

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 14-cv-01860-MSK-KLM

SUMMER R. COLBY, and  
JAMES R. COLBY,

Plaintiffs,

v.

DISTRICT COURT OF FREMONT COUNTY,  
MICHAEL HERRICK, Brand Inspector,  
COLORADO BRANDING COMMISSION, and  
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,

Defendants.

---

MINUTE ORDER

---

ENTERED BY MAGISTRATE JUDGE KRISTEN L. MIX

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiffs' **Motion for Leave of Court to Re-plead and Amend Petition** [#32] (the "Motion").

IT IS HEREBY **ORDERED** that the Motion [#32] is **DENIED without prejudice**. If Plaintiffs, who proceed in this matter pro se, are seeking leave to file a Second Amended Complaint, they must file a motion which complies with the federal and local rules, namely, Fed. R. Civ. P. 15, and which includes the proposed Second Amended Complaint as a document separate from the Motion. The Court will not permit piecemeal adjudication of Plaintiffs' case; thus Plaintiffs must include all claims they seek to bring and defendants they intend to name in the proposed Second Amended Complaint. The Second Amended Complaint must set forth "what each defendant did to [them], when each defendant did it, how each defendant's action harmed [them], what specific legal right each defendant violated, and what remedy [they] seek[ ] for each violation." *Nasious v. Two Unknown B.I.C.E. Agents*, 492 F.3d 1158, 1163 (10th Cir. 2007); *Lazarov v. Kimmel*, No. 10-cv-01238-CMA, 2010 WL 2301749 (D. Colo. June 8, 2010).

Dated: October 3, 2014