

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
28UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIAADIL HIRAMANЕК, *et al.*,

No. C-13-0228 EMC

Plaintiffs,

v.

**ORDER RE PLAINTIFFS' MOTION
FOR CLARIFICATION**L. MICHAEL CLARK, *et al.*,

Defendants.

The Court has received an e-mail (see attached) from Plaintiff Adil Hirananeк which it construes as a motion for clarification.

Previously, the Court ordered the U.S. Marshal to serve the amended complaint filed by Mr. Hirananeк and his mother, Roda Hirananeк, on the Superior Court and Judge Clark. The Court also instructed Plaintiffs not to file any motion, including a motion for leave to file a second amended complaint, until after the Superior Court and Judge Clark made an appearance in the case and the case management conference was held on November 21, 2013. *See* Docket No. 39 (Order at 12). The case management conference has now been rescheduled for December 12, 2013. *See* Docket No. 52 (clerk's notice). Mr. Hirananeк now seeks clarification as to whether he is barred from filing a motion for leave to file a second amended complaint now that the Superior Court and Judge Clark have filed a motion to dismiss.

The Court hereby clarifies that both Mr. Hirananeк and Ms. Hirananeк are barred from filing a motion for leave to file a second amended complaint until after the case management conference is held on December 12, 2013. To the extent Mr. Hirananeк suggests he is allowed to


1 amend his complaint because the Superior Court and Judge Clark have filed a motion to dismiss, the
2 Court does not agree. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15 allows for a *single* amendment as a matter
3 of course. Plaintiffs have effectively been given that amendment when the Court dismissed the
4 original complaint filed by Plaintiffs and allowed them to file an amended complaint.

5 To the extent Mr. Hiranamek contends that the Court's order barring him and his mother
6 from filing a motion for leave to amend prejudices him or his mother,¹ he has not made out a
7 sufficient showing of prejudice. Mr. Hiranamek suggests that, if Plaintiffs cannot amend, then their
8 new claim or claims will be barred by the statute of limitations, but he points to no specific claims
9 that Plaintiffs wish to add and that may be time barred unless the Court lifts the bar against them.

10 Accordingly, the Court reaffirms its prior ruling. The Court also notes that, at the hearing on
11 the Superior Court and Judge Clark's motion to dismiss (which is also set for December 12, 2013),
12 Plaintiffs are free to make any argument as why they should be given leave to amend, should the
13 Court be inclined to grant the motion to dismiss.

14
15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16
17 Dated: November 13, 2013

18 
19 EDWARD M. CHEN
20 United States District Judge

21
22
23
24
25
26
27 _____
28 ¹ Technically, Mr. Hiranamek does not have standing to make any argument on behalf of Ms.
Hiranamek, his mother. Furthermore, Mr. Hiranamek is not an attorney and therefore cannot make
arguments on her behalf in a representative capacity.