/////

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA No. 2:12-cv-1518-TLN-EFB P LATHAHN McELROY, Plaintiff, **ORDER** v. GUSTAFSON, Defendant. 

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding without counsel in an action brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. He has filed a motion to supplement his complaint. ECF No. 90. However, he has not filed a proposed supplemental complaint, nor has he adequately explained the changes he would like to make to his complaint. *See id.* (explaining generally that the proposed amendments are to "cure the relief portion of the complaint" and "to bring out evidence . . . which has been suppressed"). Without a proposed supplemental complaint and an explanation for plaintiff's proposed changes to the complaint, the court cannot determine whether leave to supplement in accordance with Rule 15(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure is appropriate. *See also* E.D. Cal, Local Rule 220 (requiring that any motion to amend or supplement "be accompanied by a proposed amended complaint that is rewritten or retyped so that it is complete in itself without reference to any earlier filed complaint.").

Accordingly, it is hereby ordered that plaintiff's motion (ECF No. 90) is denied without prejudice to filing a motion that complies with Local Rule 220 and sets forth a basis for the proposed changes to the complaint. DATED: June 2, 2015. EDMUND F. BRENNAN UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE