action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff filed this action on March 1, 2004. On May 5, 2005, the first amended complaint was screened and Plaintiff was ordered to submit service documents. Plaintiff filed a second amended complaint on June 16, 2005, alleging only those claims found to be cognizable in the screening order. On July 14, 2005, an order issued directing the United States Marshal to serve the second amended complaint. Following resolution of Defendants' motion for

On April 4, 2008, Plaintiff filed a notice of appeal regarding the judgment and order dismissing this action. On March 25, 2010, the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit issued an order affirming the granting of Defendants' motion for summary judgment, but finding that Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment claim against Defendant Winett and Due Process claims against Defendants Johnson, Stainer, and Winett had been improperly dismissed at the screening stage, and the action was remanded for further consideration of those claims.

28

23

24

25

26

27

Doc. 139

In light of the reversal of the screening of the first amended complaint, the Court finds it necessary to disregard the second amended complaint to clarify the record in this action. The first amended complaint is therefore the operative complaint, only as to the limited claims revived by the Ninth Circuit. Accordingly, the second amended complaint, filed June 16, 2005, is HEREBY DISREGARDED. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: November 17, 2011 /s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE