



SHOAF v. THOMASVILLE CITY SCHOOLS

2019 | Cited 0 times | M.D. North Carolina | June 27, 2019

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

ALYSON SHOAF,) Plaintiff,) v.) 1:18CV952 THOMASVILLE CITY SCHOOLS,) PATRICE FAISON, and BARBARA) ARMSTRONG,) Defendants.)

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER OSTEEN, JR., District Judge

leave to amend her combined motion to dismiss the original complaint, (Doc. 15). For the following reasons, the court finds that the motion to amend should be granted and the motion to dismiss should be denied as moot, without prejudice to Defendants filing a new motion to dismiss the amended complaint. I. MOTION TO AMEND

The court should freely give leave when justice so

[L]eave to amend a pleading should be denied only when the amendment would be prejudicial to the opposing party, there has been bad faith on the part of the moving party, or the amendment would be futile. The Fourth Circuit has held, as have a number of other circuits, that delay alone is not sufficient reason to deny leave to amend. The delay must be accompanied by prejudice, bad faith, or futility. *Johnson v. Oroweat Foods Co.*, 785 F.2d 503, 509-10 (4th Cir. 1986) (citations and footnote omitted). . . . should only be denied on the ground of futility when the proposed amendment is clearly insufficient or frivolous on its Id. at 510; see also *Davis v. Piper Aircraft Co.*, 615 F.2d 606, 613 14 (4th Cir. 1980) (stating that the absence of prejudice to the non-moving party alone is typically sufficient to support granting leave to amend; finding that a proposed amendment is generally not futile unless it faces an obvious and insurmountable barrier such as the statute of limitations). argues that the motion to amend is futile because

ate law tort claims and claims under § 1981 and § 1983, which are currently the subject of TCS does not, however, assert that it will suffer any prejudice if the motion to amend is granted or allege bad faith by Plaintiff.

In her proposed amended complaint, Plaintiff responds directly to certain arguments raised in the motion to dismiss. (See, e.g., Doc. 17-1 ¶ 37 (alleging that Defendants have waived sovereign or governmental immunity by maintaining liability insurance; Defendants identified governmental immunity as grounds for dismissing certain claims).) Defendants may still be able to argue that the



SHOAF v. THOMASVILLE CITY SCHOOLS

2019 | Cited 0 times | M.D. North Carolina | June 27, 2019

amendments do not cure these specific deficiencies for reasons other than those raised in the motion to dismiss. However, on its face, the proposed amended complaint squarely addresses several arguments in the motion to dismiss.

Defendants also do not assert that the amended claims are futile because they are obviously barred by any clearly- applicable law or allege only events outside the statute of limitations proposed amendments are thus not early insufficient or frivolous under Fourth Circuit

motion will be granted; Plaintiff will be permitted to file and serve her proposed amended complaint.
II. MOTION TO DISMISS

Because address some of the major arguments raised in the motion to dismiss, the court believes that the most expedient way forward is to deny the currently- pending motion to dismiss as moot and permit Defendants to file a new motion to dismiss addressing the amended complaint directly. See, e.g., Branch Banking & Tr. Co. v. Meridian Holding Co., LLC, Civil Action No. 3:18-0486, 2019 WL 454602, at *2 (S.D. W.Va. Feb. 5, 2019) (denying a motion to dismiss as moot when amendments Fox v. City of Greensboro, 1:10-CV-229, 2011 WL 13239927, at *2 (M.D.N.C. Mar. 31, 2011) judicial efficiency and to streamline and focus the analysis in on to amend and motions to dismiss as moot and without amended

Defendants have not had a chance to respond substantively to the proposed amendments. Further, notwithstanding that the amendments fail to address all grounds for dismissal identified by Defendants, the court finds it efficient to the swift resolution of this case to consider the amended complaint as a whole rather than evaluating the claims piecemeal. 1

Finally, the court notes that the motion to amend was filed on February 14, plates

1 The motion to amend was permitted as a matter of course as to Defendants Faison and Armstrong. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(1)(B). If the court were to deny the motion as to TCS, the case would move forward (at least for some time) with separate complaints for the individual and entity defendants. The court believes this approach introduces unnecessary complexity.

2 (Doc. 22 at 4.) e denied as moot in

prejudice to Defendants filing a new motion to dismiss addressing the amended complaint. III.
CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the motion to amend should be granted and that dismiss should be denied as moot.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that motion for leave to amend complaint, (Doc. 17), is GRANTED.



SHOAF v. THOMASVILLE CITY SCHOOLS

2019 | Cited 0 times | M.D. North Carolina | June 27, 2019

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, within five (5) days of the date of this order, Plaintiff shall file and serve her proposed amended complaint.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that motion to dismiss, (Doc. 15), is DENIED AS MOOT WITHOUT PREJUDICE. This the 27th day of June, 2019.

_____ United States District Judge

2 The Rule 26(f) report was approved by order of Magistrate Judge Peake on March 13, 2019. (See Doc. 23.)

