

1 **WO**

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

8
9 Liv H. Larsgard,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 Michael Mendoza, et al.,

13 Defendant.

No. CV12-8013 PCT DGC

ORDER

14 Defendants have filed motions seeking clarification of which amended complaint
15 they should answer. Docs. 31, 32. Plaintiff Liv H. Larsgard has filed two motions for
16 appointment of counsel. Docs. 26, 30.

17 The operative complaint in this case is the Second Amended Complaint filed on
18 October 12, 2012. Doc. 25. That was the deadline set by the Court for filing an amended
19 complaint. Doc. 24. The Second Amended Complaint filed on October 15, 2012
20 (Doc. 27), was untimely under the Court's order, was filed without leave of Court, and
21 was filed pro per by a plaintiff who is represented by counsel in this case. Parties
22 represented by counsel may not make pro per filings. *See Mullins v. Schriro*, No. CV-06-
23 1148-PHX-NVW, 2008 WL 1805443, at *1 (D. Ariz., Apr. 18, 2008); *United States v.*
24 *Kienenberger*, 13 F.3d 1354, 1356 (9th Cir.1994); LRCiv 83.3(c)(2).

25 Plaintiff has filed two motions for appointment of counsel. Docs. 26, 30. They
26 are denied because counsel has appeared for her in this case. *See* Docs. 25, 29.

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

IT IS ORDERED:

- 1. Defendants’ motion for clarification (Doc. 31) is **granted**.
- 2. Plaintiff’s motions for appointment of counsel (Docs. 26, 30) are **denied**.

Dated this 5th day of December, 2012.



David G. Campbell
United States District Judge