1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 9 DISTRICT OF NEVADA 10 PRISCELLA SAINTAL, Case No. 2:15-cy-02460-GMN-NJK 11 Plaintiff(s), ORDER 12 VS. 13 (Docket No. 20) MARIA PESCE, et al., 14 Defendant(s). 15 Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion to amend the complaint. Docket No. 20. 16 17 Defendants have filed a response in partial opposition. Docket No. 23. No reply was filed. The Court 18 finds the motion properly resolved without a hearing. See Local Rule 78-2. Plaintiff's motion is limited 19 to seeking to add claims against Defendants Piccinini and Riches for continuing acts of retaliation, as 20 well as a due process claim against Defendant Riches. See Docket No. 20 at 1. As Defendants' response 21 points out, however, the proposed amended complaint also appears to add other claims and defendants. 22 See, e.g., Docket No. 21 at 7 (alleging that the Nevada Department of Corrections did not properly train

Saintal v. Pesce et al

23

24

25

26

27

28

as to the claims at issue.

Instead, the Court will **DENY** without prejudice the motion for leave to amend. Plaintiff is permitted to file a new motion for leave to amend but must ensure that the motion identifies and

staff). Defendants therefore seek an order that the proposed amended complaint should be allowed to

proceed but only if it "is interpreted in conjunction with her Motion for Leave." Docket No. 23 at 5.

The Court declines to take the approach advanced by Defendants as it would likely lead to confusion

Doc. 26

addresses each proposed new claim and each proposed new party.¹ Any new motion for leave to amend must be filed by January 17, 2017. If no motion for leave to amend is filed by that date, the Court will proceed on the claims that have survived the screening process and Defendants will be required to respond to the original complaint by January 31, 2017. If a motion for leave to amend is filed, the deadline to file an answer will be stayed until 14 days after the motion for leave to amend is decided.

The Court further **INSTRUCTS** the Clerk's Office to **STRIKE** the amended complaint that was improvidently docketed at Docket No. 21.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: December 27, 2016

NANCY J. KOPPE United States Magistrate Judge

¹ The Court also notes that the amendments purport to add allegations regarding events occurring after this case was filed. *See* Docket No. 20 at 1. As such, it is not clear to the Court why the claims are being added as an amendment to the claims already screened in this case rather than being brought through the filing of a new case with a separate complaint.