAR 23 2026

TAMMY H. DOWNS, CLERK
By: 
DEP CLERK

v. Case No. 4:24-cv-00740-LPR-BBM

CLAYTON EDWARDS, et al.
Defendants

MEMORANDUM OF LAW

IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S RIGHT TO RESPOND TO DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS AND FILINGS

Plaintiff Jason Matthew Lynch respectfully submits this memorandum of law to clarify that he is legally entitled to respond to motions and filings submitted by Defendants when those filings contain errors of fact, misstatements of law, or arguments that may prejudice Plaintiff's claims or delay the proceedings.

I. FEDERAL LAW ALLOWS A PARTY TO RESPOND TO MOTIONS FILED BY THE OPPOSING PARTY

Under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, a party has the right to respond to motions filed by the opposing party.

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 7(b) governs motions and requests for court orders and establishes the framework for parties to present arguments to the Court.

More importantly, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12 and Rule 56 contemplate responses to motions filed by opposing parties. Courts consistently recognize that the adversarial system requires that both sides have an opportunity to respond before the Court rules on a motion.

Federal courts have long recognized that:

> "The fundamental requirement of due process is the opportunity to be heard at a meaningful time and in a meaningful manner."

Mathews v. Eldridge, 424 U.S. 319, 333 (1976)

Allowing a party to respond to arguments that may affect their claims is an essential part of that process.

II. PLAINTIFF MAY RESPOND WHEN A MOTION CONTAINS ERRORS OF FACT OR LAW

TRULINCS 07405510 - LYNCH, JASON M - Unit: ERE-D-A

Federal courts routinely allow parties to respond when opposing filings contain incorrect statements of fact or misrepresent the law.

The United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit has held that courts must allow parties the opportunity to address arguments raised in dispositive motions.

See:

Madewell v. Downs, 68 F.3d 1030, 1048 (8th Cir. 1995)
(Parties must have the opportunity to respond to legal arguments raised by the opposing side.)

Heisler v. Metropolitan Council, 339 F.3d 622, 631 (8th Cir. 2003)
(A district court should allow a party to present arguments opposing a motion before ruling.)

If a motion contains incorrect factual assertions or legal conclusions, the opposing party must be allowed to respond so the Court has an accurate record upon which to base its decision.

III. RESPONSES ARE APPROPRIATE WHEN A MOTION COULD PREJUDICE A PARTY'S CLAIMS

Federal courts recognize that filings which could materially affect a party's claims require the opportunity for a response.

In *United States v. Microsoft Corp.*, 253 F.3d 34, 101 (D.C. Cir. 2001), the court noted that fairness in judicial proceedings requires that parties be given a meaningful opportunity to respond to arguments that could affect the outcome of the case.

Similarly, the Eighth Circuit has emphasized that:

> Courts should resolve disputes only after the parties have had a fair opportunity to present their positions.

Johnson v. Bi-State Justice Center, 12 F.3d 133, 136 (8th Cir. 1993)

Thus, when a motion threatens to dismiss claims, alter the record, or otherwise harm a litigant's case, a response is both appropriate and necessary.

IV. RESPONSES ARE ALSO PROPER WHEN FILINGS APPEAR TO BE DELAY TACTICS

Courts recognize that parties may file motions that are intended to delay proceedings or complicate litigation.

Federal courts have inherent authority to prevent such conduct.

See:

Chambers v. NASCO, Inc., 501 U.S. 32, 43 (1991)
(Federal courts possess inherent authority to manage litigation and prevent abuse of the judicial process.)

When a party believes that a motion is filed primarily for delay or contains arguments not supported by law, the opposing party may respond and bring those issues to the Court's attention.

TRULINCS 07405510 - LYNCH, JASON M - Unit: ERE-D-A

V. PRO SE LITIGANTS ARE ENTITLED TO FILE RESPONSES AND NOTICES

Because Plaintiff is proceeding pro se, the Court must construe his filings liberally.

The United States Supreme Court held in:

Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519 (1972)

that filings from pro se litigants must be liberally construed to ensure access to the courts.

Additionally, the Eighth Circuit has held that courts should allow pro se litigants reasonable opportunity to present their arguments.

See:

Stone v. Harry, 364 F.3d 912, 914 (8th Cir. 2004)

This includes the ability to file responses, objections, and notices addressing motions filed by opposing parties.

VI. PLAINTIFF MAY FILE NOTICES TO CORRECT THE RECORD

Federal courts regularly allow litigants to file notices to clarify the record, correct factual inaccuracies, or alert the Court to legal issues affecting a pending motion.

Such notices help ensure the Court has a complete and accurate understanding of the issues presented.

Courts recognize that maintaining an accurate record is essential to the fair administration of justice.

VII. CONCLUSION

Under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and controlling case law, Plaintiff is permitted to respond to Defendants' motions when:

1. The motion contains incorrect statements of fact
2. The motion contains misstatements of law
3. The motion does not apply to the claims in the case
4. The motion could prejudice or harm Plaintiff's claims
5. The motion appears to be a delay tactic
6. Plaintiff needs to clarify the record through a notice or response

TRULINCS 07405510 - LYNCH, JASON M - Unit: ERE-D-A

Allowing such responses ensures that the Court receives a complete and accurate presentation of the issues and preserves the fairness required in federal judicial proceedings.

Respectfully submitted,

Jason Matthew Lynch
Plaintiff, Pro Se

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jason M. Lynch". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a long horizontal stroke at the end.