rife with legal and factual conclusions. Furthermore, the majority of these "re-pleaded" affirmative defenses are substantially similar, if not exactly the same, as Plaintiff's previous affirmative defenses that were stricken on or about May 4, 2006.

15. Affirmative Defense I fails to set forth a plain and concise statement of facts sufficient to support its claim of "no cause of action." Affirmative Defense I is a conclusion of law, which is prohibited in Illinois. *Lagen*, 274 Ill. App. 3d at 16; *Talbert*, 265 Ill. App. 3d at 379; 735 ILCS 5/2-603 (West 2006). Furthermore, this affirmative defense is almost identical to the previous "Affirmative Defense I" that was stricken on or about May 4, 2006.

16. Affirmative Defense II comes to several conclusions of fact and law stating, "the counterclaim is a frivolous filing," and, "It is the Plaintiff who is entitled to full relief," and, "Defendant is not a storage facility but pretends to be one." Plaintiff has failed to articulate a plain and concise statement of facts sufficient to support her claims. She has merely provided "evidence" to refute properly pleaded facts in the counterclaim, which is prohibited. *Pryweller*, 282 Ill. App. 3d at 907. Furthermore, this affirmative defense is nearly identical to Plaintiff's previous "Affirmative Defense II" which was stricken on or about May 4, 2006. Moreover, this affirmative defense does not assert a new matter which defeats the counterclaim.

17. Affirmative Defense III comes to a conclusion of law and fact, and is wholly incomprehensible stating, "the counterclaim has no legal effects except it is the best evidence in support plaintiff's claims." Again, this affirmative defense is substantially similar to Plaintiff's previous "Affirmative Defense III" which was stricken on or about May 4, 2006.