1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	Northern District of California	
10	San Francisco Division	
11		
12	TADEUSZ WYRZYKOWSKI,	No. C 14-03825 LB
13	Plaintiff,	ORDER (1) DENYING AS MOOT
14	V.	PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO EXTEND TIME, (2) DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
15	COUNTY OF MARIN, et al.,	MOTION TO FILE A SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT, AND (3)
16	Defendants.	DIRECTING PLAINTIFF TO PROVIDE ADDRESSES FOR
17	/	DEFENDANTS
18	On August 22, 2014, Plaintiff Tadeusz Wyrzykowski, who is proceeding pro se, filed a	
19	complaint and an application to proceed in forma pauperis. Complaint, ECF No. 1; IFP Application,	
20	ECF No. 3. ¹ After conducting its review of his complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2), the court	
21	determined that it failed to state a claim. The court was unable to discern any legally cognizable	
22	claim in Plaintiff's complaint. The court noted that Plaintiff listed several laws and legal doctrines	
23	in the caption of the complaint (e.g., violation of his Fourteenth Amendment right to equal	
24	protection under the law; fraud; intentional infliction of emotional distress; etc.) and alleged that	
25	county supervisors, agents, and employees cause	d her damage generally, but Plaintiff did not say
26		

27

ORDER C 14-03825 LB

 ¹ Citations are to the Electronic Case File ("ECF") with pin cites to the ECF-generated page numbers at the top of the document.

11

12

13

14

15

how Defendants violated any of the laws or doctrines mentioned. Therefore, on September 18, 1 2 2014, the court granted Plaintiff's IFP Application, dismissed the complaint without prejudice, see 3 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2); Marks v. Solcum, 98 F.3d 494, 495 (9th Cir. 1996), and gave Plaintiff thirty 4 days from the date of that order in which to file an amended complaint. 9/18/2014 Order, ECF No. 5 6.

6 On October 6, 2014—within the thirty-day deadline—Plaintiff filed a motion to extend the time 7 for filing an amended complaint. Motion to Extend Time, ECF No. 7. Plaintiff said that he 8 experienced a medical emergency that will prevent him from filing an amended complaint for at six 9 more months. Plaintiff thus asked the court to allow him at least six more months to do so, 10 essentially staying the case for at least that period of time.

While the court was reviewing Plaintiff's motion, Plaintiff filed a First Amended Complaint. FAC, ECF No. 8. It provides additional allegation against Defendants, the gist of which are that Defendants failed to apply his tax payments to property that he owns, forced him to pay taxes twice, fraudulently labeled his property as having delinquent taxes, and ignored or wrongfully denied his attempts to dispute the charges. A few days later, Plaintiff filed a motion for leave to file a Second 16 Amended Complaint. Motion for Leave to Amend, ECF No. 9.

17 Without expressing any opinion about the merit of his claims, the court finds that his First 18 Amended Complaint is sufficiently clear to pass the § 1915(e)(2) review. The court also finds good 19 cause to excuse Plaintiff's delay in filing it. To enable the U.S. Marshal to serve Defendants, 20 however, Plaintiff must provide the Clerk of the Court with addresses at which Defendants may be 21 served. Plaintiff is directed to provide these addresses by November 18, 2014. Upon receipt of 22 these addresses, the court will direct the U.S. Marshal to served Defendants with the First Amended 23 Complaint and summons.

24 Because the court has determined that Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint passes the § 25 1915(e)(2) review, the court does not believe that a Second Amended Complaint is warranted at this time. Once Defendants are served with the First Amended Complaint and appear in the action, 26 27 Plaintiff may make this request again. Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion for leave to file a Second 28 Amended Complaint is denied, and Plaintiff's motion to extend the time for filing an amended

ORDER C 14-03825 LB

