

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF  
WASHINGTON

Colby Hutton v. Papa John's USA, Inc., and Papa John's  
International, Inc.

Hutton · No. C25-1922-KKE · Decided December 18, 2025

SUMMARY

The court granted the parties’ stipulated motion extending the deadlines for the defendants to respond to the First Amended Complaint and for related opposition and reply filings. The court denied as moot the defendants’ motion to dismiss the original complaint because the First Amended Complaint superseded it and directed the clerk to terminate that motion.

CASE DETAILS

|                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| COURT                 | United States District Court for the Western District of Washington                                                                                                                                     |
| WRITING FOR THE COURT | Kymberly K. Evanson                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| JURISDICTION          | United States District Court for the Western District of Washington                                                                                                                                     |
| DECIDED               | December 18, 2025                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| DOCKET                | C25-1922-KKE                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| DISPOSITION           | other                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| PROCEDURAL POSTURE    | The district court considered the parties' stipulated motion to extend the defendants' deadline to respond to the First Amended Complaint and the defendants' motion to dismiss the original complaint. |
| PRECEDENTIAL VALUE    | Unpublished district court order with limited precedential value.                                                                                                                                       |

TOPICS

- motions to dismiss
- pleadings
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- Civil procedure
- Commercial litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether good cause supported extending the defendants' deadline to respond to the First Amended Complaint.

2. Whether the defendants' motion to dismiss the original complaint remained operative after the First Amended Complaint was filed.

## HOLDINGS

1. The court granted the parties' stipulated motion and extended the defendants' deadline to respond to the First Amended Complaint through January 26, 2026, with corresponding opposition and reply deadlines.
2. Because the First Amended Complaint completely superseded the original complaint, the defendants' motion to dismiss the original complaint was denied as moot.

## KEY QUOTATIONS

*“the general rule ... that an amended complaint supercedes [sic] the original complaint and renders it without legal effect”*” (at 1)

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff filed an original complaint against Papa John's USA, Inc. and Papa John's International, Inc. Plaintiff then filed a First Amended Complaint. The defendants had moved to dismiss the original complaint, and the parties jointly sought additional time for the defendants to respond to the amended pleading.

## PROCEDURAL HISTORY

After Plaintiff filed a First Amended Complaint, the parties stipulated to an extension of time for Defendants to respond. Defendants also had a pending motion to dismiss the original complaint. The court granted the stipulated extension and denied the motion to dismiss as moot because the amended complaint superseded the original complaint.

## DISPOSITION

other

## CASES CITED

- Lacey v. Maricopa Cnty., 693 F.3d 896, 927 (9th Cir. 2012) (en banc)

## OPINION

Hutton

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

AT SEATTLE

7

COLBY HUTTON, CASE NO. C25-1922-KKE

8 Plaintiff(s), ORDER GRANTING STIPULATED 9

v. MOTION TO EXTEND TIME TO

RESPOND TO AMENDED COMPLAINT

10

PAPA JOHN'S USA, INC., AND DENYING MOTION TO DISMISS

ORIGINAL COMPLAINT AS MOOT

11 Defendant(s). 12 This matter comes before the Court on the Parties' stipulated motion to extend  
time for 13 Defendants to respond to Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint. Dkt. No. 19. For good  
cause 14 shown, the Court GRANTS the Parties' stipulated motion and hereby extends the time  
for Papa 15 John's USA, Inc. and Papa John's International, Inc. (collectively, "Papa John's  
Defendants") to 16 respond to the First Amended Complaint through and including January 26,  
2026. Plaintiff shall have up to and including February 23, 2026, to file any opposition that might  
be required, and 17 the Papa John's Defendants shall have up to and including March 10, 2026, to  
file any reply to 18 Plaintiff's opposition. 19 Because the First Amended Complaint completely  
supersedes the original complaint, 20 Defendants' motion to dismiss the original complaint (Dkt.  
No. 15) is DENIED as moot. See 21 Lacey v. Maricopa Cnty., 693 F.3d 896, 927 (9th Cir.2012)  
(en banc) (recognizing "the general 22 rule ... that an amended complaint supercedes [sic] the  
original complaint and renders it without 23 legal effect"). The clerk is directed to terminate the  
motion at Dkt. No. 15. 24 1 Dated this 18th day of December, 2025. 2 A 3 Kymberly K. Evanson 4  
United S tates District Judge 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24