

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

RUSSELL GEISSLER,)	C/A No. 4:17-1746-MBS-TER
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	ORDER
vs.)	
)	
BRYAN P. STERLING,)	
LEFFORD FATE,)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

Presently before the court is Plaintiff’s motion entitled “Motion to Adjust titles of Defendant’s or Clarify.” (Doc. #14). In this motion, Plaintiff states that “while reviewing the order of the court allowing pro se litigation the plaintiff noticed the court has not put the official capacity on the defendants names. Both parties are named in the hand written complaint as to there official and there individual capacity . . .” (Id.)(errors in original). Thus, Plaintiff requests that if “by mistake the plaintiff did not mark this on the 1983 lawsuit packet it is requested that the partys be sued in both individual and official capacitys” and that if the mistake was made that the court “adjust for the record to agin show there offical and individual capacitys.” (Id.)(errors in original).

In a sentence at the bottom of the motion (doc. #14), Plaintiff states that “[i]t is also the Plaintiffs [sic] request that Exhibits E-J be entered into the record.”

This motion is being treated as a motion to amend the complaint and the motion

is granted.¹ Therefore, the Clerk of Court is directed to place in the caption of the case under the Defendants' names "official and individual capacity." Additionally, the Clerk of Court is directed to attach the Exhibits designated as "E-J" as supporting documents to the original complaint and enter it as an amended complaint.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

October 6, 2017
Florence, South Carolina

s/Thomas E. Rogers, III
Thomas E. Rogers, III
United States Magistrate Judge

¹ A review of the complaint form reveals Plaintiff did check the boxes for individual and official capacity.