

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

RODERICK WILLIAM LEAR

Plaintiff,

v.

MARTIN BITER, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:15-cv-01903-MJS (PC)

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
CLARIFICATION**

(ECF No. 22)

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff filed his complaint on December 21, 2015 (ECF No. 1) and then, before his complaint was screened, filed a first amended complaint on February 19, 2015 (ECF No. 21). His first amended complaint is pending screening.

Before the Court is Plaintiff's April 21, 2016 motion for clarification. (ECF No. 22.) Plaintiff writes the Court to advise of a typographical error in his first amended complaint and to explain that the error was not made with malice, as that term is used in 28 U.S.C. § 1915A (allowing the Court to dismiss a complaint that is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted).

Inasmuch as Plaintiff does not seek clarification from the Court, but instead is

1 himself clarifying an aspect of his first amended complaint, Plaintiff's motion for
2 clarification is HEREBY DENIED. The Court will screen Plaintiff's first amended
3 complaint in due course and will consider Plaintiff's point of clarification at that time.

4
5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Dated: May 9, 2016

7 */s/ Michael J. Seng*
8 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28