

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

PETER ANAYA,

 Plaintiff,

 v.

VAN VUGT, et al.,

 Defendants.

No. 1:16-cv-01094-SKO (PC)

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF’S
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE A
THIRD AMENDED COMPLAINT**

(Doc. 28)

TWENTY-ONE (21) DAY DEADLINE

Plaintiff, Peter Anaya, is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On August 24, 2017, Plaintiff filed a motion seeking leave to file an amended complaint, indicating he has determined the name of an individual identified as a Doe defendant in the Second Amended Complaint. This equates to good cause to allow amendment.

Plaintiff is informed that he must file a new pleading to make the amendment he seeks, as an amended complaint supercedes the original complaint, *Lacey v. Maricopa County*, Nos. 09-15806, 09-15703, 2012 WL 3711591, at *1 n.1 (9th Cir. Aug. 29, 2012) (en banc), and the amended complaint must be “complete in itself without reference to the prior or superceded pleading,” Local Rule 220. Plaintiff may not change the nature of this suit by adding new, unrelated claims or parties in a third amended complaint. *George v. Smith*, 507 F.3d 605, 607 (7th Cir. 2007) (no “buckshot” complaints).

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

Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion is to file an amended complaint, filed on August 24, 2017, (Doc. 28), is **HEREBY GRANTED** and his third amended complaint is due within **twenty-one (21) days** of the date of service of this order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 28, 2017

/s/ Sheila K. Oberto
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE