

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

WILLIAM ATCHERLEY,)	1:12cv00225 DLB PC
)	
Plaintiff,)	ORDER REGARDING PLAINTIFF’S
)	MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION
vs.)	
)	(Document 17)
EDGAR CLARK, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

Plaintiff William Atcherley (“Plaintiff”) is a prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff filed his complaint on February 17, 2012. On February 19, 2013, the Court ordered Plaintiff to either file an amended complaint or notify the Court of his willingness to proceed only on the cognizable claims.

On March 14, 2013, Plaintiff filed his First Amended Complaint (“FAC”). The Court screened Plaintiff’s FAC on November 13, 2013, and found certain claims cognizable. By separate order, Plaintiff was instructed to submit service documents.

On November 25, 2013, Plaintiff filed a motion requesting clarification of the Court’s order. It appears that in the text of the order, the Court determined that Plaintiff stated a claim against Defendant Clark for violation of the Eighth Amendment based on his refusal to order

1 more frequent bandage changes. In the conclusion of the order, however, the Court inadvertently
2 omitted Defendant Clark from the Eighth Amendment claim.

3 Plaintiff is informed that, pursuant to the text of the order, Defendant Clark **IS** included
4 in the Eighth Amendment claim. By separate order, the Court will issue an amended screening
5 order to clarify the error.
6

7
8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9
10 Dated: November 27, 2013

/s/ Dennis L. Beck
11 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28