1	
2	
2	
4	
5	NOT FOR PUBLICATION
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7	
8	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9	JANET ZHANG,
10	Plaintiff, No. C 09-05921 JSW
11	v. ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO STRIKE FIRST AMENDED
12	WALGREEN CO., COMPLAINT
13	Defendant.
14	
15	INTRODUCTION
16	Now before the Court for consideration is the Motion to Strike Amended Complaint
17	filed by Defendant Walgreen Co. ("Walgreen"). The Court has considered the parties' papers,
18	relevant legal authority, and the record in this case, and finds the matter suitable for disposition
19 20	without oral argument. <i>See</i> N.D. Civ. L.R. 7-1(b). The Court VACATES the hearing set for
20 21	September 17, 2010 and HEREBY GRANTS Walgreen's motion. The Court also GRANTS Plaintiff leave for the purposes of either filing a motion for leave to file the proposed amended
21	complaint or for obtaining a stipulation from Walgreen permitting the amendment.
23	BACKGROUND
24	On March 26, 2010, the parties appeared before this Court for the initial case
25	management conference. At that time, the Court April 15, 2010, as the deadline by which the
26	parties could amend their pleadings. (Docket No. 16.) On April 15, 2010, the Court granted the
27	parties' stipulation to continue that deadline until two weeks after they completed mediation.
28	(Docket No. 23.) On July 14, 2010, the parties completed mediation. (Docket No. 27.) On

United States District Court For the Northern District of California 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

July 30, 2010, two days after the Court imposed deadline, Plaintiff filed the First Amended
Complaint.

Walgreen now moves to strike the First Amended Complaint on the basis that it is untimely. Plaintiff, through counsel, has explained the reason for the untimely filing. (*See* Declaration of David A. Depolo, ¶¶ 7, 9-14.) Although Plaintiff missed the deadline imposed by the Court, the Court finds good cause to excuse Plaintiff's two day lapse. However, Plaintiff's proposed amended complaint was not accompanied by a stipulation permitting amendment or a motion for leave to amend. Accordingly, the Court shall strike the proposed First Amended Complaint on the basis that Plaintiff failed to follow the procedures required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15. Because the Court finds that Plaintiff has shown good cause for missing the deadline, the Court's ruling is without prejudice to Plaintiff filing a motion for leave to file the amended complaint. Plaintiff must file that motion by no later than September 9, 2010. Defendant's opposition to the motion shall be due on September 23, 2010, and Plaintiff's reply shall be due on September 30, 2010. Unless the Court determines that a hearing is necessary, the matter will be resolved on the papers.

## IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 2, 2010

Yrun & White

JEFFREY S/WHITE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE