

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
FLORIDA, ORLANDO DIVISION

Benjamin Joseph Ligieri v. Amazon.com, Inc.

Ligieri v. Amazon.com, Inc. · No. 6:25-cv-2119-AGM-LHP · Decided January 14, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida grants Plaintiff Benjamin Joseph Ligieri an extension to file an amended complaint after finding excusable neglect sufficiently supported in light of his pro se status and stated circumstances. The Court denies the remaining requests concerning a temporary restraining order, preliminary injunction, CM/ECF access, and affirmative relief related to a pending motion to transfer.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida, Orlando Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Leslie Noffman Price
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida, Orlando Division
DECIDED	January 14, 2026
DOCKET	6:25-cv-2119-AGM-LHP
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for an extension of time and leave to file an amended complaint, consideration of a renewed temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction request, and authorization to file through CM/ECF. Defendant opposed the request to amend and sought affirmative relief concerning its pending motion to transfer.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The Court considered whether Plaintiff had shown excusable neglect under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b)(1)(B) and whether an extension of the amendment deadline was appropriate in light of the circumstances presented.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished trial-court order
PARTIES	Benjamin Joseph Ligieri v. Amazon.com, Inc.

TOPICS

motion to amend

injunctions

civil procedure

pleadings

equitable relief

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

injunctive relief

pleadings

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff should receive an extension of the deadline to file an amended complaint after missing the Court-ordered deadline.
2. Whether the Court should consider Plaintiff's renewed request for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction.
3. Whether Plaintiff established good cause or extenuating circumstances warranting access to CM/ECF.
4. Whether the Court should grant Defendant's requested transfer relief in response to Plaintiff's motion.

HOLDINGS

1. The Court extended the November 30, 2025 deadline and granted Plaintiff leave to file an amended complaint within fourteen days of the order.
2. The Court denied the request to consider the renewed temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction at this stage, explaining that Plaintiff could renew the request after filing the amended complaint and did not require leave of Court merely to file such a renewed motion.
3. The Court denied Plaintiff's renewed request for authorization to file through CM/ECF because the motion again failed to establish good cause or extenuating circumstances.
4. The Court denied Defendant's request for affirmative transfer relief because affirmative relief should not be sought in a response to a motion and because the motion to transfer remained pending before the presiding district judge.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“although the issue of excusable neglect is a close one (see Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(B)), the Court finds an extension of the November 30, 2025 deadline for filing the amended complaint appropriate.” (Order text)

“It is not appropriate to seek an order for affirmative relief in a response to a motion.” (Footnote 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff, proceeding pro se, had been given until November 30, 2025, to file an amended complaint but missed the deadline. He attributed the delay to holidays, the practical limitations of paper filing, illness, temporary travel without computer access, and the need to comply with local rules and formatting requirements. Defendant argued that the proposed amendment was futile or made in bad faith and that Plaintiff lacked good cause for the delay.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Court had previously granted Plaintiff leave to amend and set November 30, 2025, as the filing deadline. Plaintiff missed that deadline and filed a renewed motion seeking leave to file an amended complaint, along with additional requests concerning emergency injunctive relief and CM/ECF access. The Court extended the amendment deadline and granted leave to amend, denied the remaining requests, and declined to grant Defendant's requested transfer relief in this order.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Clifft v. School District of Lee County, No. 2:25-cv-345-JES-DNF, 2025 WL 3012038, at *2 (M.D. Fla. Oct. 28, 2025), reconsideration denied, No. 2:25-cv-345-JES-DNF, 2025 WL 3080533 (M.D. Fla. Nov. 4, 2025)
- Armington v. Dolgencorp, Inc., No. 3:07-cv-1130-J-JRK, 2009 WL 210723, at *2 (M.D. Fla. Jan. 20, 2009)

OPINION

Benjamin Joseph Ligieri v. Amazon.com, Inc.

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

ORLANDO DIVISION

BENJAMIN JOSEPH LIGIERI,

Plaintiff, v. Case No: 6:25-cv-2119-AGM-LHP

AMAZON.COM, INC.,

Defendant

ORDER

Before the Court is Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for Leave to File and Deem First Amended Complaint Operative, to Consider Plaintiff's Emergency TRO and Preliminary Injunction, and for Authorization to File Via CM ECF (With Memorandum of Law). Doc. No. 27. Defendant opposes in part, with respect to the filing of an amended complaint. Doc. No. 29. As relevant, Plaintiff seeks to file an amended complaint in accordance with the Court's prior order giving him through November 30, 2025 to do so. See Doc. No. 15. Plaintiff missed that deadline, but says it was due to "a convergence of extraordinary and time-sensitive circumstances," to include holidays, "practical limitations of paper filing as a pro se litigant, illness, and Plaintiff's temporary travel without access to a computer, and the need to carefully review and comply with this District's fastidious Local Rules and formatting requirements." Doc. No. 27, at 3. Defendant, on the other hand, contends that Plaintiff's proposed amendment is in bad faith and futile as demonstrated by a pending motion to transfer (Doc. No. 8), and it is unsupported by good cause for the delay. Doc. No. 29. Given that the Court previously found leave to amend appropriate, see Doc. No. 15, and in

light of Plaintiff's pro se status and the representations made in the motion, and although the issue of excusable neglect is a close one (see Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(B)), the Court finds an extension of the November 30, 2025 deadline for filing the amended complaint appropriate. Accordingly, to the extent that Plaintiff's motion (Doc. No. 27) requests leave to file an amended complaint, the motion will be GRANTED. Plaintiff shall file an amended complaint within fourteen (14) days of the date of this Order.¹ The remainder of Plaintiff's requests, however, are DENIED for the same reasons previously set forth by the Court. See Doc. No. 26. Specifically, once Plaintiff files his amended complaint, it does not appear that he would require leave of Court to file a renewed motion for temporary restraining order/preliminary injunction. And although Plaintiff renews his request for access to CM/ECF, the Court will not entertain Plaintiff's request to consider a previous proposed amended complaint attached to a prior motion, see Local Rule 3.01(h), and instead, Plaintiff must make a separate filing. renewed motion again does not establish good cause or extenuating circumstances in support. See, e.g., *Cliff v. Sch. Dist. of Lee Cnty.*, No. 2:25-cv-345-JES-DNF, 2025 WL 3012038, at *2 (M.D. Fla. Oct. 28, 2025), reconsideration denied, No. 2:25-cv-345-JES-DNF, 2025 WL 3080533 (M.D. Fla. Nov. 4, 2025) (affirming denial of CM/ECF access to pro se litigants, finding that unpredictable delays and mail delivery risks, complexity of the case, and inability to obtain legal counsel did not rise to the level necessary to justify CM/ECF access). DONE and ORDERED in Orlando, Florida on January 14, 2026.

LESLIE NOFFMAN PRICE

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Copies furnished to: Counsel of Record Unrepresented Parties 2 To the extent that Defendant seeks affirmative relief in response to the motion, such that if leave to amend is permitted the Court concurrently grant its motion to transfer, see Doc. No. 29, at 12 n.5, the request is denied for two reasons. First, "[i]t is not appropriate to seek an order for affirmative relief in a response to a motion." See *Armington v. Dolgencorp. Inc.*, No. 3:07-cv-1130-J-JRK, 2009 WL 210723, at *2 (M.D. Fla. Jan. 20, 2009). Second, the motion to transfer (Doc. No. 8) remains pending before the presiding District Judge, and the undersigned declines to speak to its merits. Qo