1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	STACY ROJAS, et al.,	Case No.: 1:17-cv-01514 DAD JLT
12	Plaintiffs,	ORDER DISCHARGING THE ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
13	V.	CAUSE
14	EDMUND BROWN, et al.,	
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	In ordering this matter reclassified as a "civil" case, the Court took note that there were pleading	
18	deficiencies in the complaint. Consequently, it ordered the plaintiffs to show cause why certain	
19	defendants and causes of action should not be dismissed but permitted, if the plaintiffs chose, leave to	
20	file an amended complaint instead ¹ (Doc. 23); they chose the latter option (Doc. 24). Therefore, the	
21	Court ORDERS the order to show cause is DIS	SCHARGED ² .
22		
23	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
24	Dated: <u>May 8, 2018</u>	/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
25 26		
26	¹ The plaintiffs have chosen to omit one or more defendants and one or more causes of action. Because the amended complaint supersedes the original complaint, in essence, the plaintiffs have dismissed the omitted defendant and cause of action. <i>See Loux v. Rhay</i> , 375 F.2d 55, 57 (9th Cir. 1967) (explaining that as a general rule, an amended complaint supersedes the original complaint); <i>King v. Atiyeh</i> , 814 F.2d 565, 567 (9th Cir. 1987), overruled on other grounds by <i>Lacey v. Maricopa County</i> , 693 F.3d 896 (9th Cir. 2012) ["All causes of action alleged in an original complaint which are not alleged in an amended complaint are waived."]	
27 28		
		burt makes no comment as to the cognizability of the complaint and show cause were rectified.

1	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
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	