

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

OPINION

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

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

7

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