

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

<p>JAIME C. SANTIAGO, Plaintiff</p> <p style="text-align: center;">v.</p> <p>WHARDEN WHIDDEN, et al., Defendants</p>	<p>:</p> <p>:</p> <p>:</p> <p>:</p> <p>:</p> <p>:</p> <p>:</p>	<p>CASE NO. 3:10-cv-1839 (VLB)</p> <p>July 19, 2011</p>
--	--	---

RULING DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTIONS TO AMEND THE COMPLAINT [DOC. 11,
13, AND 14] AND ORDER TO RE-FILE AN AMENDED COMPLAINT IN
ACCORDANCE WITH THE FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE WITHIN
THIRTY DAYS

The plaintiff has filed three motions to amend his complaint. The first motion included a purported proposed amended complaint. This document, captioned both an amended complaint and a brief on motion for leave to file an amended complaint [Doc. 11], includes legal argument and does not contain a “short and plain statement of the plaintiff’s claim” as required by Rule 8(a)(2), Fed. R. Civ. P. In addition, the plaintiff includes only defendants Whidden, Faneuff and Regan in the case caption, suggesting that he intends to withdraw all claims against the remaining defendants, Dolan and Harrisson. In the second motion, the plaintiff seeks to amend his request for injunctive relief [Doc. 13]. In the third motion, the plaintiff asks to include another claim [Doc. 14]. The plaintiff has not submitted a proposed second amended complaint with the second or

