

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Raysene Hall v. Antonio Apodaca, et al.

Hall v. Apodaca, No. CV-25-00139-TUC-JCH (D. Ariz. Jan. 5, 2026) · No. CV-25-00139-TUC-JCH · Decided January 5, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Arizona denied pro se Plaintiff Raysene Hall’s motion for leave to file a consolidated amended complaint. The Court held that the motion failed to comply with Local Rule of Civil Procedure 15.1, the Court’s prior orders, and the good-cause requirement under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16. The Court cautioned that any future attempt to amend must first establish good cause.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Arizona
WRITING FOR THE COURT	John C. Hinderaker
DECIDED	January 5, 2026
DOCKET	CV-25-00139-TUC-JCH
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Pro se plaintiff moved for leave to file a consolidated amended complaint after the court-ordered deadline to amend had passed. The district court denied the motion.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown

TOPICS

- motion to amend
- pleadings
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- pleading amendment

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether Hall's motion for leave to amend should be denied for failure to comply with Local Rule of Civil Procedure 15.1.
- Whether, after the court-ordered amendment deadline had passed, Hall demonstrated good cause under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b) to modify the scheduling order and obtain leave to amend.

3. Whether Hall's proposed amended complaint complied with the restrictions imposed by the court's November 6, 2025 order.

HOLDINGS

1. A motion for leave to amend must comply with LRCiv. 15.1, including by attaching a proposed amended pleading that identifies deletions and additions and does not incorporate the prior pleading by reference. Hall's motion did not satisfy those requirements, providing an independent basis to deny leave.
2. Once a court-ordered deadline for amending pleadings has passed, a party must satisfy Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b) by showing good cause to modify the scheduling order. Good cause requires demonstrating that the deadline could not be met despite the party's diligence, and Hall failed to make that showing.
3. Hall was not entitled to amend under the terms of the November 6, 2025 order because the proposed amended complaint did not track the claims authorized by that order and included a First Amendment retaliation claim that the order specifically excluded.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"If the court-ordered deadline for amending pleadings has passed, Rule 16 governs." (at 2)

"For purposes of Rule 16, 'good cause' means the scheduling deadlines cannot be met despite the party's diligence." (at 2)

"The Court will deny Plaintiff's Motion." (at 3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Hall sought leave to file a consolidated amended complaint after the deadlines in the scheduling order and November 6, 2025 order had passed. Her proposed pleading did not comply with Local Rule of Civil Procedure 15.1 because it lacked the required properly marked proposed amended pleading and incorporated material from the prior pleading. It also included a First Amendment retaliation claim contrary to the court's prior order, added new due-process, equal-protection, and failure-to-intervene claims, and did not explain why the amendments could not have been made earlier despite diligence.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court had previously entered a scheduling order setting August 25, 2025, as the deadline to amend the First Amended Complaint. In a November 6, 2025 order, the court granted Hall 20 days to amend on specified terms, including that the proposed amendment track claims identified in an earlier motion and omit a First Amendment retaliation claim. Hall filed the present motion, but it did not comply with the local rule governing proposed amended pleadings, the prior order, or Rule 16's good-cause requirement.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir.)
- Hoang v. Bank of Am., N.A., 910 F.3d 1096, 1102 (9th Cir.)
- Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux Tribe of Lake Traverse Indian Rsrv., N. Dakota & S. Dakota v. United States, 90 F.3d 351, 355 (9th Cir.)
- Allen v. City of Beverly Hills, 911 F.2d 367, 373 (9th Cir.)
- Gimbel v. California, 308 F. App'x 123, 124 (9th Cir.)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-arizona/2026/raysene-hall-v-antonio-apodaca-et-al-3g0nnc60>