| 1  |  |  |  |
|----|--|--|--|
| 2  |  |  |  |
| 3  |  |  |  |
| 4  |  |  |  |
| 5  |  |  |  |
| 6  | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT   |  |  |
| 7  | EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA   |  |  |
| 8  |  |  |  |
| 9  | KASEY F. HOFFMANN,   | Case No. 1:18-cv-00078-LJO-BAM (PC)                              |  |
| 10 | Plaintiff,   | ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION<br>FOR LEAVE TO AMEND COMPLAINT |  |
| 11 | V.   | (Doc. 20)  |  |
| 12 | L. PULIDO, et al,  | (1900.20)  |  |
| 13 | Defendants.  |  |  |
| 14 |  |  |  |
| 15 | Plaintiff Kasey F. Hoffmann is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in               |  |  |
| 16 | this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On June 12, 2018, the Court dismissed this        |  |  |
| 17 | action, without prejudice, for the failure to exhaust available administrative remedies. (Docs. 13,      |  |  |
| 18 | 14.) On June 20, 2018, Plaintiff filed a notice of appeal. (Doc. 15.)                                    |  |  |
| 19 | On July 12, 2018, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals referred the matter back to this                    |  |  |
| 20 | Court for the limited purpose of determining whether <i>in forma pauperis</i> status should continue for |  |  |
| 21 | the appeal. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3). On July 17, 2018, this Court issued an order regarding that          |  |  |
| 22 | limited referral. (Doc. 19.)   |  |  |
| 23 | Currently before the Court is Plaintiff's motion for leave to amend the complaint, filed on              |  |  |
| 24 | July 20, 2018. (Doc. 20.) Plaintiff states that based on the referral by the Ninth Circuit Court of      |  |  |
| 25 | Appeals, he seeks leave to amend his complaint.  |  |  |
| 26 | As noted above, the referral was for the limited purpose of determining Plaintiff's in                   |  |  |
| 27 | forma pauperis status on appeal, and has been addressed by this Court. Thus, the matter is no            |  |  |
| 28 | longer referred to this Court. Furthermore, this Court has otherwise been divested of jurisdiction       |  |  |
|    |  |  |  |
|    |  | 1  |  |

| 1  | over this matter. See Rodriguez v. County of Los Angeles, 891 F.3d 776, 790 (9th Cir. 2018)           |  |
|----|---|--|
| 2  | ("The filing of a notice of appeal is an event of jurisdictional significance—it confers jurisdiction |  |
| 3  | on the court of appeals and divests the district court of its control over those aspects of the case  |  |
| 4  | involved in the appeal.") (quoting Griggs v. Provident Consumer Disc. Co., 459 U.S. 56, 58            |  |
| 5  | (1982)).  |  |
| 6  | For these reasons, Plaintiff's motion for leave to amend, filed on July 20, 2018 (Doc. 20)            |  |
| 7  | is HEREBY DENIED.   |  |
| 8  | IT IS SO ORDERED.   |  |
| 9  | Dated: July 25, 2018 /s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe   |  |
| 10 | UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  |  |
| 11 |   |  |
| 12 |   |  |
| 13 |   |  |
| 14 |   |  |
| 15 |   |  |
| 16 |   |  |
| 17 |   |  |
| 18 |   |  |
| 19 |   |  |
| 20 |   |  |
| 21 |   |  |
| 22 |   |  |
| 23 |   |  |
| 24 |   |  |
| 25 |   |  |
| 26 |   |  |
| 27 |   |  |
| 28 |   |  |
|    | 2   |  |