Huffman v. Allred, et al Doc. 248

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 11-cv-01459-CMA-KLM

LORAL HUFFMAN,

Plaintiff,

٧.

DR. ALLRED,
DR. CARTER,
SANCHEZ, Case Manager,
DERR, Unit Manager,
JOHN DOE, Mailroom Supervisor,
JANE DOE, Food Supervisor,
BUCKNER, Investigator,
LINCOLN, D.H.O., and
CRANK, Trust Manager,

Defendants.

MINUTE ORDER

ENTERED BY MAGISTRATE JUDGE KRISTEN L. MIX

This matter is before the Court on a letter from Plaintiff, filed by the Clerk's Office as a "Motion to Reinstate Bureau of Prisons as a Defendant" [Docket No. 246; Filed June 18, 2012] (the "Motion"). There is no clearly stated request for relief in the Motion; however, the Court interprets the Motion as a request to add the Federal Bureau of Prisons as a defendant in this matter. However, Plaintiff again does not state any supportive factual allegations, and does not include a proposed Second Amended Complaint with his Motion. See [#237]. On October 20, 2011, the District Judge dismissed the BOP as "immune from monetary liability." [#65] at 3. Plaintiff presents no authority to the contrary.

If Plaintiff is seeking leave to file a Second Amended Prisoner Complaint, he must file a motion which complies with the applicable federal and local rules and which includes the proposed Second Amended Prisoner Complaint stating all claims Plaintiff seeks to pursue as a document separate from the motion. The Court will not permit the adjudication of this case in piecemeal fashion. Plaintiff, as a *pro se* litigant, is required to follow the same rules of procedure that govern all litigants in this District. *Nielson v. Price*, 17 F.3d 1276, 1277 (10th Cir. 1994). Any proposed Second Amended Prisoner Complaint which does not comply with this Minute Order will be summarily stricken. Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY **ORDERED** that the Motion is **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

Dated: June 19, 2012