

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
EASTERN DIVISION

VONNETTA BENSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

SAMLIP ALABAMA, LLC,

Defendant.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

CASE NO. 3:12-cv-379-MEF
(WO – Do Not Publish)

ORDER

This cause is before the Court on Plaintiff’s Motion to Amend and Incorporate the Plaintiff’s Response of August, 2012 into and in Support of Original Complaint. (Doc. #28.) Plaintiff apparently seeks to incorporate the entirety of her Response to Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss (Doc. #22) into her complaint. However, Plaintiff has neither provided the substance of the proposed amendment nor included a copy of the proposed amended complaint with her motion. Furthermore, Plaintiff has shown no reason as to why her motion to amend should be granted. Denial of a motion to amend is proper where the movant provides no reason why the motion should be granted and fails to indicate the substance of the proposed amendment. *Vanderberg v. Donaldson*, 259 F.3d 1321, 1327 (11th Cir. 2001).

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Motion to Amend (Doc. #28) is DENIED with leave to refile. Should Plaintiff choose to refile her motion for leave to amend, such motion must comply with Rule 15.1 of the Local Rules for the United States District Court for the Middle District of Alabama for Civil and Criminal Cases, which

provides in pertinent part: “Any amendment to a pleading . . . whether filed as a matter of course or upon a motion to amend, must, except by leave of Court, reproduce the entire pleading . . . as amended, and may not incorporate any prior pleading . . . by reference.”

DONE this the 21st day of December, 2012.

/s/ Mark E. Fuller

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE