

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 14-cv-00391-MEH

CURTIS GUION,

Plaintiff,

v.

SPURLOCK, Correctional Officer, in his official and individual capacities,
GILBERT, Correctional Officer, in his official and individual capacities,
CUTCHER, Sergeant, in his official and individual capacities,
GROOMS, Correctional Officer, in his official and individual capacities,
Z. MAHER, Correctional Officer, in his official and individual capacities,
CASADY, Correctional Officer, in his official and individual capacities,
WHITE, Correctional Officer, in his official and individual capacities,
TRUJILLO, Correctional Officer, in his official and individual capacities,
BARBERO, Captain, in his official and individual capacities,
TRAVIS TRANI, Warden, in his official and individual capacities,
BROWN, Correctional Officer, in his official and individual capacities,
P. ARCHULETA, Correctional Officer, in his official and individual capacities,
MONTROYA, Correctional Officer, in his official and individual capacities,
MORRIS, in his official and individual capacities,
BENSKO, Correctional Officer, in his official and individual capacities,
D. RAYMOND, Sergeant, in his official and individual capacities,
S. FOSTER, Associate Warden, in his official and individual capacities,
SOLANO, Correctional Officer, in his official and individual capacities,
J.R. ADAMS, Correctional Officer, in his official and individual capacities,
BUTERO, Sergeant, in his official and individual capacities, and
MAHONEY, Correctional Officer, in his official and individual capacities,

Defendants.

MINUTE ORDER

Entered by Michael E. Hegarty, United States Magistrate Judge, on May 27, 2014.

Plaintiff's Motion for Civil Order of Protection, construed by the Court as a motion for temporary restraining order [[filed February 11, 2014; docket #4](#)] is **denied without prejudice**. The motion was filed contemporaneously with the original complaint in this action, which has been since amended and substantially modified. First, Plaintiff was ordered to, and filed, an Amended Complaint on April 10, 2014. Then, on initial review of the Amended Complaint, Senior Judge Babcock dismissed several claims and Defendants; accordingly, the pleading on which the present

motion relies has been substantially modified and superceded. Therefore, if the Plaintiff wishes to re-file his motion, he must do so based only on the Amended Complaint as it has been modified by the Court.