



1 bring unrelated claims against unrelated parties in a single action. Fed. R. Civ. P. 18(a), 20(a)(2);  
2 Owens v. Hinsley, 635 F.3d 950, 952 (7th Cir. 2011); George v. Smith, 507 F.3d 605, 607 (7th Cir.  
3 2007).

4 First, contrary to Plaintiff's contention, it is not apparent from Plaintiff's second amended  
5 complaint did not contain a distinct common law claim for negligence, but rather sought relief under  
6 the California Constitution which the Court addressed in the February 20, 2015, screening order and  
7 properly found such claim not cognizable by way of section 1983. Second, Plaintiff's present motion  
8 to amend is defective. Local Rule 137(c) requires that all motions for leave to amend be accompanied  
9 by the proposed amended complaint. Plaintiff's present motion does not include a proposed amended  
10 complaint. Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion to amend is DENIED, *without prejudice*, to re-filing in a  
11 timely manner if so desired.

12  
13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14 Dated: September 25, 2015



UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE