

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO  
Magistrate Judge Boyd N. Boland

Civil Action No. 11-cv-02336-LTB-BNB

BRENDA PATTERSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

DEX MEDIA, INC., a Delaware corporation,  
n/k/a Dex Media East, inc., a Delaware corporation,

Defendant.

---

**ORDER**

---

This matter arises on the plaintiff's **Motion Request to Amend My Complaint . . . .**  
[Doc. #21, filed 11/14/2011] (the "Motion"). The Motion is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED  
IN PART.

The plaintiff seeks leave to amend her Complaint. She states that she is "unaware of how  
to submit an amendment with the Courts, in the proper format and follow appropriate []  
procedure to amend my complaint." *Motion*, ¶ 6. However, I recently issued an order wherein I  
explained the procedure:

[T]he plaintiff must either obtain consent from the defendant or  
file a motion seeking leave of court to amend her Complaint. The  
plaintiff may not amend her Complaint by simply including what  
appear to be amended claims in the Papers. Rather, she must  
include with her motion the entire proposed amended complaint.  
Because she is proceeding *pro se*, the proposed amended  
complaint must be submitted on the court's standardized form.  
D.C.COLO.LCivR 8.1A. The plaintiff may not incorporate by  
reference her original Complaint into the proposed amended  
complaint. The proposed amended complaint must stand alone; it  
must contain all of the plaintiff's claims. Mink v. Suthers, 482

F.3d 1244, 1254 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2007) (stating that “an amended complaint supercedes an original complaint and renders the original complaint without legal effect”).

*Order issued October 27, 2011* [Doc. #18], pp. 2-3.

The plaintiff has not attached a proposed amended complaint to her motion to amend. Therefore, the motion to amend is denied without prejudice, subject to compliance with Rule 15, Fed. R. Civ. P.; Rule 8.1, D.C.COLO.LCivR; and my order of October 27, 2011.

The plaintiff also requests that the court cease serving papers on her former attorneys. This request is granted. Accordingly,

**IT IS ORDERED:**

1. The plaintiff’s request to amend her Complaint is DENIED without prejudice subject to compliance with Rule 15, Fed. R. Civ. P.; Rule 8.1, D.C.COLO.LCivR; and my order of October 27, 2011;
2. The Clerk of the Court shall cause the plaintiff’s former attorneys to be removed from the service list; and
3. In the future, titles to all motions shall not exceed ten words.

Dated November 17, 2011.

**BY THE COURT:**

s/ Boyd N. Boland  
United States Magistrate Judge