



1 to correct the mistake.

2 Plaintiff is reminded that his first amended complaint should be brief, Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a),  
3 but it must state what each named defendant did that led to the deprivation of Plaintiff's  
4 constitutional rights, *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678–79 (2009). Although accepted as true,  
5 the “[f]actual allegations must be [sufficient] to raise a right to relief above the speculative  
6 level . . . .” *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (citations omitted).

7 Additionally, Plaintiff may not change the nature of this suit by adding new, unrelated  
8 claims in his first amended complaint. *George v. Smith*, 507 F.3d 605, 607 (7th Cir. 2007) (no  
9 “buckshot” complaints).

10 Finally, Plaintiff is advised that an amended complaint supersedes the original complaint.  
11 *Lacey v. Maricopa Cty.*, 693 F.3d 896, 927 (9th Cir. 2012). Therefore, Plaintiff's amended  
12 complaint must be “complete in itself without reference to the prior or superseded pleading.”  
13 Local Rule 220.

14 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 15 1. Plaintiff's response to screening order, (ECF No. 9), is CONSTRUED as a motion for  
16 extension of time;
- 17 2. Plaintiff's motion for extension of time, (ECF No. 9), is GRANTED;
- 18 3. Within **thirty (30) days** from the date of service of this order, Plaintiff shall file a first  
19 amended complaint curing the deficiencies identified by the Court's March 4, 2024  
20 screening order (or file a notice of voluntary dismissal); and
- 21 4. **If Plaintiff fails to comply with this order, this action will be dismissed, with**  
22 **prejudice, for failure to obey a court order and for failure to state a claim.**

23  
24 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25 Dated: March 26, 2024

25 /s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe  
26 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE