

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

| | | |
|--|----------|-----------------------------------|
| <p>JOE BURGOS VEGA, Plaintiff,</p> | <p>:</p> | |
| <p>v.</p> | <p>:</p> | <p>PRISONER CASE NO.</p> |
| <p>M. JODI RELL ET AL., Defendants.</p> | <p>:</p> | <p>3:09-cv-00737 (VLB)</p> |
| | <p>:</p> | <p>August 12, 2009</p> |

RULING ON PLAINTIFF’S MOTION TO AMEND [Doc. #23]

The plaintiff, Joe Burgos Vega, seeks leave to file an amended complaint. The plaintiff did not submit a proposed amended complaint with his motion. For the reasons that follow, the plaintiff’s motion to amend is denied without prejudice.

Amended complaints are governed by Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(2), which provides that “the court should freely give leave [to amend] when justice so requires.” Underlying this rule is an assumption that the amended complaint will clarify or amplify the original cause of action. See Klos v. Haskell, 835 F. Supp. 710, 715 n.3 (W.D.N.Y. 1993).

The plaintiff states that he wishes to include claims against existing defendants that he overlooked when drafting the original complaint. He does not indicate the nature of the claims or specify the defendants to whom the proposed claims relate. Absent this information, the Court cannot determine whether the additional claim would clarify or amplify the original claims.

The plaintiff’s motion to amend [Doc. #23] is DENIED without prejudice.

The plaintiff may refile his motion accompanied by a proposed amended complaint including all claims he wishes to assert in this case and clearly identifying the proposed new claims within 30 days of this order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/

Vanessa L. Bryant
United States District Judge

Dated at Hartford, Connecticut: August 12, 2009.