



800 F.3d 1262, 1286 (11th Cir. 2015) (citation omitted); *Laurie v. Ala. Ct. of Crim. App.*, 256 F.3d 1266, 1274 (11th Cir. 2001) (explaining that overall “there must be a substantial reason to deny a motion to amend.”). The district court “may consider several factors when deciding whether to grant a motion to amend, including ‘undue delay, bad faith or dilatory motive [on the part of the movant], repeated failure to cure deficiencies by amendments previously allowed, undue prejudice to the opposing party by virtue of allowance of the amendment, [and] futility of amendment.’” *Perez v. Wells Fargo N.A.*, 774 F.3d 1329, 1340–1341 (11th Cir. 2014) (citing *Equity Lifestyle Props., Inc. v. Fla. Mowing & Landscape Serv., Inc.*, 556 F.3d 1232, 1241 (11th Cir.2009) (quoting *Foman v. Davis*, 371 U.S. 178, 182, 83 S. Ct. 227, 230 (1962)); *Donley v. City of Morrow, Georgia*, 601 Fed. Appx. 805, 810 (11th Cir. 2015) (same).

Upon consideration of the factors, the Court finds that the interest of justice requires granting the Motion. There is no undue delay because the motion was filed within the time limit set by the Rule 16(b) Scheduling Order and soon after the receipt of discovery, which prompted the motion. Review of the docket indicates that Defendants have not engaged in bad faith or dilatory motive, nor have they repeatedly failed to cure deficiencies in prior pleadings. The deadline for discovery is July 8, 2019. Therefore, Plaintiff has sufficient time to conduct discovery with regard to the amended answers and would not be unduly prejudiced by the amended answers. Plaintiff has not raised any argument with respect to futility of allowing the amended answers.

**DONE and ORDERED** this 22nd day of April 2019.

s / Kristi K DuBose  
**KRISTI K. DuBOSE**  
**CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**