UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MIKE BAKER,	Case No.: 1:16-cv-01737-AWI-BAM (PC)
Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO CLARIFY/RECONSIDER SCREENING ORDER
v.	(ECF No. 22)
E. BEAM, et al.,	
Defendants.	

Plaintiff Mike Baker ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On May 10, 2017, the Court issued and order screening Plaintiff's first amended complaint, and requiring him to either file a second amended complaint, or a notice that he was willing to proceed only on the claims found to be cognizable in that pleading. (ECF No. 13.) Plaintiff subsequently sought extensions of time to comply with that order, (ECF Nos. 16, 19, 21, 23), which were granted, (ECF Nos. 17, 20, 24).

Plaintiff also filed the instant motion for the Court to clarify/reconsider its order screening his first amended complaint, on August 7, 2017. (ECF No. 22). However, on September 11, 2017, before the Court could rule on that motion, Plaintiff filed a second amended civil rights complaint, as permitted by the Court's prior order. (ECF No. 25.)

"[A]n amended complaint supersedes the original complaint and renders it without legal effect." <u>Lacey v. Maricopa County</u>, 693 F.3d 896, 927 (9th Cir. 2012). Therefore, this case does not

proceed upon Plaintiff's prior complaints, but instead proceeds upon his current second amended complaint. His motion for reconsideration of the Court's prior screening order is rendered moot by his filing of a subsequent second amended complaint. That complaint will be screened in due course.

Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration of the Court's screening order is HEREBY DENIED, as moot.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **October 10, 2017**

/s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE