(PC) Felton v. Lopez, et al.		
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	KELVIN FELTON,	1:12-cv-01066-AWI-GSA-PC
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S RENEWED MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE
13	V.	SUPPLEMENTAL COMPLAINT, WITHOUT PREJUDICE
14	J. LOPEZ, et al.,	(Doc. 16.)
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	/	
18	Kelvin Felton ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this	
19	civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff filed the Complaint commencing this	
20	action on June 29, 2012. (Doc. 1.)	
21	On February 13, 2013, the Court issued an order denying Plaintiff's motion to supplement	
22	the Complaint, without prejudice to renewal of the motion with Plaintiff's declaration signed under	
23	penalty of perjury, stating that he had exhausted administrative remedies for a later-occurring	
24	incident he seeks to add to the Complaint. (Doc. 12.) On March 13, 2013, Plaintiff filed a renewed	
25	motion for leave to file a supplemental complaint. (Doc. 16.)	
26	In the renewed motion, Plaintiff explains that he attempted, but was prevented from,	
27	$exhausting \ administrative \ remedies \ for \ the \ later-occurring \ incident. \ However, Plaintiff's \ explanation$	
28	was not submitted to the Court in the form of a declaration signed under penalty of perjury, as	

Doc. 17

required by the Court's order. Therefore, Plaintiff's renewed motion shall be denied without prejudice to submitting another renewed motion which includes Plaintiff's declaration.

Plaintiff is advised that his declaration must be dated and signed by Plaintiff, attesting under penalty of perjury to facts known by Plaintiff, in substantially the following form: "I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on <u>(date)</u>. (Signature)." Such a declaration, if properly prepared, is admissible in federal court with the same effect as an affidavit. 28 U.S.C. § 1746.

Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff's motion to file a supplemental complaint, filed on March 13, 2013, is DENIED, without prejudice to renewal of the motion as instructed by this order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 18, 2013 /s/ Gary S. Austin
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE