Byrne v. Sai	nta Cruz County	and Planning	Department (	County of San	ta Cruz et	al

1		**E-Filed 2/12/2010**	
2		E 1 110a 2/12/2010	
2			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	IN THE UNITED STATES D	ISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRI	CT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	SAN JOSE DIVISION		
11			
12	ANTOINETTE JARDINE BYRNE,	Case Number C 09-3729 JF (PVT)	
13	Plaintiff,	ORDER <sup>1</sup> GRANTING DEFENDANTS'	
14	v.	MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AN AMENDED ANSWER	
15	SANTA CRUZ COUNTY AND PLANNING DEPARTMENT, et al.,	[re: document no. 16]	
16	Defendants.	[re. document no. ro ]	
17	Detendants.		
18			
19	Defendants seek leave to amend their answer to	add additional defenses. The Court has	
20	considered the moving and responding papers as well a	as the argument presented at the hearing on	
21	February 12, 2010. For the reasons discussed below, the	he motion will be granted.	
22	The request for leave to amend is governed by	Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a),	
23	which provides that "leave shall be freely given when j	ustice so requires." Fed. R. Civ. P.	
24	15(a)(2). "But a district court need not grant leave to a	mend where the amendment: (1)	
25	prejudices the opposing party; (2) is sought in bad faith	n; (3) produces an undue delay in	
26	litigation; or (4) is futile." AmerisourceBergen Corp.	v. Dialysist West, Inc., 465 F.3d 946, 951	
27			
28	<sup>1</sup> This disposition is not designated for pu	ublication in the official reports.	

Case No. C 09-3729 JF (PVT) ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AN AMENDED ANSWER (JFLC2)

1	(9th	Cir.	2006)
---	------	------	-------

There is no prejudice to Plaintiff, as the case is in the early stages and very little discovery has been done. There is no indication in the record that Defendants are acting in bad faith. The proposed amendment will not delay the litigation, and Defendants have explained the timing of their request by submitting a declaration of counsel explaining that the potential applicability of the new defenses came to light only recently after counsel reviewed the administrative record in this case. Finally, it does not appear that the proposed new defenses are futile.

## ORDER

9 Defendants' motion for leave to amend their answer is GRANTED. Defendants shall file
10 an amended answer within twenty (20) days after the date of this order.

Dated:	2/12/2010	

		l
JER MY FOGE United States Di	L tr ct sudge	
_		

1	Copies of Order served on:
2	
3	Antoinette Jardine Byrne poirotacctg@hotmail.com
4	Dana Maureen McRae dana.mcrae@co.santa-cruz.ca.us
5	Jessica Claudine Espinoza jessica.espinoza@co.santa-cruz.ca.us, csl026@co.santa-cruz.ca.us, csl054@co.santa-cruz.ca.us
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	3 Case No. C 09-3729 JF (PVT) ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AN AMENDED ANSWER (JFLC2)