8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10	
DARON MICHAEL OLIVER,	No. 2:18-CV-1809-KJM-DMC-P
Plaintiff,	
v.	<u>ORDER</u>
DUANE SHELTON, et al.,	
Defendants.	
	I
Plaintiff, a prisoner proceeding pro se, brings this civil rights action pursuant to	
42 U.S.C. § 1983. Pending before the court is plaintiff's request for leave to file an amended	
19 complaint (ECF No. 42).	
On August 8, 2019, the court issued an order addressing the status of the pleadings	
in this case in the context of defendants' then-pending motion to dismiss plaintiff's first amended	
complaint. See ECF No. 41. The court noted at footnote 1: "The first amended complaint was	
filed with leave of court following the court's ruling on defendants' motion to dismiss plaintiff's	
original complaint. See ECF No. 31 (April 23, 2019, district judge order granting defendants'	
25 motion to dismiss and directing plaintiff to file a first amended complaint)." The court also	
26 noted: "This action, however, now proceeds on a superseding pleading, specifically a second	
amended complaint filed as of right on June 17, 2019 (ECF No. 36). See Fed. R. Civ. P.	
	DARON MICHAEL OLIVER, Plaintiff, V. DUANE SHELTON, et al., Defendants. Plaintiff, a prisoner proceeding 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Pending before the court is complaint (ECF No. 42). On August 8, 2019, the court is in this case in the context of defendants' thencomplaint. See ECF No. 41. The court noted filed with leave of court following the court's original complaint. See ECF No. 31 (April 23, motion to dismiss and directing plaintiff to file noted: "This action, however, now proceeds or

15(a)(1)(A), (B)." The court also struck from the record a third amended complaint filed without

leave of court. See ECF No. 41, pg. 2.

In his current request for leave to amend, plaintiff states he "need to add new defendants," see id., but does not say who the new defendants are, what his factual allegations against these new defendants are, or how they relate to the current pleading. As discussed above, leave of court is required to further amend because plaintiff's second amended complaint filed as of right. Plaintiff's current one-page, conclusory request simply fails to demonstrate good cause for a court order permitting leave to amend.

The court will sua sponte extend the time for defendants to respond to plaintiff's second amended complaint.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Plaintiff's request for leave to amend (ECF No. 42) is denied; and

DENNIS M. COTA

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

2. Defendants shall file a response to plaintiff's second amended complaint within 30 days of the date of this order.

Dated: August 29, 2019