1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT					
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA					
10	JAMES MCNEIL,					
11	Plaintiff, No. 2:09-cv-1959 JFM (PC)					
12	VS.					
13	TRUST OFFICE RESTITUTION,					
14	Defendant. <u>ORDER</u>					
15	/					
16	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se. On August 6, 2009, plaintiff filed a					
17	motion for leave to amend.					
18	The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provide that a party may amend his or her					
19	pleading "once as a matter of course at any time before a responsive pleading is served." Fed. R.					
20	Civ. P. 15(a). However, an amended or supplemental complaint supersedes the original					
21	complaint. See Loux v. Rhay, 375 F.2d 55, 57 (9th Cir. 1967). Once an amended pleading is					
22	filed, the original pleading no longer serves any function in the case. <u>Id.</u> ; <u>see also</u> E.D. Local					
23	Rule 15-220. Although the allegations of this pro se complaint are held to "less stringent					
24	standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers," <u>Haines v. Kerner</u> , 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972)					
25	(per curiam), plaintiff will be required to comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and					
26	the Local Rules of the Eastern District of California.					
	1					

1

1	If plaintiff chooses to amend the complaint, plaintiff must demonstrate how the				
2	conditions complained of have resulted in a deprivation of plaintiff's constitutional rights. See				
3	Ellis v. Cassidy, 625 F.2d 227 (9th Cir. 1980). Also, the complaint must allege in specific terms				
4	how each named defendant is involved. There can be no liability under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 unless				
5	there is some affirmative link or connection between a defendant's actions and the claimed				
6	deprivation. <u>Rizzo v. Goode</u> , 423 U.S. 362 (1976); <u>May v. Enomoto</u> , 633 F.2d 164, 167 (9th Cir.				
7	1980); Johnson v. Duffy, 588 F.2d 740, 743 (9th Cir. 1978). Furthermore, vague and conclusory				
8	allegations of official participation in civil rights violations are not sufficient. Ivey v. Board of				
9	<u>Regents</u> , 673 F.2d 266, 268 (9th Cir. 1982).				
10	In addition, plaintiff is informed that the court cannot refer to a prior pleading in				
11	order to make plaintiff's amended complaint complete. Local Rule 15-220 requires that an				
12	amended complaint be complete in itself without reference to any prior pleading. This is				
13	because, as a general rule, an amended complaint supersedes the original complaint. See Loux v.				
14	Rhay, 375 F.2d 55, 57 (9th Cir. 1967). Once plaintiff files an amended complaint, the original				
15	pleading no longer serves any function in the case. Therefore, in an amended complaint, as in an				
16	original complaint, each claim and the involvement of each defendant must be sufficiently				
17	alleged.				
18	In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:				
19	1. Within thirty days from the date of this order, plaintiff shall complete the				
20	attached Notice of Amendment and submit the following documents to the court:				
21	a. The completed Notice of Amendment; and				
22	b. An original and one copy of the Amended Complaint.				
23	Plaintiff's amended complaint shall comply with the requirements of the Civil Rights Act, the				
24	Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and the Local Rules of Practice; the amended complaint must				
25	bear the docket number assigned this case and must be labeled "Amended Complaint." If				
26	/////				
	2				

I

1	plaintiff fails to file an amended complaint in accordance with this order, the action will proceed				
2	on plaintiff's original complaint.				
3	DATED: September 8, 2009.				
4	Al I Ma le				
5	UNFIED STATÉS MAGISTRATE JJDGE				
6					
7	/001; mcne1959.10				
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16 17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
	3				

I

1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
10	JAMES MCNEIL,				
11		Plaintiff,	No. 2:09-cv-1959 JFM (PC)		
12	VS.				
13	TRUST OFFIC	E RESTITUTION,	NOTICE OF AMENDMENT		
14		Defendants.			
15			/		
16		Plaintiff hereby submit	ts the following document in compliance with the court's		
17	order filed	:			
18			Amended Complaint		
19	DATED:				
20					
21			Plaintiff		
22	DATED:				
23					
24			UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE		
25					
26					
			4		