

1 **WO**

2  
3  
4  
5  
6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

8 Roger Mahuwe,

No. CV12-0263-PHX-DGC

9 Plaintiff,

**ORDER**

10 v.

11 Petsmart,


12 Defendant.  
13  
14  
15

16 Plaintiff has filed a document (Doc. 13) that appears to be his response to the  
17 Court's order requiring a more definite statement (Doc. 12). The document does not  
18 provide a more definite statement and does not comply with the Court's order of  
19 April 9, 2012 (Doc. 12). Plaintiff shall, on or before **May 11, 2012**, file an amended  
20 complaint that complies with and addresses the issues set forth in sections II and III of the  
21 Court's order of April 9, 2012 (Doc. 12). Specifically, Plaintiff's amended complaint  
22 must include (1) numbered paragraphs, with each paragraph limited to a single allegation  
23 or issue, (2) state the basis for the Court's jurisdiction over this case, (3) set forth factual  
24 detail in support of his claim, such as the detail contained in the written statement  
25 attached to his original complaint, (4) set forth the legal basis for his claim (the statute or  
26 common law under which he is making a claim), and (5) identify the relief he seeks in  
27 this case. Plaintiff is again warned that if he fails to comply with these requirements by  
28 **May 11, 2012**, the Court likely will dismiss this case for failure to comply with the

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Court's orders and for failure to prosecute.

Dated this 27th day of April, 2012.



---

David G. Campbell  
United States District Judge