

Northern District of California

United States District Court

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JOHNNY ANDREW MOORE,

Plaintiff,

v.

S. HATTON, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 20-01445 BLF (PR)

ORDER SUA SPONTE GRANTING EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE AMENDED COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, a California inmate, filed a *pro se* complaint in Monterey County Superior Court, which Defendants removed to this Court under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1441(a), 1446(b). Dkt. No. 1. On July 7, 2020, the Court granted Defendants' request to screen the complaint, dismissed the Eighth Amendment deliberate indifference claim as barred by res judicata, and dismissed the First Amendment retaliation claim with leave to amend. Dkt. No. 7 at 3-4. Plaintiff was directed to file an amended complaint within twenty-eight days from the date the order was filed. *Id.* at 4. Plaintiff was also advised that in the alternative, he may file notice in the same time provided that he wishes to strike all the federal claims from this action and have the matter remanded back to state court to pursue the sole state law claim for intentional infliction of emotional distress. *Id.* at 5.

To date, Plaintiff has filed nothing in this matter. However, the Court notes that

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

Plaintiff filed two motions requesting an extension of time "to prepa[re] response to order granting motion for dismissal with leave to amend complaint" in a different case which is closed. See Moore v. Hatton, et al., Case No. 17-03696 BLF (PR), Dkt. Nos. 35, 38. Apparently, Plaintiff has his case numbers confused. Accordingly, in the interest of justice, the Court will sua sponte grant Plaintiff an extension of time to file an amended complaint in this matter.

Within twenty-eight (28) days from the date this order is filed, Plaintiff shall file an amended complaint using the court's form complaint to attempt to state sufficient facts to state a First Amendment retaliation claim. The amended complaint must include the caption and civil case number used in this order, i.e., Case No. C 20-01445 BLF (PR), and the words "AMENDED COMPLAINT" on the first page. Plaintiff must not make any reference to Case No. 17-03696 BLF, which is a closed matter, to avoid any further delays in this matter. Plaintiff must answer all the questions on the form in order for the action to proceed. Plaintiff is reminded that the amended complaint supersedes the original, and Plaintiff may not make references to the original complaint. Claims not included in the amended complaint are no longer claims and defendants not named in an amended complaint are no longer defendants. See Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1262 (9th Cir.1992).

Failure to respond in accordance with this order by filing an amended complaint in the time provided will result in the dismissal of this action without prejudice and without further notice to Plaintiff.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 9, 2020

United States District Judge

Order Granting EOT to File Am. Compl. PRO-SE\BLF\CR.20\01445Moore eot-ac