Braunstein v. Sand	doval et al	Doc. 15
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
8		
9	STEVEN BRAUNSTEIN, #64697)
10	Plaintiff,))) 3:12-cv-00235-LRH-WGC
11	ŕ) 5.12-CV-00253-LRTI-WGC
12	VS.	ORDER
13	BRIAN SANDOVAL, et al.,)
14	Defendants.	
15	On June 5, 2012, the court issued an order dismissing plaintiff's pro se civil rights complaint	
16	with prejudice for failure to state any claims for which relief may be granted (ECF #3). Judgment was	
17	entered on June 6, 2012 (ECF #5). On June 12, 2012, plaintiff filed a notice of appeal (ECF #6). On	
18	June 29, 2012, the court noted <i>sua sponte</i> that the judgment should have directed dismissal without	
19	prejudice rather than with prejudice of the <i>Heck</i> -barred claims (ECF #11). On September 12, 2012, the	
20	Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals remanded the matter to this court for the limited purpose of reconsidering	
21	the judgment (ECF #13).	
22	IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the portion of the Screening Order (ECF #3) dismissing	
23	the complaint with prejudice rather than without prejudice is VACATED .	
24	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the judgment entered on June 6, 2012 (ECF #5), is	
25	VACATED.	
26	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this action is DISMISSED without prejudice.	
27		
28	///	

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk shall enter judgment accordingly and close this case. Eldihi DATED this 25th day of September, 2012. LARRY R. HICKS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE