

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 12-cv-00489-CMA-KLM

JOSE MEDINA ESCOBAR,

Plaintiff,

v.

ASSOCIATE WARDEN S. FOSTER,
DEPUTY DIRECTOR L. REID,
MAJOR L. MAIFELD,
LIEUTENANT L. TRAVIS,
LIEUTENANT TEDEMANN,
LIEUTENANT BURKE,
CAPTAIN PADILLA,
CAPTAIN D. WILLIAMS,
SERGEANT MARQUEZ,
SERGEANT MONTGOMERY,
SERGEANT KELEMAN,
SERGEANT HAWKINS,
SERGEANT FRETWELL,
C/O CALDARONELLO,
C/O P. ARCHULETA,
C/O ALANIS,
C/O AURITI,
C/O SAUCIDO,
C/O KITCHEN,
C/O S. HARTUNG,
C/O MONTANEZ,
C/O B. TETRICK, and
C/O VERSTEEGH,

Defendants.

MINUTE ORDER

ENTERED BY MAGISTRATE JUDGE KRISTEN L. MIX

This matter is before the Court on **Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave to Amend** [Docket No. 18; Filed April 9, 2012] (the “Motion”).

IT IS HEREBY **ORDERED** that the Motion is **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**. Although Plaintiff proceeds *pro se* in this matter, he is obligated to comply with the same rules of procedure that govern all litigants. See *Green v. Dorrell*, 969 F.2d 915, 917 (10th Cir. 1992). Plaintiff cites to Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a) in support of his request; however, the Court construes Plaintiff's Motion as seeking permission to file a supplemental pleading, thus the Court finds that Rule 15(d) is the applicable Rule. Although Rule 15(d) permits the filing of supplemental pleadings "on just terms," the Court finds that just terms are not present at this early stage of the case. If Plaintiff seeks to add claims regarding events occurring after the filing of his Complaint [#1], which is the operative pleading, Plaintiff must submit one proposed Amended Complaint for the Court's review, in the interests of judicial efficiency and clarity of the docket.

Dated: April 10, 2012