

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

Guardant Health, Inc. v. Tempus AI, Inc.

Guardant Health · No. Civil Action No. 25-82-GBW · Decided November 24, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Delaware grants Tempus AI, Inc.’s motion for leave to amend its answer and counterclaims under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a)(2). The court finds that Guardant Health did not establish undue prejudice, futility, delay, or bad faith, while directing the parties to submit a joint proposed amended scheduling order without changing the trial and related pretrial dates. Guardant’s pending motions to dismiss the counterclaims are denied as moot, and a scheduled telephonic hearing is cancelled.

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE
GUARDANT HEALTH, INC., Plaintiff, v. Civil Action No. 25-82-GBW TEMPUS AI, INC.,
Defendant. MEMORANDUM ORDER Pending before the Court is Defendant Tempus AI, Inc.’s
(“Tempus”) Motion for Leave to Amend Answer and Counterclaims (the “Motion”) (D.I. 56),
which has been fully briefed (D.I. 57, D.I.

59, D.I. 60). Plaintiff Guardant Health, Inc. (“Guardant”) opposes the Motion on the grounds that
the scope of the proposed amendment and the pace of discovery makes the existing case schedule
unviable. For the following reasons, the Court grants the Motion.

I. LEGAL STANDARD “Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a)(2) provides that a district court
should ‘freely give leave [to amend] when justice so requires.’” Talley v. Wetzel, 15 F.4th 275,
286 n.6 (3d Cir. 2021) (alterations in original). “Despite this liberal standard, leave to amend may
be denied when there is undue delay, bad faith, dilatory motive, prejudice, [or] futility.” *Jd.*
(quotation marks omitted); see *LaSpina v. SEIU Pa. State Council*, 985 F.3d 278, 291 (3d Cir.

2021). “Amendment would be futile when the complaint, as amended, would fail to state a claim
upon which relief could be granted.” Talley, 15 F.4th at 286 n.6 (quotation marks omitted). “When
assessing futility, the [d]istrict [c]ourt applies the same standard of legal sufficiency as [it] applies
under Rule 12(b)(6).” *Id.* (quotation marks omitted). II. DISCUSSION!

Tempus seeks leave to amend its Answer and Counterclaims pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil
Procedure 15(a)(2) to add “new factual support for Tempus’s existing false advertising claims.”
D.J. 57 at 1. Tempus contends that the amendment would also “streamline[] the case by removing
claims that are the subject of Guardant’s two pending motions to dismiss (DJ.

22; D.I. 46).” Id. Guardant does not oppose or contest the proposed amendment itself. Rather, Guardant’s response focuses on the impact of the proposed amendment on the existing scheduling order. See generally D.J. 59. Guardant contends that it “will suffer undue prejudice if Tempus’ proposed amendment is allowed and either the current schedule remains or an inadequate schedule is put into place.” Id. at 3-4.

To support its position, Guardant argues that the proposed amendment would broaden the case and necessitate additional discovery. Accordingly, Guardant contends that any revised schedule should account for the additional allegations introduced by the proposed amendment, as well as the related patent action, *Guardant Health, Inc. v. Tempus AI, Inc.*, No. 24- 687, which Guardant argues should proceed to trial first. Id. at 4-5.

The Court is not persuaded that an entirely new scheduling order is warranted. Upon review of the current scheduling order (D.I. 36), trial is currently scheduled approximately two years away on September 27, 2027. Additionally, the scheduling order provides a one-year gap between the deadline for the pretrial order and the deadline for dispositive and Daubert motions.

See D.I. 36 (case dispositive motions/Daubert Motions briefing to be complete by September 28, 2026 and the proposed pretrial order due September 15, 2027). The Court believes that the existing gap could be used to adjust deadlines and effectively allow additional time for discovery.

Although the Court does not adopt the schedule proposed by Guardant, the parties shall meet and confer and ' The Court writes for the benefit of the parties and assumes familiarity with the case. submit a joint proposed amended scheduling order.

However, the trial date, pretrial conference date and deadlines for the associated pretrial filings including the proposed pretrial order, motions in limine, jury instructions, voir dire, and the verdict form shall remain unchanged in the joint proposed amended scheduling order. Given that the Court has addressed Guardant’s concern regarding undue prejudice, the Court will allow Tempus to amend its Answer and Counterclaims.” Il.

CONCLUSION For the foregoing reasons, the Court grants Tempus’s Motion for Leave to Amend Answer and Counterclaims (D.I. 56). eek WHEREFORE, at Wilmington this 24th day of November 2025, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 1. Tempus AI, Inc.’s Motion for Leave to Amend Answer and Counterclaims (D.I. 56) is GRANTED; 2. Tempus shall file its Amended Answer and Counterclaims within three (3) days from entry of this Order; 3.

Plaintiff Guardant Health, Inc. shall respond to the Amended Counterclaims within fourteen (14) days of filing; 4. The parties shall meet and confer and, by no later than December 3, 2025, submit a joint proposed amended scheduling order.

The current trial date, pretrial conference date and associated pretrial filings including the proposed pretrial order, motions in limine, jury instructions, voir dire, and the verdict form shall remain in effect; Guardant's response did not argue nor show that Tempus's proposed amendment is futile, dilatory or sought in bad faith. See *The Torrenzano Grp., LLC v. Dorchester Cap.*

Mgmt. Co., No. 08-357, 2010 WL 3615015, at *2 (D. Del. Sept. 10, 2010). 5. Plaintiff Guardant Health, Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss Defendant Tempus AI, Inc.'s Counterclaims (D.I. 22) and Plaintiff Guardant Health, Inc.'s 12(b)(1) Partial Motion to Dismiss Defendant Tempus AI, Inc.'s State Law Employee-Hiring Counterclaims for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction (D.I.

46) are DENIED AS MOOT; and 6. The telephonic hearing scheduled for today at 2:30 p.m. E.T. is cancelled, given the Court's ruling by this Memorandum Order on the Motion (D.1. 56).
GREGORY B. WILLIAMS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE