1			
2			
3			
<u>4</u>			
5			
6			
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
8	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
9			
10	RODERICK WILLIAM LEAR	Case No. 1:15-cv-01903-MJS (PC)	
11	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION FOR	
12	v.	RECONSIDERATION (ECF NO. 28)	
13	MARTIN BITER, et al.,	ORDER DENYING MOTIONS FOR	
14	Defendants.	EXTENSION OF TIME (ECF NOS. 29, 30)	
15			
16		_	
17	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceedi	ng pro so and in forma pauporis in this civil	

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. On November 21, 2016, the Court
screened Plaintiff's first amended complaint and concluded that it stated a cognizable
Eighth Amendment inadequate medical care claim for damages against Defendants
Akanno and Palomino, but no other cognizable claims. Plaintiff was ordered to file an
amended complaint or notify the Court of his willingness to proceed only on the
cognizable claims. (ECF No. 27.)

On December 12, 2016, Plaintiff filed a motion for leave to file a motion for
reconsideration of the screening order. (ECF No. 28.) On December 12, 2016 and
December 21, 2016, he filed motions for an extension of time to file his second
amended complaint. (ECF Nos. 29, 30.) Also on December 21, 2016, he timely filed his

1	second amended complaint.	(ECF No. 31.)
---	---------------------------	---------------

Plaintiff's second amended complaint supersedes his first amended complaint.
<u>See Loux v. Rhay</u>, 375 F.2d 55, 57 (9th Cir. 1967). Thus, arguments regarding his first
amended complaint and the screening thereof are moot. His request for leave to file a
motion for reconsideration will be denied on that basis.

6 Plaintiff's second amended complaint was timely filed. Thus, there is no basis for7 granting Plaintiff's motions for extension of time, and these too will be denied as moot.

Plaintiff's second amended complaint will be screened in due course.

Based on the foregoing, it is HEREBY ORDERED that:

- Plaintiff's motion for leave to file a motion for reconsideration is DENIED as moot; and
- 2. Plaintiff's motions for extension of time to file a second amended complaint are DENIED as moot.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 21, 2017

1s1 Michael V. Sena

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE