

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
INDIANA, FORT WAYNE DIVISION

Beasley Ministries, Inc. et al. v. Stacey O'Day et al.

Beasley Ministries · No. 1:25-cv-00579-HAB-ALT · Decided February 3, 2026

SUMMARY

The court grants Plaintiffs’ motion to amend or correct the complaint under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a)(2), rejecting Defendants’ argument that amendment would be futile. The court directs the amended complaint to be filed separately, gives Defendants until February 18, 2026, to respond, and denies the pending motion to dismiss as moot.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana, Fort Wayne Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Andrew L. Teel
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana, Fort Wayne Division
DECIDED	February 3, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-cv-00579-HAB-ALT
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendants moved to dismiss the complaint for failure to state a claim. Plaintiffs then moved for leave to amend the complaint. The court granted leave to amend, directed the amended complaint to be docketed separately, and denied the motion to dismiss as moot.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A motion for leave to amend under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a)(2) is committed to the sound discretion of the district court, which should freely grant leave when justice so requires, subject to considerations including undue prejudice, undue delay, bad faith, dilatory motive, or futility.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court opinion

TOPICS

- motion to amend
- motions to dismiss
- pleadings
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiffs should be granted leave under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a)(2) to file the proposed amended complaint after the period for amendment as a matter of course had expired.
2. Whether the court should deny leave to amend based on defendants' argument that the proposed amendment would be futile because it did not address all issues raised in the pending motion to dismiss.
3. Whether defendants' pending motion to dismiss should be denied as moot after leave to amend is granted.

HOLDINGS

1. Leave to amend was granted because Rule 15(a)(2) directs that leave should be freely given when justice so requires, and the circumstances did not warrant denial on the grounds presented.
2. The court declined to resolve defendants' futility arguments in opposition to amendment because those arguments were better left for full briefing on a motion to dismiss.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Court “should freely give leave [to amend] when justice so requires,” id., and “the decision as to whether to grant a motion to amend a complaint is entrusted to the sound discretion of the trial court,””

*“even if merited, remain better left for full briefing on a motion to dismiss.” (*2)*

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Defendants challenged the original complaint through a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim. Plaintiffs sought to amend the complaint after the time to amend as a matter of course had expired. Defendants argued that amendment would be futile because the proposed amended complaint did not resolve all issues identified in the motion to dismiss.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Defendants filed a motion to dismiss on December 23, 2025. Plaintiffs did not amend as a matter of course within the applicable deadline and instead filed a motion to amend on January 20, 2026. Defendants opposed amendment on futility grounds, but the court concluded that the arguments were better addressed through a motion to dismiss after amendment. The court granted the motion to amend and denied the pending motion to dismiss as moot.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Cohen v. Ill. Inst. of Tech., 581 F.2d 658, 661 (7th Cir. 1978)
- Sides v. City of Champaign, 496 F.3d 820, 825 (7th Cir. 2007)
- Adams v. N. Ind. Pub. Serv. Co., No. 2:10-CV-469, 2014 WL 4248230, at *2 (N.D. Ind. Aug. 27, 2014)
- Eminger v. City of Kendallville, No. 1:24-cv-00444-HAB-ALT, 2025 WL 3267763, at *2 (N.D. Ind. Nov. 21, 2025)
- Chen v. Yellen, No. 3:20-cv-50458, 2021 WL 5005373, at *3 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 28, 2021)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-northern-district-of-in/2026/beasley-ministries-inc-et-al-v-stacey-o-day-et-al-3h914h20>