

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
5 AT TACOMA

6 AARON HAHN,

7 Plaintiff,

8 v.

9 DOUG WADDINGTON, et al,

10 Defendants.

Case No. 3:14-cv-05047-RJB-TLF

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AN
AMENDED COMPLAINT

11 This matter comes before the Court on plaintiff's filing of a motion for leave to file an
12 amended complaint. Dkt. 64. In his motion, plaintiff states that since the filing of his original
13 complaint, he has discovered evidence that will further substantiate his claims and would like to
14 add that evidence to his case. *Id.*

15 As defendants point out in their opposition to the motion, plaintiff has not attached a copy
16 of his proposed amended complaint as required by Local Rule LCR 15. For this reason, the Court
17 is denying plaintiff's motion, but will give plaintiff to re-file his motion in accordance with LCR
18 15. Plaintiff should be aware that should he choose to re-file, in addition to "attach[ing] a copy of
19 the proposed amended pleading as an exhibit to" the motion, he "must indicate on the proposed
20 amended [complaint] how it differs from [his original complaint] by bracketing or striking
21 through the text to be deleted and underlining or highlighting the text to be added." *Id.* Further,
22 "[t]he proposed amended pleading must not incorporate by reference any part of the preceding
23 pleading, including exhibits." *Id.*

