

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

* * *

TERRANCE DAVIS,

Plaintiff,

v.

MADELINE PICKENS, *et. al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:24-CV-00119-ART-CLB
**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR LEAVE
TO AMEND COMPLAINT**

[ECF No. 48]

Before the Court is Plaintiff Terrance Davis’s (“Davis”) motion for leave to file an amended complaint. (ECF No. 48.) In the motion, Davis seeks to amend his complaint to add defendants Warden Patricia Hernandez and Warden Tesheena Cooke. (*Id.* at 2.)

Pursuant to Local Rule 7-2(a), all motions “must be supported by a memorandum of points and authorities.” “The failure of a moving party to file points and authorities in support of the motion constitutes a consent to the denial of the motion.” L.R. 7-2(d). Here, Davis has not provided points and authorities that explain why additional defendants should be joined under the corresponding rules of Civil Procedure and what facts support their addition to the case. Therefore, Davis’s motion for leave to amend his complaint, (ECF No. 48), is **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**. However, pursuant to the Court’s Scheduling Order, (ECF No. 43), Davis is permitted to re-file a properly supported motion for leave to file an amended complaint, which must include points and authorities that support amending his complaint, for the Court’s consideration by no later than **Monday, January 13, 2025**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: January 2, 2025.


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE