

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**

RAYMOND ALFORD BRADFORD, ) Case No.: 1:17-cv-01128-SAB (PC)  
 )  
Plaintiff, )  
 )  
v. ) ORDER OVERRULING PLAINTIFF'S  
 ) OBJECTIONS TO COURT'S MAY 28, 2021  
C. OGBUEHI, et al. ) ORDER DENYING HIS MOTION TO AMEND  
 ) THE COMPLAINT  
Defendants. ) (ECF No. 127)  
 )  
 )

Plaintiff Raymond Alford Bradford is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

On May 28, 2021, the Court denied Plaintiff's motion for leave to file an amended and/or supplemental complaint and his second amended complaint was stricken from the record. (ECF No. 122.)

On June 10, 2021, Plaintiff filed objections to the Court's May 28, 2021 order. (ECF No. 127.)

Plaintiff contends that he sought to add new claims and additional parties who acted in concert with the Deputy Attorney to deliberately misrepresent the facts and because Defendants did not oppose his requests to extend the deadline to amend the pleadings, he is entitled to relief. Plaintiff's objections must be overruled.

///  
///  
///  
///  
///

1 Initially, Plaintiff is advised that the fact the Court granted his requests to extend the deadline  
2 to amend the pleadings does not entitle him to amend as a matter of right as amendment is governed  
3 by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15. Further, as stated in the Court’s May 28, 2021 order,

4 The allegations in the second amended complaint took place several years after filing the  
5 instant action and all involve medical circumstances after he tested positive for Valley Fever.  
6 Plaintiff seeks to add new claims against numerous new parties. The new claims assertedly  
7 arose long after the events giving rise to the claims asserted in Plaintiff’s first amended  
8 complaint (the operative pleading). Although, like the existing claims, some of the new claims  
9 allege deliberate indifference to Plaintiff’s medical condition, the new claims concern events  
10 quite different in time and scope from the existing claims. Further, the new claims involve new  
11 Defendants who are unrelated to the claims asserted in the first amended complaint. Plaintiff  
12 also appears to propose to add a claim of denial of access to the courts and retaliation, claims  
13 wholly different from the existing claims. See Womack v. Windsor, No. 2:15-cv-0533 MCE  
14 KJN P, 2016 WL 4702827, at \*3 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 7, 2016) (denying motion to file  
15 supplemental complaint adding a retaliation claim which involved “multiple elements not  
16 pertinent to the claims [of deliberate indifference to medical needs] raised in plaintiff’s original  
17 pleading, and none of the defendants who [had] answered were involved in the alleged  
18 retaliation”). A court properly declines to allow a plaintiff to file a supplemental complaint  
19 asserting such new and disparate claims. See Bradford v. Ogbuehi, No. 1:15-cv-01918-AWI-  
20 BAM (PC), 2018 WL 430097, at \*2 (E.D. Cal. Jan. 16, 2018) (declining to allow prisoner  
21 plaintiff to file supplemental complaint based on alleged denial of medical care occurring over  
22 a year after the denial of medical care by different defendants for the same condition alleged in  
23 the operative complaint). Therefore, judicial economy will not be served by allowing  
24 supplementation here. Rather, these unrelated claims against new and different defendants  
25 belong in a different lawsuit. See George v. Smith, 507 F.3d 605, 607 (7th Cir. 2007)  
26 (“[M]ultiple claims against a single party are fine, but Claim A against Defendant 1 should not  
27 be joined with unrelated Claim B against Defendant 2.”)

18 (ECF No. 122 at 5-6.)

19 Plaintiff’s objections fail to meaningfully address the Court’s May 28, 2021 order. While  
20 Plaintiff may disagree with the Court’s order, he fails to present any valid grounds to justify reversal  
21 or modification of the Court’s May 28, 2021 order. Accordingly, Plaintiff’s objections are overruled.

22 IT IS SO ORDERED.

23 Dated: June 11, 2021

24   
25 \_\_\_\_\_  
26 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE