

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

RONALD EUGENE JAMES,
Plaintiff,
v.
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:22-cv-02193-DAD-JDP (PC)

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS

(Doc. Nos. 48, 54, 61)

Plaintiff Ronald Eugene James is a county inmate proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On March 12, 2024, the magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations recommending that plaintiff’s motions to supplement the sixth amended complaint (Doc. Nos. 48, 51) be denied without prejudice because plaintiff did not follow the proper procedure for amending a complaint under Local Rule 220. (Doc. No. 61 at 2.) Specifically, plaintiff did not file a proposed seventh amended complaint that was complete in itself. (*Id.*) (citing *Goodbar v. Paldara*, No. 1:21-cv-01811-GSA-PC, 2022 WL 1462142, at *1 (E.D. Cal. May 9, 2022) (“Under Rule 220, Plaintiff may not amend the Complaint by adding new information submitted separately from the Complaint. To add information or make a correction to the Complaint, Plaintiff must file an amended complaint which is complete in itself, without reference to prior

1 complaints. To add his new allegations, Plaintiff must file a First Amended Complaint, complete
2 in itself, incorporating the new allegations.”)).

3 Those pending findings and recommendations were served on plaintiff and contained
4 notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within fourteen (14) days after service. (*Id.* at
5 5.) On March 29, 2024, plaintiff filed objections to the pending findings and recommendations.
6 (Doc. No. 62.) However, plaintiff’s objections do not address the shortcomings of his filings as
7 described in the findings and recommendations.


8 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304, this
9 court has conducted a *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the
10 court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper
11 analysis.

12 Accordingly:

- 13 1. The findings and recommendations issued on March 12, 2024 (Doc. No. 61) are
14 adopted in full; and
- 15 2. Plaintiff’s requests to supplement the sixth amended complaint (Doc Nos. 48, 54)
16 are denied without prejudice.

17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 Dated: June 5, 2024

19 
20 DALE A. DROZD
21 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
22
23
24
25
26
27
28