

Lopez filed another motion asking for leave to amend or, in the alternative, an extension of time to respond to Defendants' motion. (Dkt. No. 26.)

Defendants argue that Plaintiff's request should be denied because she missed the month-long window to respond to their motion to dismiss. (Dkt. No. 27 at 1.) Additionally, they point to Plaintiff's use of "the same boilerplate reasoning that Plaintiff's prior Motion for Leave to file an Amended Complaint contained" to suggest that "this action is completely frivolous." (*Id.*)

"The Court should freely give leave [to amend] when justice so requires." Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 15(a)(2). *Pro se* submissions, in particular, must be construed liberally and read "to raise the strongest arguments they suggest." *Ortiz v. McBride*, 323 F.3d 191, 194 (2d Cir. 2003). The Court has reviewed the submissions on this motion and finds that justice requires that Lopez have the opportunity to amend her complaint in light of the delays she reports facing. However, the Court is not inclined to grant further extensions or leave to amend absent compelling reasons.

Plaintiff's motion for leave to file an amended complaint is therefore GRANTED.

Plaintiff is directed to file a second amended complaint by October 17, 2016.

The Clerk of Court is directed to close the motion at Docket Number 26.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 23, 2016
New York, New York



J. PAUL OETKEN
United States District Judge

COPY MAILED TO PRO SE PARTY BY CHAMBERS