

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  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

FELICIA CLARK,  
  
  Plaintiff,  
  
  v.  
  
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, et al.,  
  
  Defendants.

No. 2:15-cv-1211 JAM DB PS

ORDER

This action came before the court on October 21, 2016, for a Status (Pretrial Scheduling) Conference. Plaintiff Felicia Clark appeared on her own behalf. Attorney Jill Nathan appeared telephonically on behalf of the defendants.


Upon consideration of the arguments on file and those made at the hearing, and for the reasons set forth on the record at that hearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff is granted thirty days from the date of this order to file a second amended complaint.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff is again reminded that the court cannot refer to a prior pleading in order to make an amended complaint complete. Local Rule 220 requires that any amended complaint be complete in itself without reference to prior pleadings. The second amended complaint will supersede the amended complaint just as the amended complaint superseded the original complaint. See Loux v. Rhay, 375 F.2d 55, 57 (9th Cir. 1967). Thus, in the second amended complaint, just as if it were the initial complaint filed in the case, each defendant must be listed in the caption and identified in the body of the complaint, and each claim and the involvement of each defendant must be sufficiently alleged. The second amended complaint must also include concise but complete factual allegations describing the conduct and events which underlie plaintiff’s claims.

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  
27  
28

Dated: October 21, 2016



---

DEBORAH BARNES  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DLB:6  
DLB1\orders.pro se\clark1211.oah.102116.ord