

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
EASTERN DIVISION

LAWRENCE M. EDWARDS,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	Case No. 4:16CV1077 RLW
	)	
TIM VILLMER, et. al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	


**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff’s Motion for Clarification (ECF No. 6). In the Motion, Plaintiff seems to be clarifying his claims from his recently filed Amended Complaint (ECF No. 5). The Court does not accept filings by interlineation. *Georges v. Accutira Mortgage, Inc.*, No. 4:08-CV-201 (JCH), 2008 WL 2079125, at \*3 (E.D. Mo. May 15, 2008). Therefore, if Plaintiff wishes to amend or clarify his Amended Complaint, then he must file a new amended complaint. However, the Court cautions Plaintiff “[t]he filing of an amended complaint replaces all previous complaints, and claims that are not realleged are deemed abandoned.” *Id.* (citing *In re Wireless Tel. Fed. Cost Recovery Fees Litig.*, 396 F.3d 922, 928 (8th Cir. 2005)). If Plaintiff wishes to amend the complaint, he must do so by filing an amended complaint that names each of the defendants in the caption and contains all of their claims for relief. *Georges*, 2008 WL 2079125, at \*3.

Accordingly,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s Motion for Clarification (ECF No. 6) is **DENIED**. Plaintiff may file an amended complaint if he wants the Court to consider any additional information.

Dated this 22nd day of August, 2016.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**RONNIE L. WHITE**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**