

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

KFD ENTERPRISES, INC., a California
Corporation dba Norman’s Dry Cleaners,

No. C-08-4571 MMC

Plaintiff,

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE FIFTH
AMENDED COMPLAINT**

v.

CITY OF EUREKA,

Defendant

Before the Court is plaintiff KFD Enterprises Inc’s (“KFD”) “Motion for Leave to File Fifth Amended Complaint,” filed February 18, 2011.¹ Defendants the City of Eureka (“the City”), Environmental Resolutions Inc. (“ERI”), Firbimatic SpA (“Firbimatic”), and R.R. Street & Co., Inc. (“RR Street”) have filed opposition, to which KFD has replied. Defendants Multimatic LLC and the Kirrberg Corporation have filed a joint statement of non-opposition. Having read and considered the papers filed in support of and in opposition to the motion, the Court rules as follows.²

¹ The motion was filed on behalf of both KFD and “Third Party Defendant Kenneth Daer” (see Mot. at 1:26-27) but seeks to amend a pleading filed by KFD; the Court refers herein to the moving party as KFD.

² On March 29, 2011, the Court took the matter under submission and vacated the hearing scheduled for April 1, 2011.

1 **BACKGROUND**

2 The instant action, filed October 1, 2008 by KFD, “aris[es] out of environmental
3 contamination at and around 2907 E Street, in Eureka California” (“the Property”), at which
4 location KFD operates a dry cleaner. (See Fourth Amended Complaint ¶¶ 1, 17.) By the
5 instant motion, KFD seeks leave to amend its pleading to add Kenneth Daer (“Daer”) as a
6 plaintiff “due to his status as an owner of the Property” (see Mot. at 3:5) from “on or about
7 1980” (see Mot. Ex. 1 at 3:27).

8 **LEGAL STANDARD**

9 A party seeking a second or successive amendment “may amend its pleading only
10 with the opposing party’s written consent or the court’s leave.” See Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a).
11 Generally, Rule 15 provides a “liberal amendment policy,” under which “leave to amend
12 should be granted unless amendment would cause prejudice to the opposing party, is
13 sought in bad faith, is futile, or creates undue delay.” See Johnson v. Mammoth
14 Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 607 (9th Cir. 1992). An amendment sought after a
15 deadline imposed by a scheduling order, however, may be made only upon a showing of
16 “good cause.” See id. at 609. “Unlike Rule 15(a)’s liberal amendment policy which focuses
17 on the bad faith of the party seeking to interpose an amendment and the prejudice to the
18 opposing party, Rule 16(b)’s ‘good cause’ standard primarily considers the diligence of the
19 party seeking the amendment.” See Johnson, 975 F.2d 609. Where “the party seeking the
20 extension” demonstrates the pretrial schedule “cannot reasonably be met despite the
21 diligence of [such] party,” the district court “may modify the pretrial schedule.” See id.³

22 **DISCUSSION**

23 On March 13, 2009, at the initial case management conference, the Court entered a
24 scheduling order setting June 12, 2009 as the deadline for any party to move to amend its
25

26 ³ Here, KFD did not move for a modification but only for leave to amend. In
27 Johnson, the Ninth Circuit held a district court may deny as untimely a motion to amend the
28 pleadings made after a scheduling order deadline has passed. See 975 F.2d at 609.
Nevertheless, the Court will consider KFD’s motion as including a request to modify the
scheduling order, and will decide the motion on its merits.

1 pleadings.⁴ Thereafter, on June 12, 2009, KFD filed a motion for leave to file a First
2 Amended Complaint, which motion was granted. KFD subsequently has sought and been
3 granted leave to file three additional amended complaints.⁵ Each such amendment has
4 resulted in additional amended answers and counterclaims, as well as motions to dismiss
5 and strike. Now, more than two years from the date this action was filed, the pleadings
6 have yet to close, and four motions to dismiss KFD's Fourth Amended Complaint currently
7 are pending before the Court.

8 As noted above, the instant motion is brought for the sole purpose of "add[ing]
9 Kenneth Daer as a [p]laintiff due to his status as the owner of the Property." (See Mot. at
10 3:5.) As KFD essentially concedes in its proposed Fifth Amended Complaint, however,
11 such fact is not newly discovered, as KFD and Daer have known of Daer's ownership for at
12 least three decades (see Mot. Ex. A ¶ 17); as KFD further concedes, Daer "is already a
13 party to this lawsuit" (see KFD Reply to Firbimatic at 3:2) and, indeed, Daer has
14 continuously been a party since the City named him as a third-party defendant on June 12,
15 2009.

16 KFD explains its newfound interest in adding Daer as a plaintiff as follows: "Counsel
17 for the City and for [RR] Street and Firbimatic informed KFD in early 2011 that they may
18 move to dismiss certain claims brought against them because KFD, despite being named a
19 responsible party by the Regional Water Quality Control Board, is not the owner of the
20 Property." (See KFD Reply to Firbimatic and RR Street at 2:27-3:1; KFD Reply to the City
21 at 3:5-8.) KFD has had notice of the possible relevance of property ownership, however,
22 since at least June 14, 2010, when Firbimatic moved to dismiss KFD's strict liability and
23 negligence claims on the ground, inter alia, that "KFD does not clearly allege that it actually

24
25 ⁴ On August 6, 2010, the Court extended the deadline for filing amended pleadings
to October 15, 2010.

26 ⁵ The instant motion represents KFD's sixth motion for leave to amend its pleadings,
27 as KFD filed two separate motions for leave to file a Fourth Amended Complaint, the first of
28 which was denied for the reason that the proposed pleading suffered from "some of the
same deficiencies" the Court had found in KFD's Third Amended Complaint. (See Order
Denying Pl.s' Mot for Leave to file Fourth Amended Complaint, filed Nov. 22, 2010.)

1 owns any soil or groundwater” at the Property, and thus lacked standing to assert such
2 claims. (See Firbimatic Mot. to Dismiss KFD’s Third Am. Compl. at 20:3, filed June 14,
3 2010.)

4 In sum, KFD has been aware of the factual predicate for the instant motion for
5 decades, and, for over seven months prior to the filing of said motion, has been aware that
6 certain of the parties were asserting such fact to be a necessary element of certain of
7 KFD’s claims. In short, KFD has failed to show good cause for its belated request to file yet
8 another amended complaint. See Johnson, 975 F.2d at 609-10 (finding plaintiff “failed to
9 demonstrate good cause for his belated motion to amend” where plaintiff “fail[ed] to heed
10 clear and repeated signals that not all necessary parties has been named in the
11 complaint”).


12 Moreover, KFD’s motion raises serious concerns as to prejudice. The case has
13 been pending for two and a half years. There are numerous parties to the action.⁶
14 Numerous motions have been filed and heard with respect to the pleadings alone. The
15 defendants have a right to have the claims against them heard and not hanging over their
16 heads with no end in sight. Allowing unending amendments, with the motions to dismiss
17 and strike, which inevitably follow, prevents that day from approaching let alone arriving.
18 Simply put, at some point, the pleadings must close.

19 **CONCLUSION**

20 For the reasons stated above, KFD’s “Motion to File Fifth Amended Complaint” is
21 hereby DENIED.

22 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

23 Dated: April 22, 2011

24 
25 MAXINE M. CHESNEY
26 United States District Judge

27
28

⁶ Including KFD and Daer, the action currently encompasses fourteen parties.