

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO  
**Magistrate Judge Kathleen M. Tafoya**

Civil Action No. 10-cv-00487-CMA-KMT

MARK BAKER, and  
MELISSA BAKER,

Plaintiffs,

v.

PROFESSIONAL FINANCE COMPANY, INC.,  
TRANSUNION LLC,  
EQUIFAX INC.,  
EQUIFAX INFORMATION SERVICES, LLC,  
EXPERIAN INFORMATION SOLUTIONS, INC.,

Defendants.

---

**ORDER**

---

This matter is before the court on Plaintiffs' "Motion (Opposed?) to Add Two Party Defendants" (Doc. No. 83, filed July 9, 2010).

To the extent Plaintiffs are seeking to amend their Amended Complaint pursuant to Fed.

R. Civ. P. 15, this court has already advised Plaintiffs that

when seeking leave of the court to amend a complaint, the motion to amend must detail the proposed amendments and the reasons why such amendments are necessary. In addition, the plaintiff must attach the proposed amended complaint to the motion. The proposed amended complaint must stand alone; it must contain all of the plaintiff's claims.

(See Order, Doc. No. 74, entered June 21, 2010.)

Here, Plaintiffs again only barely describe the proposed amendments. Additionally, Plaintiffs have not attached a proposed amended complaint to their Motion. To the extent Plaintiffs have attached an “Amended Complaint for Damages” (Doc. No. 86–1) to their “Motion to Amend Complaint” (Doc. No. 86, filed July 9, 2010), the court notes that the parties Plaintiffs seeks to add as defendants in its present Motion, Amaesing Credit Solutions, LLC and Landsafe Credit, Inc., are not featured in the caption, nor are any allegations against these proposed defendants featured in that proposed Amended Complaint. As a result, it is impossible to determine if the proposed amendments are permissible. Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that Plaintiffs’ “Motion (Opposed?) to Add Two Party Defendants” (Doc. No. 83) is DENIED without prejudice.

Dated this 14th day of July, 2010.

**BY THE COURT:**



---

Kathleen M. Tafoya  
United States Magistrate Judge