UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

7 THOMAS L. GOFF,

CASE NO. 1:15-CV-0937 AWI EPG

IIIOMAS E. GOIT

V.

ORDER ON PLAINTIFF'S RULE 15(b) MOTION

(Doc. No. 95)

GAMEZ,

Defendants

Plaintiff

On November 8, 2019, the Court dismissed this case after Plaintiff failed to respond to an order to show cause. The dismissal follows a previous dismissal and other orders to show cause, all based either on Plaintiff's inability prosecute this case.

On December 9, 2019, Plaintiff filed a notice of appeal.

On December 12, 2019, Plaintiff filed what is styled as a Rule 15(b) motion. <u>See</u> Doc. No. 95. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(b) deals amending a complaint during trial and amendment based on implied consent. However, Plaintiff's motion does not fit within the purview of Rule 15(b) because Plaintiff this case did not make it to trial and Plaintiff does not address or request amendment. As a Rule 15(b) motion, Plaintiff's motion will be denied.

Despite the styling of the motion, Plaintiff's motion appears to be an attempt to respond to the order to show cause. As a response, Plaintiff's motion is unavailing. The time to show cause was within the time limit set by the order to show cause. Plaintiff has only now responded to the order to show cause - after he has filed an appeal, after more than a month has passed since this case was closed, and well beyond the time to respond set by the order to show cause. Plaintiff's response is too late.

1	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's Rule 15(b) motion (Doc. No. 95)
2	is DENIED.
3	
4	IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: December 16, 2019
5	Dated: December 16, 2019 SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE
6	SLIVIOR DISTRICT JUDGE
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	