

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

| | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| ANTHONY NGUYEN, | CASE NO. 1:11-cv-00809-AWI-SKO PC |
| Plaintiff, | ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION |
| v. | FOR LEAVE TO FILE A SUPPLEMENTAL |
| | COMPLAINT AND FOR FORM |
| M. D. BITER, et al., | (Doc. 50) |
| Defendants. | |

Plaintiff Anthony Nguyen, a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on May 18, 2011. On January 13, 2012, Plaintiff filed a motion seeking leave to file a supplemental complaint and for a supplemental complaint form.

Rule 15(d) provides that “[o]n motion and reasonable notice, the court may, on just terms, permit a party to serve a supplemental pleading setting out any transaction, occurrence, or event that happened after the date of the pleading to be supplemented.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(d). However, a motion seeking relief from the Court must “state with particularity the grounds for seeking the order.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 7(b)(1)(B).

The Court will not grant Plaintiff leave to file a supplemental complaint in the absence of any showing by Plaintiff regarding the grounds for supplementation and in the absence of the submission of a proposed supplemental complaint. Plaintiff’s motion is HEREBY DENIED on those grounds.

///
///
///

1 Further, Plaintiff's motion for a supplemental form complaint is also DENIED. The Court
2 does not have a form complaint for supplemental complaints. Plaintiff may either handwrite his
3 supplemental complaint or use the complaint form available at the prison, making any necessary
4 changes to the caption to reflect it is a supplemental complaint.

5
6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 **Dated: January 25, 2012**

/s/ Sheila K. Oberto
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28