

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

JIMMY RAY RAMOS,

Plaintiff,

v.

TULARE COUNTY SHERIFF'S  
DEPARTMENT, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:18-cv-00065-MJS (PC)

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO AMEND  
COMPLAINT**

**(ECF No. 12)**

Plaintiff is a County jail inmate proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Before the Court is Plaintiff's motion to amend the complaint and to direct defendants to answer.

At this stage of the proceedings, Plaintiff may amend his complaint once as a matter of course. Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a). He need not seek leave of the Court. Accordingly, his motion to amend the complaint will be denied. The first amended complaint has been filed and will be screened in due course. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.

With regard to the request that defendants be directed to answer, the Court will not authorize service on the defendants until the Court has conducted this initial

1 screening and determined whether the complaint is “frivolous, malicious, or fails to state  
2 a claim upon which relief may be granted; or seeks monetary relief from a defendant  
3 who is immune from such relief.” Id.

4 Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff’s motion is HEREBY DENIED.

5  
6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 Dated: April 9, 2018

1st Michael J. Seng  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28