**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
**FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **RUFUS EDWARD JONES,** | ) | |
| | ) | |
| | ) | |
| **Plaintiff,** | ) | |
| | ) | |
| **vs.** | ) | **CIVIL NO. 16-cv-00386-SMY** |
| | ) | |
| **SPARTA CMTY. HOSPITAL,** | ) | |
| **SA GODINEZ,** | ) | |
| **CHARLENE JONES,** | ) | |
| **FLAGG,** | ) | |
| **AUSTIN,** | ) | |
| **WAGGONER,** | ) | |
| **CITY OF SPARTA ILL.,** | ) | |
| **ANDY DAHLEM,** | ) | |
| **ANDY REEL,** | ) | |
| **GARY STEELE,** | ) | |
| **DANIEL HANNA,** | ) | |
| **JEREMY WALKER,** | ) | |
| **DAVID SMITH,** | ) | |
| **JAMES KELLY, and** | ) | |
| **CRYSTAL DOE,** | ) | |
| | ) | |
| **Defendants.** | ) | |

# MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

**YANDLE, District Judge:**

This action came before the Court on Plaintiff Rufus Jones's Complaint filed April 7, 2016 (Doc. 1). On June 1, 2016, the Court dismissed the Complaint for failure to state a claim and ordered Jones to file an amended complaint within 35 days (by July 7, 2016) (Doc. 5). In its June 1st Order the Court clearly stated that in order to proceed on his claims Jones would need to tender additional information to identify specifically how each individual defendant violated his rights (Doc. 5 at 2-4). The Order instructed that Jones's claims need not be artfully pled, but that he did need to make more than bare conclusory legal allegations to state a sufficient claim (*Id.*).

In the June 1, 2016 Order, the Court expressly notified Jones that it was not acceptable to file piecemeal amendments or additions to his original complaint, and that the original complaint would be dismissed in its entirety (Doc. 5 at 6-7). The Order also expressly warned Jones that failure to file an amended complaint, captioned "First Amended Complaint," would result in dismissal of his action with prejudice (*Id.*). Despite the Court's guidance, Jones failed to provide any additional information of the kind the Court clearly outlined. In fact, Jones's First Amended Complaint is a nearly a verbatim recitation of his original complaint—though the Court notes that he has shuffled the order of the paragraphs such that they appear in a different order than before (Docs. 1, 5). The Court now dismisses Jones's action for failure to comply with an order of this Court, and thus for failure to state a plausible claim for relief. In light of the insufficiency of Jones's filings, and his failure to comply with the Court's order, the Court has rendered the following decision:

**IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** this action is **DISMISSED**. **Dismissal is with prejudice**. The Clerk of the Court is DIRECTED to enter Judgment in favor of the Defendants and against Plaintiff Jones.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**DATED: December 6, 2016**

**s/ STACI M. YANDLE**
**U.S. District Judge**