

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

ANDREW LINDSTROM,

Plaintiff,

v.

NEVADA STATE MILITIA (NEVADA
NATIONAL GUARD),

Defendant.

Case No. 3:24-cv-00152-ART-CSD

ORDER

Re: ECF No. 38

Before the court is Plaintiff’s document entitled “Amendment to Complaint” (ECF No. 38). Defendant filed a response (ECF No. 39).

Plaintiff’s “Amendment to Complaint” document is considered to be a fugitive document because it is not an amended complaint. The document fails to set forth a short and plain statement of the grounds for jurisdiction, a short and plain statement showing Plaintiff is entitled to relief, and a demand for the relief sought. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(1)-(3). Nor does the document constitute a motion for leave to amend the complaint (with proposed amended complaint attached). *See* LR 15-1.

The court has inherent authority to strike fugitive documents from the record. *See Mazzeo v. Gibbons*, No. 2:08-cv-01387-RLH-PAL, 2010 WL 3910072, at *3 (D. Nev. Sept. 30, 2010).

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Amendment to Complaint (ECF No. 38) shall be **STRICKEN**.

DATED: December 6, 2024.



Craig S. Denney
United States Magistrate Judge