

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
SOUTHEASTERN DIVISION**

WILLIAM GRACE,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	No. 1:16-CV-70 SNLJ
	)	
IAN WALLACE, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants,	)	

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on plaintiff's motion to amend and motions for reconsideration. The motions are denied.

Plaintiff moves to amend his complaint to add a claim against defendant James Hurley. To obtain leave to file an amended complaint, "a party must submit the proposed amendment along with its motion." Clayton v. White Hall School Dist., 778 F.2d 457, 460 (8th Cir. 1985); see Wolgin v. Simon, 722 F.2d 389, 395 (8th Cir. 1983) ("Absent some indication as to what might be added to the complaint to make it viable, the [moving party] is not entitled to leave to amend."). Plaintiff did not submit an amended complaint with his motion. So, the motion is denied.

Plaintiff moves the Court to reconsider the dismissal of the supervisory defendants because they were not personally involved in the alleged deprivations of his civil rights. Plaintiff argues that they were personally responsible because they are supervisors and denied his grievances. Plaintiff is incorrect. See Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 676 (2009) ("Because vicarious liability is inapplicable to Bivens and § 1983 suits, a plaintiff must plead that each Government-official defendant, through the official's own individual actions, has violated the


Constitution.”); Camberos v. Branstad, 73 F.3d 174, 176 (8th Cir. 1995) (“a general responsibility for supervising the operations of a prison is insufficient to establish the personal involvement required to support liability.”); George v. Smith, 507 F. 3d 605, 609 (7th Cir. 2007) (“Only persons who cause or participate in the [constitutional] violations are responsible. Ruling against a prisoner on an administrative complaint does not cause or contribute to the violation.”). As a result, the motions are denied.

Accordingly,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that plaintiff’s motion to amend [ECF No. 7] is **DENIED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that plaintiff’s motions for reconsideration [ECF Nos. 12, 13, 14] are **DENIED**.

Dated this 9<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2016.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
STEPHEN N. LIMBAUGH, JR.  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE