

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
AT KNOXVILLE

UNITED STATES ex. rel. DYLAN J. FYE, )  
STATE OF TENNESSEE, ex rel., DYLAN FYE, )  
and DYLAN J. FYE, individually, )  
 )  
Plaintiff, )  
 )  
v. )  
 )  
SUPPORT SOLUTIONS OF THE MID-SOUTH, )  
LLC d/b/a SUPPORT SOLUTIONS, )  
 )  
Defendant. )

No. 3:17-CV-395-JRG-HBG

**ORDER**

This case is before the undersigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, the Rules of this Court, and Standing Order 13-02.

Now before the Court is Defendant’s Response in Opposition to Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave to File Motion to Amend [Doc. 70]. By way of background, Plaintiff filed his Motion for Leave to File Motion to Amend (“Motion for Leave”) on August 13, 2019, and the Court granted the Motion [Doc. 71] on August 15, 2019. Defendant filed a Response, arguing that the Court should deny Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave because he failed to demonstrate good cause or extraordinary circumstances that would merit continuing this case.

The Court has considered Defendant’s Response, and the Court will assess Defendant’s arguments once Plaintiff moves to amend his Complaint and the parties have completed briefing on the motion. *See Scheib v. Boderk*, No. 3:07-CV-446, 2011 WL 208341, at \*2 (E.D. Tenn. Jan. 21, 2011) (in determining whether motions to amend should be granted, courts should consider

undue delay, bad faith, or dilatory motive, repeated failures to cure deficiencies by amendments previously allowed, undue prejudice, and futility of the amendment).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

ENTER:

  
United States Magistrate Judge