WO

2 3

1

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Gary Jerome Harper,

Plaintiff,

v.

Charles L. Ryan, et al.,

Defendants.

No. CV-18-0298-PHX-DGC (DMF)

**ORDER** 

On August 6, 2018, the Court issued its scheduling order in this matter which stated that "All motion to amend the complaint or to add parties shall be filed by October 2, 2018." (Doc. 29) On September 28, 2018, the Court struck Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint and denied his Motion to Add Parties to Original Complaint. (Doc. 39) The Court's Order included the full text of LRCiv. 15.1 and informed Plaintiff that if he "seeks any extension of time to add additional parties or amend the Complaint, Plaintiff must lodge with the Court at the time of the motion for extension, the proposed motion to amend and the accompanying proposed documents that comply with the Local Rules of Civil Procedure and the previous Court orders." (Doc. 39 at 3-4)

On October 26, 2018, Plaintiff filed a "Motion to Amend Original Complaint (+) Add Additional Parties! [sic]" (Doc. 43) Plaintiff did not file a motion for extension of time and his filed Motion does not comply with LRCiv. 15.1 which states, in relevant part:

A party who moves for leave to amend a pleading must attach a copy of the proposed amended pleading as an exhibit to the motion, which must indicate in what respect it differs from the pleading which it amends, by bracketing or striking through the text to be deleted and underlining the text to be added. In short, Plaintiff's motion is untimely without explanation and he has not complied with the relevant Local Rules (see Doc. 39). Accordingly, the Court will not grant his motion. IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED denying Plaintiff's Motion to Amend (Doc. 43). Dated this 18th day of December, 2018. Honorable Deborah M. Fine United States Magistrate Judge