

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
LOUISIANA

**Uma R. Kandan v. Andrea R. Lucas, Chair, Division (3), Equal
Employment Opportunity Commission**

Kandan v. Lucas · No. 2:24-cv-02089 · Decided February 9, 2026

OPINION

Kandan

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA
UMA R. KANDAN CIVIL ACTION
VERSUS NO. 24-2089
ANDREA R. LUCAS, CHAIR, DIVISION (3)
EQUAL EMPLOYMENT
OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION
ORDER AND REASONS

Before the Court is Defendant’s Ex Parte Motion for Leave to File Amended Answer (R. Doc. 151). The motion is granted for the following reasons. Rule 15(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides: When an issue not raised by the pleadings is tried by the parties’ express or implied consent, it must be treated in all respects as if raised in the pleadings. A party may move—at any time, even after judgment—to amend the pleadings to conform them to the evidence and to raise an unpleaded issue. *Id.* (emphasis added). “District courts, of course, have discretion to allow late amendments when no prejudice would result to the other party, and the ends of justice so require.” *Simi Inv. Co. v. Harris Ctny., Tex.*, 236 F.3d 240, 252 n.16 (5th Cir. 2000) (internal citations and quotations omitted). “[T]he principal purpose of Rule 15(b) is judicial economy.” *Deere & Co. v. Johnson*, 271 F.3d 613, 621 (5th Cir. 2001). 1 Defendant seeks leave to amend its answer to state a “same decision” defense to a mixed-motive theory of the case.1 Prior to trial, both parties submitted proposed jury instructions which contemplated “mixed motive” and “but for” causation.2 On February 5, 2026, the Court informed the parties that it would charge the jury with a mixed-motive causation instruction.3 Granting Defendant leave to explicitly state the “same decision” defense would not prejudice Plaintiff and would promote the important interest of judicial efficiency. Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that the Defendant’s Ex Parte Motion for Leave to File Amended Answer (R. Doc. 151) is GRANTED. New Orleans, Louisiana, this 6 day of February, 2026.

f J. DOSSIER

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Doc. 151 at 1. 2R. Docs. 115 at 7, 121 at 7. 3 Trial courts are tasked with discerning whether the “but for” or “mixed motive” causation standard is appropriate given the state of the evidence. See *Adams v. 'l Hermann*, 973 F.3d 3438, 354 (5th Cir. 2020).

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-lou/2026/uma-r-kandan-v-andrea-r-lucas-chair-division-3-equal-q8px6l00>