
**THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF UTAH**

FRANCISCO RODRIGUEZ-RAMOS,

Plaintiff,

v.

UTAH COUNTY JAIL et al.,

Defendants.

**MEMORANDUM DECISION AND
ORDER**

Case No. 2:23-cv-00384 DBP

Chief Magistrate Judge Dustin B. Pead

On June 13, 2023, the Court granted Plaintiff Francisco Rodriguez-Ramos's motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e).¹ Plaintiff's complaint against Defendants was then docketed.² Because Plaintiff proceeds in forma pauperis, the Court reviewed the sufficiency of the pleading under the authority of 28 U.S.C. § 1915.³ On February 2, 2024, Plaintiff was ordered to file an amended complaint by February 29, 2024.⁴ To date, Plaintiff has failed to comply with the court's order.

Accordingly, Plaintiff is HEREBY ORDERED to comply with the court's order and file an Amended Complaint on or before April 15, 2024. A failure to do so will result in a recommendation that the matter be dismissed. As a reminder from the court's prior order, the Amended Complaint should comply with the following:

¹ ECF No. 4, Order Granting Leave to Proceed In Forma Pauperis.

² ECF No. 5.

³ 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e).

⁴ ECF No. 16.

1. The Amended Complaint must stand entirely on its own and shall not refer to, or incorporate by reference, any portion of the original complaint. Any claims which are not realleged in the Amended Complaint will be deemed abandoned.⁵

2. The Amended Complaint must clearly state what each Defendant did to violate Plaintiff's civil rights.⁶ Plaintiff should include, as much as possible, specific dates when each alleged constitutional violations occurred. "To state a claim, a complaint must 'make clear exactly who is alleged to have done what to whom.'"⁷

3. Each cause of action, together with the facts and citations that support the cause of action, should be stated separately.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 8 March 2024.



Dustin B. Pead
United States Magistrate Judge

⁵ See *Pierce v. Williams*, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 185074, at *6 (E.D. Okla. Oct. 6, 2020) (unpublished) (citing *Miller v. Glanz*, 948 F.2d 1562, 1565 (10th Cir. 1991) (“An amended complaint completely replaces the original complaint and renders the original complaint of no legal effect”)); *Murray v. Archambo*, 132 F.3d 609, 612 (10th Cir. 1998) (amended complaint supersedes original complaint).

⁶ *Bennett v. Passic*, 545 F.2d 1260, 1262-63 (10th Cir. 1976) (personal participation of each named defendant required to state a civil rights claim).

⁷ *Stone v. Albert*, 338 F. App'x 757, 759 (10th Cir. 2009) (unpublished) (quoting *Robbins v. Oklahoma*, 519 F.3d 1242, 1250 (10th Cir. 2008)).