For the Northern District of California

Gall v. City Of San Jose

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

Timothy Gall,

City of San Jose,

Defendant.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN JOSE DIVISION No. C 08-00120 JW Plaintiff, ORDER CONSTRUING PLAINTIFF'S FILING AS A MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AN AMENDED COMPLAINT; REQUESTING RESPONSE FROM DEFENDANT

Presently before the Court is a filing by Plaintiff entitled, "Complaint Amendment and Proposed Order." (See Docket Item No. 24.) Plaintiff states that he would like to "amend the original complaint to include" certain claims. In light of Plaintiff's pro se status, the Court liberally construes this filing as a Motion for Leave to File an Amended Complaint.

Ruled 15(a) provides that a party may amend his pleading once as a matter of course at any time before a responsive pleading is served. Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a). However, when a party can no longer amend a pleading as a matter of right under Rule 15(a), the party must either petition the court for leave to amend or obtain consent from the adverse parties. Id.; Keniston v. Roberts, 717 F.2d 1295, 1300 (9th Cir. 1983).

On February 21, 2008, Defendant filed an Answer to Plaintiff's original Complaint. (See Docket Item No. 8.) Defendant's Answer is a responsive pleading within the meaning of Rule 15(a). Thus, Plaintiff must either obtain consent from Defendant or seek leave of Court before filing an Amended Complaint. Here, Plaintiff has done neither. However, in light of Plaintiff's pro se status,

Doc. 38

United States District Court For the Northern District of California

27

28

1	the Court treats Plaintiff's motion as a motion for leave to file an amended complaint. To avoid		
2	prejudice to Defendant, the Court will give Defendant an opportunity to respond.		
3	Accordingly, on or before October 15, 2008, Defendant shall file its Opposition, if any, to		
4	Plaintiff's motion for leave to file an amended complaint. The matter is taken under submission		
5	without oral argument. See Civ. L.R. 7-1(b).		
6	O(4)		
7	Dated: October 2, 2008 JAMES WARE JAMES WARE		
8	United States District Judge		
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
2425			
26			

United States District Court For the Northern District of California

28

1	THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT COPIES OF THIS ORDER HAVE BEEN DELIVERED TO		
2	Clifford S. Greenberg cao.main@sanjosec	a.gov	
3	Timothy L Gall 15435 La Jolla Drive		
4			
5			
6	Dated: October 2, 2008	Richard W. Wieking, Clerk	
7		Rv. /s/ IW Chambars	
8		By: <u>/s/ JW Chambers</u> Elizabeth Garcia Courtroom Deputy	
9		Court oom Deputy	
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			