

1
2
3 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
4 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

5 * * *

6 William Alexander Lee,

7 Plaintiff,

8 v.

9 Yellow Checker Star Transportation Taxi
Management, et al.,

10 Defendants.

Case No. 2:23-cv-00919-APG-DJA

Order

11
12 Before the Court is Plaintiff's motion to amend his complaint. (ECF No. 21). Plaintiff
13 does not attach a proposed amended complaint as required under Local Rule 15-1(a). While the
14 Court previously liberally construed Plaintiff's motion to amend his complaint as his proposed
15 amended complaint, the Court will not do so again here. This is because Plaintiff's motion to
16 amend appears to be an addendum, rather than an amendment, to the complaint on which he is
17 proceeding. But an amended complaint must be complete in itself, without reference to any prior
18 pleading, because an amended complaint supersedes the original. *See Lacey v. Maricopa County*,
19 693 F.3d 896, 928 (9th Cir. 2012). If the Court were to construe Plaintiff's motion as his
20 amended complaint, that would mean that Plaintiff has abandoned nearly all of his factual
21 allegations and has abandoned his Family and Medical Leave Act claim (the one claim on which
22 he is currently proceeding).

23 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Plaintiff's motion to amend his complaint (ECF
24 No. 21) is **denied without prejudice**. The Clerk of Court is kindly directed to send Plaintiff a
25 copy of this order.

26 DATED: September 24, 2024

27
28 

DANIEL J. ALBREGTS
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE