

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

LOUREECE STONE CLARK,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
DELL FARINAS, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. 2:17-cv-0727 JAM DB P

ORDER

On July 18, 2018, the District Court judge assigned to this matter adopted the findings and recommendations issued on June 19, 2018. (See ECF Nos. 11, 12, 13). As a result, the matter was dismissed for failure to obey a court order, and the case was closed. (ECF No. 12).

On July 27, 2018, plaintiff filed a motion to vacate the judgment. (ECF No. 14). The motion, a forty-five page tome, is unintelligible and is completely unrelated to the claims in plaintiff’s original complaint which was dismissed because he failed to amend it in a timely manner.<sup>1</sup> (Compare ECF No. 1, with ECF No. 14).


---

<sup>1</sup> In addition, the record indicates that the dismissal order was twice returned to the court in August 2018 as “undeliverable, not in custody” and as “unable to forward.” It appears that plaintiff has failed to comply with Local Rule 183(b), which requires that a party appearing in propria persona inform the court of any address change. More than sixty-three days have passed since the first court order was returned by the postal service, and plaintiff has failed to notify the court of a current address.

1 To the extent that the court could construe the motion as an amended complaint, an  
2 amended complaint must not force the court and the defendants to guess at what is being alleged  
3 against whom. See McHenry v. Renne, 84 F.3d 1172, 1177 (9th Cir. 1996) (affirming dismissal  
4 of a complaint where the district court was “literally guessing as to what facts support the legal  
5 claims being asserted against certain defendants”). The amended complaint must not require the  
6 court to spend its time “preparing the ‘short and plain statement’ which Rule 8 obligated plaintiffs  
7 to submit.” Id. at 1180. Moreover, plaintiff may not change the nature of this suit by alleging  
8 new, unrelated claims. See George v. Smith, 507 F.3d 605, 607 (7th Cir. 2007).

9 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff’s motion to vacate the judgment,  
10 filed July 27, 2018 (ECF No. 14) is DENIED.

11 Dated: February 19, 2019

12  
13  
14   
15 DEBORAH BARNES  
16 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
DLB:13  
DB/ORDERS/ORDERS.PRISONER.CIVIL RIGHTS/clar0727.vac.mtn.den