

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Harris v. JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.

Harris · No. 1:25-cv-00652-JLT-HBK · Decided June 30, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California granted the parties’ stipulated motion to extend the time for responding to the complaint and to permit amendment. Plaintiffs were ordered to file a First Amended Complaint by August 4, 2025, and JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. was excused from responding to the original complaint but required to respond to the amended complaint within fourteen days of filing.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Helena M. Barch-Kuchta
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	June 30, 2025
DOCKET	1:25-cv-00652-JLT-HBK
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	After removal to federal court, the parties filed a stipulated motion seeking additional time for Defendant to respond to the Complaint and permission for Plaintiffs to file a First Amended Complaint.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential procedural order

TOPICS

- motion to amend
- pleadings
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should grant the parties' stipulated request for leave for Plaintiffs to file a First Amended Complaint and extend Defendant's time to respond.

HOLDINGS

- 1. The stipulated motion for leave to amend was granted, and Plaintiffs were permitted to file a First Amended Complaint no later than August 4, 2025.
- 2. Chase need not respond to the original Complaint and must respond to the First Amended Complaint within fourteen days after it is filed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“court should freely give leave when justice so requires.” (Order at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiffs Leonard Harris and Imogene Anderson sued JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. and Does 1 through 30. After removal, the parties stipulated to an extension of time and requested that Plaintiffs be allowed to amend their Complaint. Chase consented to the filing of the First Amended Complaint.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. removed the action to the Eastern District of California on May 30, 2025. The parties initially agreed to a 27-day extension for Chase to respond to the Complaint, then jointly requested that Plaintiffs be permitted to file a First Amended Complaint by August 4, 2025, with Chase's response due fourteen days thereafter. The court granted the stipulated motion, excused Chase from responding to the original Complaint, and set the response deadline for the amended pleading.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Ramirez v. County of San Bernardino, 806 F.3d 1002, 1008 (9th Cir. 2015)
- T.T. v. County of San Diego, No. 3:19-CV-00407-AJB-AGS, 2020 WL 516146, at *3 (S.D. Cal. Jan. 31, 2020)

OPINION

Harris v. J.P. Morgan Chase Bank, N.A.

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 LEONARD HARRIS, IMOGENE Case No. 1:25-cv-00652-JLT-HBK

11 ANDERSON,

ORDER GRANTING STIPULATED

12 Plaintiffs, MOTION FOR LEAVE TO EXTEND TIME

13 TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT AND FILE

vs. AMENDED COMPLAINT

14 JPMORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A.; and (Doc. No. 7) 15 DOES 1 through 30, inclusive, 16 Defendants. 17 18 Defendant JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. (“Chase”) removed this action to this Court on May 19 20 30, 2025. (Doc. No. 1). Plaintiffs Leonard Harris and Imogene Anderson (“Plaintiffs”) and Chase 21 agreed to a 27-day extension, or until July 3, 2025, for Chase to respond to the Complaint. (Doc. 22 No. 6). On June 27, 2025, the Parties filed a Stipulation For Leave To Extend Time To Respond To 23 Complaint And File Amended Complaint. (Doc. No. 7). Therein, the Parties request that Plaintiffs 24 be allowed to file a First Amended Complaint no later than August 4, 2025, and that Chase need 25 respond to the original Complaint. 26 27 Rule 15 governs amended complaints and supplemental pleadings. Fed. R. Civ. P. 15.

eee eI I I IIE OIE IR III IID ISIE) OIE IIS

1 consent or the court’s leave” and the “court should freely give leave when justice so requires.” 2 || Here, Chase consents to Plaintiffs filing a first amended complaint.! 3 ACCORDINGLY, it is hereby ORDERED: 4 1. The Parties’ stipulated motion (Doc. No.7) is GRANTED; 5 2. Plaintiffs shall file their First Amended Complaint no later than August 4, 2025; ® 3. Defendant Chase need not file a response to Plaintiffs’ Complaint but shall file a response to Plaintiffs’ First Amended Complaint within fourteen (14) days after its filing. Fed. R. 9 Civ. P. 15(a)(3). 10 Dated: __ June 30, 2025 Wile. Th fares Zack

11 HELENA M. BARCH-KUCHTA

D UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 oo 26 ||! Defendant’s consent does not eliminate Plaintiffs’ right to file an amended complaint under Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(1). Ramirez v. Cnty. of San Bernardino, 806 F.3d 1002, 1008 (9th Cir, 2015) (holding a “[27 || 15(a)(2) amendment, filed first in time, cannot be construed as a waiver or exhaustion of his automatic right to amend under 15(a)(1), so long as that amendment was timely.” See also T.T. v. Cnty. of San Diego, No. 28 ||] 319-CV-00407-AJB-AGS, 2020 WL 516146, at *3 (S.D. Cal. Jan. 31, 2020).