

1 **WO**

2
3
4
5
6 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
7 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**
8

9 Khorī Francis,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 Doug Collins, et al.,

13 Defendants.
14

No. CV-25-01009-PHX-KML

ORDER

15 Plaintiff Khorī Francis filed his original complaint on March 27, 2025. The
16 following day Francis filed an amended complaint. (Doc. 5.) The parties then agreed
17 Francis could file his second amended complaint. (Doc. 19.) On June 9, 2025, Francis filed
18 a third amended complaint. That complaint was not accompanied by an indication
19 defendants had agreed to the filing. Having already amended as a matter of course, Francis
20 was not permitted to amend his complaint again absent “the opposing party’s written
21 consent or the court’s leave.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(2). To prevent additional delay, the
22 court will deem the third amended complaint properly filed. In the future, Francis must
23 take greater care to comply with all procedural requirements. *See King v. Atiyeh*, 814 F.2d
24 565, 567 (9th Cir. 1987), *overruled in part by Lacey v. Maricopa Cnty.*, 693 F.3d 896 (9th
25 Cir. 2012) (pro se litigants “must follow the same rules of procedure that govern other
26 litigants”).

27 /

28 /

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

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED the Third Amended Complaint (Doc. 23) is deemed properly filed.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED the Motion to Allow Electronic Filing (Doc. 24) is **DENIED**.

Dated this 11th day of June, 2025.


Honorable Krissa M. Lanham
United States District Judge