1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 LEROY DALE HOLSEY, No. 2:13-cv-0962 KJM GGH P 12 Petitioner. 13 v. **ORDER** 14 WILLIAM KNIPP, 15 Respondent. 16 17 A joint scheduling statement in this matter was filed on August 8, 2013, pursuant to the 18 court's order filed July 15, 2013. Subsequently, petitioner filed an amended petition which seeks 19 to supplement the "existing petition" and incorporates by reference all the claims and arguments 20 presented in the "existing petition." 21 A review of the original petition and the supplemental or amended petition indicates that 22 new claims have been added to the supplemental petition that were not raised in the initial 23 petition. The court cannot refer to a prior pleading in order to make plaintiff's amended 24 complaint complete. Local Rule 220 requires that an amended petition be complete in itself without reference to any prior pleading. This is because, as a general rule, an amended petition 25 26 supersedes the original petition. See Forsyth v. Humana, Inc., 114 F.3d 1467, 1474 (9th 27 Cir.1997), overruled in part on other grounds, Lacey v. Maricopa County, 693 F.3d 896, 928 (9th

Cir. 2012) (en banc). Once plaintiff files an amended petition, the original pleading no longer

28

26

27

28