

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
9 AT SEATTLE

10 LHF PRODUCTIONS, INC,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 DOES 1-19,

14 Defendants.  
15

Case No. C16-1175 RSM

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION TO AMEND SECOND  
AMENDED COMPLAINT

16 This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff LHF Productions, Inc.'s ("LHF") Motion  
17 for Leave to Amend Complaint to Name Defaulted Parties. Dkt. #86. LHF filed this matter in  
18 July 2016; an Amended Complaint was filed in October 2016. *See* Dkts. #1 and #20. In April  
19 2017, LHF filed a motion to amend its Amended Complaint, and on June 16, 2017, the Court  
20 granted LHF's motion. *See* Dkts. #79 and #81. On June 19, 2017, LHF filed its Second Amended  
21 Complaint. Dkt. #82. However, the Second Amended Complaint only identified one defendant.  
22 *Id.* at 1. Because LHF does not seek to dismiss six previously identified defendants from this  
23 matter, it now asks the Court for leave to amend its Second Amended Complaint so it can name  
24 the six defendants it failed to include in its Second Amended Complaint. Dkt. #86 at 1. For the  
25 reasons discussed herein, the Court GRANTS LHF's motion.  
26  
27  
28

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO AMEND COMPLAINT - 1

1 Rule 15(a)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure calls for the liberal amendment of  
2 pleadings, “when justice so requires.” FED. R. CIV. P. 15(a)(2). Thus, “[i]n the absence of any  
3 apparent or declared reason—such as undue delay, bad faith or dilatory motive on the part of the  
4 [plaintiff], repeated failure to cure deficiencies by amendments previously allowed, undue  
5 prejudice to the opposing party by virtue of allowance of the amendment, futility of the  
6 amendment, etc.,” parties should be allowed to amend a complaint. *Foman v. Davis*, 371 U.S.  
7 178, 182 (1962). Here, LHF demonstrates the interests of justice warrant allowing it to amend  
8 its Second Amended Complaint. Because LHF had previously named Richard Acosta, Nathaniel  
9 Lewis, Shawn Gauci, Antoliy Orlovskiy, Zhana Prieb, and Denise Evans as defendants in this  
10 matter, and because LHF indicates it inadvertently removed these defendants from its Second  
11 Amended Complaint, the Court is satisfied that LHF demonstrates there is no evidence of bad  
12 faith or undue delay on its part. Consequently, LHF’s motion to amend its Second Amended  
13 Complaint (Dkt. #86) is GRANTED.

14  
15  
16 DATED this 19<sup>th</sup> day of July 2017.

17  
18 

19  
20 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
21 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28