

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

DURRELL A. PUCKETT,

Case No. 1:13-cv-00525-SKO (PC)

Plaintiff,

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
LEAVE TO FILE SECOND AMENDED
COMPLAINT

v.

SGT. RONALD VOGEL, et al.,

(Doc. 11)

Defendants.

Plaintiff Durrell A. Puckett, a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on April 12, 2013. On July 8, 2014, the Court screened Plaintiff’s amended complaint and found that it stated cognizable federal excessive force and equal protection claims against eleven defendants. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. The Court ordered Plaintiff to complete and return the service documents so that service of process could be initiated.

The order was filed on July 9, 2014, the same day on which Plaintiff filed a motion seeking leave to amend, accompanied by a proposed second amended complaint. Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a). Plaintiff’s motion to amend, however, fails to identify what “ground for relief” he is adding. (Doc. 11.) The party seeking relief bears the burden of stating “with particularity the grounds for” the motion. Fed. R. Civ. P. 7(b)(1)(B). The Court does not have a duty to compare Plaintiff’s

1 complaints side and side and attempt to deduce what new grounds for relief were added, and it
2 declines to do so.¹

3 Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion seeking leave to file a second amended complaint is
4 HEREBY DENIED, without prejudice. Fed. R. Civ. P. 7(b)(1)(B).

5
6
7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 Dated: July 27, 2014

/s/ Sheila K. Oberto
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

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

28 ¹ It bears mention that the complaints are in different formats, making the task of ascertaining the changes even more difficult.