1 2 3 5 6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 10 COSME PRESAS, Case No. 1:13-cv-02038-LJO-SKO (PC) 11 Plaintiff, ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL PLEADING, 12 DISREGARDING PROPOSED v. JPPLEMENTAL COMPLAINT. AND 13 KERN MEDICAL CENTER, et al., DIRECTING PLAINTIFF TO COMPLY WITH ORDER FILED APRIL 8, 2015 14 Defendants. (Docs. 30 and 31) 15 16 Plaintiff Cosme Presas, a prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed this civil 17 rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on December 13, 2013. On April, 8, 2015, the Court 18 issued an order (1) granting Plaintiff's two motions for leave to file supplemental complaints, 19 subject to filing a second amended complaint that is complete within itself, and (2) disregarding 20 Plaintiff's proposed supplemental complaint. Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(d). On April 17, 2015, Plaintiff 21 filed a third motion for leave to file a supplemental pleading, accompanied by his second proposed 22 supplemental complaint. Id. 23 Based on the date Plaintiff signed his motion – April 11, 2015 – it appears Plaintiff may 24 have drafted and mailed his filings prior to receiving the Court's order of April 8, 2015. Plaintiff 25 is required to comply with that order if he wishes to either amend or supplement his first amended 26 complaint. 27

28

This is Plaintiff's third motion for leave to file a supplemental complaint. It, therefore, bears emphasis that "[t]he purpose of Rule 15(d) is to promote as complete an adjudication of the dispute between the parties as possible by allowing the addition of claims which arise after the initial pleadings are filed." William Inglis & Sons Baking Co. v. ITT Cont'l Baking Co., Inc., 668 F.2d 1014, 1057 (9th Cir. 1981). Rule 15(d) is not intended to allow Plaintiff to repeatedly add unnecessary or immaterial facts to his complaint, even if they may be tangentially relevant; the purpose of supplementing is to add new claims based on new events or, in some instances, to cure deficiencies in the prior pleading based on new events. William Inglis & Sons Baking Co., 668 F.2d at 1057.

Based on the order filed on April 8, 2015, Plaintiff's motion for leave to file a supplemental pleading is HEREBY DENIED; Plaintiff's proposed supplemental complaint is DISREGARDED; and Plaintiff is directed to comply with the order filed on April 8, 2015.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 27, 2015 /s/ Sheila K. Oberto
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE