

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  
Northern District of California

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

GODWIN GAMELI LADZEKPO,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
M. HRITZ, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. [4:16-cv-01695-KAW](#)

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE TO  
PLAINTIFF**

Re: Dkt. No. 30

On October 28, 2016, the Court granted Defendant’s motion to dismiss with leave to amend. (Dkt. No. 30.) The Court ordered Plaintiff to file a first amended complaint no later than December 16, 2016. *Id.* To date, Plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint.

Accordingly, Plaintiff is ordered to file the first amended complaint on or before **February 17, 2017**, and respond to this ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE by explaining why he did not timely file his amended complaint and why this case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute. The first amended complaint and the response to the order to show cause should be filed separately. Failure to timely respond to this order to show cause and file the first amended complaint may result in this case being dismissed for failure to prosecute.

In amending his complaint, Plaintiff may wish to consult a manual the court has adopted to assist pro se litigants in presenting their case. This manual, and other free information for pro se litigants, is available online at: <http://cand.uscourts.gov/proselitigants>. Plaintiff may also wish to contact the Federal Pro Bono Project's Help Desk—a free service for pro se litigants—by calling (415) 782-8982.

Plaintiff should be aware that an amended complaint will supersede or replace the original complaint, and the original complaint will thereafter be treated as nonexistent. *Armstrong v. Davis*, 275 F.3d 849, 878 n.40 (9th Cir. 2001), abrogated on other grounds by *Johnson v. Cal.*, 543 U.S.

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

499 (2005). The first amended complaint must, therefore, be complete, in itself, without reference to the prior or superseded pleading, as “[a]ll causes of action alleged in an original complaint which are not alleged in an amended complaint are waived.” *King v. Atiyeh*, 814 F.2d 565, 567 (9th Cir. 1987) (citations omitted).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 25, 2017

  
KANDIS A. WESTMORE  
United States Magistrate Judge