(PC) Ortiz v.	Cox et al
1	
2	
3	
4	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
6	ROMAN ORTIZ,
7	Plaintiff, No. 2:10-cv-0351 JFM (PC)
8	VS.
9	COX, et al.,
10	Defendants. <u>ORDER</u>
11	
12	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se. On April 16, 2010, plaintiff's
13	February 10, 2010 complaint was dismissed as to defendants Torres, Popvits and Swarthout, and
14	plaintiff was granted leave to amend his complaint within thirty days of the date of the order. On
15	April 27, 2010, plaintiff filed a notice of filing an amended complaint. However, no amended
16	complaint was filed.
17	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff shall file an amended
18	complaint on or before June 30, 2010. If plaintiff fails to do so, this action will proceed on his
19	February 10, 2010 complaint solely against defendant Cox.
20	DATED: June 14, 2010.
21	10 7 1110 01
22	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
23	CALLED STATES WATCHCARLE SOLDE
24	/014.orti0351.order
25	
26	
	1

Doc. 11