

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Trove Brands, LLC v. TRRS Magnate LLC

No. 2:22-cv-02222-TLN-CKD (E.D. Cal. Mar. 17, 2025) · No. 2:22-cv-02222-TLN-CKD · Decided March 18, 2025

SUMMARY

The court grants in part and denies in part Defendants’ motion to amend the scheduling order and for leave to file an amended answer. Defendants may file an amended answer limited to withdrawing, correcting, and clarifying existing claims and defenses, but may not add new defenses or counterclaims. The court denies an extension of the discovery deadline and denies several related motions as moot.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Troy L. Nunley
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	March 18, 2025
DOCKET	2:22-cv-02222-TLN-CKD
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendants moved to amend the scheduling order to extend discovery and sought leave to file an amended answer. Plaintiff opposed the motion.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4), modification of a scheduling order requires good cause and the judge's consent, with diligence as the primary consideration. If good cause is shown, leave to amend is evaluated under Rule 15(a)(2), including bad faith, undue delay, prejudice, futility, and prior amendment.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished, nonprecedential district court order
PARTIES	TRRS Magnate LLC dba Hydra Cup, Thomas Raymus v. Trove Brands, LLC dba The BlenderBottle Company

TOPICS

motion to amend

civil procedure

discovery dispute

affirmative defenses

intellectual property

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

intellectual property

patent law

commercial litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Defendants demonstrated good cause under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) to modify the scheduling order and extend the discovery deadline.
2. Whether Defendants should receive leave under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a)(2) to file an amended answer.
3. If leave to amend was appropriate, whether the proposed amendments could add new defenses or counterclaims at that stage of the litigation.

HOLDINGS

1. Defendants did not establish good cause to modify the scheduling order and extend discovery because the discovery period had already been extended by 60 days and Defendants did not adequately justify the need for another extension.
2. Defendants were entitled to limited leave to file an amended answer because they demonstrated sufficient diligence under Rule 16, but the proposed amendment could not add new defenses or counterclaims because doing so would cause undue delay and significant prejudice to Plaintiff.
3. Because the amended answer would supersede the operative answer, Plaintiff's motion to dismiss the counterclaims and strike affirmative defenses, Defendants' motion for reconsideration concerning the struck amended answer, and Defendants' prior motion to amend were moot.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The good cause standard primarily considers the diligence of the party seeking the amendment.” (at 3)

“The consideration of prejudice to the opposing party ... carries the most weight.” (at 3)

“resources are limited. In order to give fair consideration to those who call upon us for justice, we must insist that parties not clog the system by presenting us with a slubby mass of words rather than a true brief.” (at 4)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The parties manufacture and sell shaker bottles, and Plaintiff alleges Defendants' products infringe Plaintiff's intellectual-property rights. Defendants filed an extensive answer with counterclaims and exhibits, followed by an amended answer filed without leave that the Court struck. Defendants asserted that Plaintiff produced more than 21,000 files at the end of the original discovery period and sought both additional discovery time and leave to amend their answer based on newly reviewed information.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff initiated the action on December 14, 2022, and filed the operative Second Amended Complaint on May 10, 2024, asserting state-law, patent-infringement, and trade-dress-infringement claims. Defendants filed an answer and counterclaims, then filed an amended answer without leave; the Court struck that filing. Defendants later moved to amend the scheduling order and obtain leave to file another amended answer. The Court granted leave to file a limited amended answer, denied the request to extend discovery, and denied several related motions as moot.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Coleman v. Quaker Oats Co., 232 F.3d 1271, 1294 (9th Cir. 2000)
- Johnson v. Mammoth Recs., Inc., 975 F.2d 604, 609-610 (9th Cir. 1992)
- In re W. States Wholesale Nat. Gas Antitrust Litig., 715 F.3d 716, 738 (9th Cir. 2013)
- Swanson v. U.S. Forest Serv., 87 F.3d 339, 343 (9th Cir. 1996)
- Eminence Cap., LLC v. Aspeon, Inc., 316 F.3d 1048, 1052 (9th Cir. 2003) (per curiam)
- N/S Corp. v. Liberty Mut. Ins. Co., 127 F.3d 1145, 1146 (9th Cir. 1997)