

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  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

VIRGINIA REEDER,	)	Civil No. 07-CV-362-L(LSP)
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	<b>ORDER DISMISSING ACTION</b>
	)	<b>WITHOUT PREJUDICE and</b>
v.	)	<b>GRANTING LEAVE TO FILE AN</b>
	)	<b>AMENDED COMPLAINT</b>
JOHN KNAPIK DBA K/MONT	)	
CONSTRUCTION, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

On February 26, 2007, Virginia Reeder, who is listed as plaintiff and is appearing *pro se*, submitted a complaint that was signed only by Willie James Washington, as having power of attorney for Virginia Reeder. A non-attorney cannot represent a *pro se* litigant. *See Johns v. County of San Diego*, 114 F.3d 874, 876 (9th Cir.1997) ("While a non-attorney may appear *pro se* on his own behalf, he has no authority to appear as an attorney for others than himself."). Accordingly, the Court will dismiss the current complaint and grant Virginia Reeder leave to file an amended complaint which she signs.

If Virginia Reeder chooses to continue to pursue this action by filing an amended complaint, plaintiff is advised that she must set forth the grounds upon which the court's jurisdiction depends. Moreover, any amended complaint must include clear and concise factual allegations describing the events which underlie plaintiff's claims. *See* Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8. In addition, plaintiff is informed that the court cannot refer to a prior pleading in

1 order to make any amended complaint complete. An amended complaint must be complete in  
2 itself without reference to any prior pleading. This is because an amended complaint supersedes  
3 the original complaint. *See Loux v. Rhay*, 375 F.2d 55, 57 (9th Cir.1967). Once a plaintiff files  
4 an amended complaint, the original complaint no longer serves any function in the case.  
5 Therefore, in an amended complaint, as in an original complaint, each claim and the involvement  
6 of each defendant must be sufficiently alleged. Any amended pleading which fails to provide  
7 the necessary factual description as to each defendant will likely be dismissed.

8 Further, it is not clear from the complaint whether Virginia Reeder is attempting to  
9 remove an action from the state court. The complaint states: "That Plaintiff seeks to remove the  
10 pending civil small claims petition to the United States District Court based on the amount of  
11 damages exceeding \$50,000."<sup>1</sup> (Complaint at 4). A plaintiff cannot remove an action to federal  
12 court; only a defendant may seek removal. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1446(a):

13 A defendant or defendants desiring to remove any civil action or criminal  
14 prosecution from a State court shall file in the district court of the United States for  
15 the district and division within which such action is pending a notice of removal  
16 signed pursuant to Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and containing  
17 a short and plain statement of the grounds for removal, together with a copy of all  
18 process, pleadings, and orders served upon such defendant or defendants in such  
19 action.

17 If Virginia Reeder is attempting to remove an action from the state court in which she is a named  
18 defendant, she must follow the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure notwithstanding her *pro se*  
19 status.

20 Finally, Virginia Reeder names several private individuals as defendants in this purported  
21

---

22 <sup>1</sup> It is also not clear if Virginia Reeder intends to bring this action or remove the  
23 action on the basis of original jurisdiction or diversity jurisdiction given her statement that  
24 damages are in excess of \$50,000. "The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of all civil  
25 actions arising under the Constitution, laws or treaties of the United States." 28 U.S.C. § 1331.  
26 Additionally, a federal court has jurisdiction over an action involving citizens of different states  
27 and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000.00. 28 U.S.C. § 1332. The diversity statute  
28 must be strictly construed. *Kantor v. Wellesley Galleries, Ltd.*, 704 F.2d 1088, 1092 (9th Cir.  
1983). The citizenship of all defendants, whether or not they have been served with the  
complaint, determines if complete diversity exists. *Clarence E. Morris, Inc. v. Vitek*, 412 F.2d  
1174, 1176 (9th Cir. 1969); *accord Pecherski v. General Motors Corp.*, 636 F.2d 1156, 1160  
(8th Cir. 1981). The party seeking to invoke the court's original or diversity jurisdiction bears  
the burden of establishing that jurisdiction exists. *Gaus v. Miles, Inc.*, 980 F.2d 564, 566 (9th  
Cir. 1992).

1 civil rights complaint. A § 1983 plaintiff must demonstrate a deprivation of a right secured by  
2 the Constitution or laws of the United States, and that the defendant acted under color of state  
3 law. *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48, 108 S. Ct. 2250 (1988). Thus, a § 1983 action is generally  
4 not applicable to private parties. Plaintiff is cautioned to determine whether there is some legal  
5 basis for asserting a § 1983 claim against private parties if she seeks to amend the complaint to  
6 name private individuals.

7 Based on the foregoing, **IT IS ORDERED** dismissing the complaint without prejudice.  
8 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** granting leave to file an amended complaint within 30 days of  
9 the filing of this Order. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the failure to file an amended  
10 complaint which complies with this order within the time provided will result in this action be  
11 closed.

12 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

13 DATED: February 28, 2007

14   
15 M. James Lorenz  
United States District Court Judge

16 COPY TO:

17 HON. LEO S. PAPAS  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

18 ALL PARTIES/COUNSEL  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28