

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

JIMMY GONZALES,	CASE NO. 1:11-cv-01997-AWI-MJS PC
Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS TO SUPPLEMENT
v.	(ECF No. 21, 24)
HAROLD TATE.,	
Defendant.	

Plaintiff Jimmy Gonzales ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

On February 1, 2013, Plaintiff filed a motion to submit an additional exhibit to the Court. (ECF No. 21.) On February 24, 2013, he filed a motion asking the Court to keep a record of the retaliation he has encountered in response to his having filed this litigation. (ECF No. 24.) Plaintiff's motions are now before the Court.

In the first motion, Plaintiff states that he forgot to include a document regarding his medical care. (ECF No. 21.) In the second, he alleges he has been denied medical care because he filed this lawsuit and wants the Court to consider this fact when making decisions in his case. (ECF No. 24.)

The only practical way to accommodate Plaintiff's requests would be to supplement his Amended Complaint with this additional information. Thus these motions are deemed to be motions to supplement the Third Amended Complaint

1 Amended pleadings must be complete within themselves without reference to
2 another pleading. Partial amendments are not permissible. Local Rule 220.

3 Accordingly, Plaintiff's motions to supplement (ECF Nos. 21 & 23) are DENIED.
4

5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Dated: September 19, 2013

/s/ Michael J. Seng
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28