

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

MICHAEL NEIL JACOBSEN,
Plaintiff,
v.
OFFICER CURRAN, et al.,
Defendants.

CASE No. 1:16-cv-01050-MJS (PC)
**ORDER DENYING AS MOOT MOTION
FOR ADDENDUM**
(ECF No. 7)

Plaintiff is a county inmate proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. He has consented to Magistrate Judge jurisdiction. No other parties have appeared in the action.

On September 21, 2016, the Court screened Plaintiff's complaint and concluded that it stated a cognizable Fourteenth Amendment inadequate medical care claim against Defendant Curren and Does 1 through 8, but no other cognizable claims. Plaintiff was ordered to either file an amended complaint curing the noted deficiencies or notify the Court of his willingness to proceed only on the cognizable claim. (ECF No. 6.) On September 29, 2016, Plaintiff filed a "Motion for Addendum" seeking to add additional facts to his complaint. (ECF No. 7.)

It appears that the motion for addendum was submitted prior to Plaintiff receiving the Court's screening order. (See ECF No. 8.) Furthermore, Plaintiff has stated his intent

1 to file an amended complaint. (Id.) Accordingly, the motion for addendum (ECF No. 7) is
2 HEREBY DENIED as moot.

3 Plaintiff is reminded that any amended pleading must be complete in itself without
4 reference to any prior pleading. Local Rule 220. See Loux v. Rhay, 375 F.2d 55, 57 (9th
5 Cir. 1967).

6
7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 Dated: October 31, 2016

1st Michael J. Seng
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28