

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Prince Paul Raymond Williams v. Westlake Financial Services, Inc.,
et al.

Williams v. Westlake Financial Services, Inc. · No. 1:25-cv-00957-JLT-SAB · Decided October 2, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California granted Plaintiff Prince Paul Raymond Williams’s motion for leave to file a second amended complaint. The court directed the Clerk to file the lodged complaint and noted that it would be screened under 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	October 2, 2025
DOCKET	1:25-cv-00957-JLT-SAB
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff, proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, moved for leave to file a second amended complaint before the first amended complaint had been screened or served.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a)(2), leave to amend is freely given when justice so requires; absent prejudice or a strong showing of a Foman factor, there is a presumption in favor of granting leave.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court order with no reporter citation.

TOPICS

- motion to amend
- pleadings
- section 1983
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiff should be granted leave under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a)(2) to file a second amended complaint.
2. Whether the proposed amendment should be denied because of bad faith, undue delay, repeated failure to cure deficiencies, undue prejudice, or futility.

HOLDINGS

1. Leave to amend should be granted because none of the applicable factors warranted denial, and the proposed amendment would refine and clarify claims arising from the same events.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“In the absence of . . . undue delay, bad faith or dilatory motive on the part of the movant, repeated failure to cure deficiencies by amendments previously allowed, undue prejudice to the opposing party by virtue of allowance of the amendment, futility of amendment, etc.—the leave sought should . . . be ‘freely given.’” (at 1)

“Absent prejudice, or a strong showing of any of the remaining Foman factors, there exists a presumption under Rule 15(a) in favor of granting leave to amend.” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff sought to refine and clarify claims arising from the same events alleged in the first amended complaint. The proposed amendment was presented before the first amended complaint had been screened or served. The court found no bad faith, undue delay, prejudice, or futility.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed this civil-rights action and a first amended complaint. Before the first amended complaint was screened or served on defendants, plaintiff lodged a proposed second amended complaint and moved for leave to amend. The court granted the motion and directed the clerk to file the second amended complaint, subject to screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Foman v. Davis*, 371 U.S. 178, 182 (1962)
- *Eminence Capital, LLC v. Aspeon, Inc.*, 316 F.3d 1048, 1052 (9th Cir. 2003)

OPINION

Prince Paul Raymond Williams v. Westlake Financial Services, Inc., et al.

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

8 9 PRINCE PAUL RAYMOND WILLIAMS Case No. 1:25-cv-00957-JLT-SAB 10 Plaintiff,
ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S

MOTION TO AMEND THE COMPLAINT

11 AND DIRECTING CLERK OF COURT TO

v.

FILE SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT

12

WESTLAKE FINANCIAL SERVICES, INC., (ECF No. 11)

13 et al., 14 Defendant. 15 16 17 Plaintiff is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this action
pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. 18 (ECF Nos. 1, 8.) Currently before the Court is Plaintiff's motion
for leave to file a second amended 19 complaint which was lodged on September 18, 2025. (ECF
No. 10.) 20 Under Rule 15(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, leave to amend shall be
freely given 21 when justice so requires. Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(2). "In the absence of . . . undue
delay, bad faith or 22 dilatory motive on the part of the movant, repeated failure to cure
deficiencies by amendments 23 previously allowed, undue prejudice to the opposing party by
virtue of allowance of the amendment, 24 futility of amendment, etc.—the leave sought should . . .
be 'freely given.'" Foman v. Davis, 371 U.S. 25 178, 182 (1962), quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a). In
other words, "[a]bsent prejudice, or a strong showing 26 of any of the remaining Foman factors,
there exists a presumption under Rule 15(a) in favor of granting 27 leave to amend." Eminence
Capital, LLC v. Aspeon, Inc., 316 F.3d 1048, 1052 (9th Cir. 2003). 28 Here, the Court finds that
granting leave to amend to Plaintiff implicates none of the Foman 1 || factors. In his motion to
amend, Plaintiff submits that he seeks to refine and clarify his claims that were 2 || not fully
available at the time of the original filing. (ECF No. 11, pp. 2, 3.) The Court finds no bad faith 3 ||
or futility in his proposed amendment. The proposed supplemental information arises out of the
same 4 || events at issue in the first amended complaint for this action. As the first amended
complaint has not yet 5 || been screened or served on Defendants, there will be no undue delay or
prejudice to Defendants in 6 || allowing Plaintiff to file a second amended complaint. Therefore,
Plaintiff's motion shall be granted, 7 the second amended complaint shall be filed. Plaintiff is
advised that the second amended 8 || complaint will be screened pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915 in
due course. 9 Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED that: 10 1. Plaintiff's motion for leave to file
a second amended complaint (ECF No. 11) is 11 GRANTED; 12 2. The Clerk of Court shall file
Plaintiff's second amended complaint (ECF No. 10), lodged 13 on September 18, 2025. 14

15 IT IS SO ORDERED. FA. Se

16 Dated: _ October 2, 2025

STANLEY A. BOONE

17 United States Magistrate Judge 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-cal/2025/prince-paul-raymond-williams-v-westlake-financial-services-a8wnzw8u>