3 4 5

1

2

7

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

1516

17

19

18

21

20

22

24

25

26

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DARRELL JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-10-0699 GGH P

VS.

WARDEN MARTEL, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis He seeks relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

On July 13, 2010, the court issued a screening order where plaintiff's amended complaint was dismissed with leave to file a second amended complaint within twenty-eight days. The court outlined the deficiencies in plaintiff's amended complaint and set forth what would be required in a second amended complaint. On July 29, 2010, plaintiff filed a response to the court's July 13, 2010, screening order. To the extent this response could be construed as a second amended complaint, it is entirely insufficient. Plaintiff must still file a second amended complaint as described in the court's July 13, 2010 screening order.

Plaintiff is reminded that the court cannot refer to a prior pleading in order to make plaintiff's amended complaint complete. Local Rule 220 requires that an amended

complaint be complete in itself without reference to any prior pleading. This is because, as a general rule, an amended complaint supersedes the original complaint. See Loux v. Rhay, 375 F.2d 55, 57 (9th Cir. 1967). Once plaintiff files an amended complaint, the original pleading no longer serves any function in the case. Therefore, in an amended complaint, as in an original complaint, each claim and the involvement of each defendant must be sufficiently alleged.

In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff must file a second amended complaint within twenty-eight days from the date of service of this order. Failure to file a second amended complaint will result in this action being dismissed..

DATED: August 23, 2010

/s/ Gregory G. Hollows

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

GGH: AB john699.ord