

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

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

STEWART MANAGO,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-11-2891 GGH P

vs.

MATTHEW CATE, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

_____ /

By order, filed on February 16, 2012, plaintiff in this prisoner civil rights action was granted in forma pauperis status and his original complaint was dismissed with leave to amend. In filings dated February 29, 2012, plaintiff filed another complaint and another application to proceed in forma pauperis. These documents were mistakenly filed in the docket of the instant case at docket entry # 8 and entry # 9, respectively. Docket entry # 8 was misconstrued as a first amended complaint. Thereafter, plaintiff filed an amended complaint on March 19, 2012 (docket # 10), in the instant action which was erroneously construed as a second amended complaint.

By notice filed on April 4, 2012, plaintiff points out the docketing error, making clear that his filings and docket # 8 and # 9 should have been filed as a new civil rights action and that the amended complaint at docket # 10 is the amended complaint for this action.

