



1 Gipson. Petitioner filed an amended petition, but did not name Connie Gipson as respondent. (Doc.  
2 9).

3 On February 21, 2014, the Court issued another order that, again, required Petitioner to name  
4 Ms. Gipson as the proper respondent. (Doc. 11). On March 3, 2014, Petitioner filed a motion to  
5 amend that contained almost three hundred pages of documents, only one of which related to the  
6 suggested amendment. (Doc. 14). In his motion to amend, Petitioner named the “People of Kern  
7 County” as respondent, not Ms. Gipson. On March 5, 2014, the Court issued an order denying  
8 Petitioner’s motion to name the People of Kern County as Respondent and Ordered Petitioner to Show  
9 Cause why the petition should not be dismissed for lack of personal jurisdiction over the Respondent.  
10 (Doc. 15). The Order to Show Cause gave Petitioner thirty days within which to file a response.

11 On March 17, 2014, Petitioner filed a response to the Order to Show Cause in which he  
12 appears to agree that Connie Gipson should be the named Respondent. (Doc. 16). The Court  
13 construes Petitioner’s response to the Order to Show Cause as a motion to amend the caption to reflect  
14 the proper Respondent and will grant said motion.

15 **ORDER**

16 For the foregoing reasons, the Court HEREBY ORDERS as follows:

- 17 1. The Court CONSTRUES the response to the Order to Show cause (Doc. 16), filed on  
18 March 17, 2014, as a motion to amend the caption to name the proper respondent.
- 19 2. Petitioner’s construed motion to amend the caption to name the proper respondent (Doc.  
20 16), is GRANTED.
- 21 3. The Clerk of the Court is DIRECTED to substitute the name of Connie Gipson as proper  
22 Respondent in this action.

23  
24 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25 Dated: March 25, 2014

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston  
26 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE