UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

DEMETRIC SCOTT,

       Plaintiff,

   v.   Case No. 17-cv-140-pp

MEGAN RODRIQUEZ, *et al.*,

       Defendants.

ORDER DENYING AS UNNECESSARY PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST TO AMEND COMPLAINT (DKT. NO. 22)

In his June 19, 2017 order screening the plaintiff's amended complaint, Judge J.P. Stadtmueller discussed the plaintiff's official capacity claims against some of the defendants. See Dkt. No. 18 at 6. In that discussion, Judge Stadtmueller noted that a plaintiff could obtain only injunctive relief (not monetary damages) for official capacity claims, and pointed out that the plaintiff had made a specific request only for monetary damages (not injunctive relief). Id.

On July 19, 2017, the court received from the plaintiff a motion seeking leave to file an amended complaint. Dkt. No. 22. The plaintiff appears to believe that when Judge Stadtmueller noted that the plaintiff "only specifically asked for money damages," Judge Stadtmueller was trying to tell him that the court did not know how much money he was seeking. He asks for leave to amend the complaint to show that he is seeking compensatory damages, punitive damages

1

and monetary damages "each separately in the amount of $250,000." Dkt. No. 22 at 2.

The plaintiff's amended complaint *did* state the specific amount of money he wanted as damages. Dkt. No. 13 at 5. He asked for $200,000 in compensatory damages, $200,000 in punitive damages, and $200,000 in "monetary" damages. Id. The motion for leave to amend, however, indicates that the plaintiff now seeks "compensatory damages, punitive damages, and monetary damages each separately in the amount of $250,000." Dkt. No. 22 at 2.

The court will consider the plaintiff's motion as a supplement to his complaint. There is no need for the plaintiff to file another amended complaint.

The court **ORDERS** that the plaintiff's motion to file an amended complaint (dkt. no. 22) is **DENIED** as unnecessary.

Dated in Milwaukee, Wisconsin this 4th day of August, 2017.

BY THE COURT:

_____

HON. PAMELA PEPPER
United States District Judge