

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
EASTERN DIVISION

JARVIS SIMMS,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	No. 4:12-CV- 314-JAR
	)	
CITY OF ST. LOUIS, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave to Amend Plaintiff’s Complaint [ECF No. 13]. Plaintiff did not submit a proposed amended complaint with his motion, nor does his motion contain any specific information regarding what his amended complaint would contain. Amendment under these circumstances would be inappropriate.


The Court recognizes that Plaintiff is proceeding *pro se*. Plaintiff’s *pro se* status does not, however, excuse him from complying with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Bommarito v. Vilsack, 2012 WL 786227, \*2 (E.D.Mo. March 9, 2012)(citing Ellis v. Butler, 890 F.2d 1001, 1003 (8th Cir.1989) (citing Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972)). Fed.R.Civ.P. 7(b) requires motions to be made in writing, state the grounds for the motion with particularity, and set forth the relief or order sought. “The particularity requirement of Rule 7(b) is met by submitting a proposed amendment with the motion for leave to amend the complaint.” Bommarito, 2012 WL 786227, \*2 (citing Wolgin v. Simon, 722 F.2d 389, 394 (8th Cir. 1983)(internal citation omitted). The Eighth Circuit has held it is appropriate to deny leave to amend a complaint when a proposed amendment was not submitted with the motion. Popoalii v.

Correctional Medical Services, 512 F.3d 488, 497 (8th Cir.2008). Thus, Plaintiff's motion will be denied.

Accordingly,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Amend Plaintiff's Complaint [ECF No. 13] is **DENIED** without prejudice.

Dated this 2nd day of April, 2012.



---

JOHN A. ROSS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE