

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

MARVIN E. OWENS,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	CASE NO. 3:16cv897(RNC)
	:	
STATE OF CONNECTICUT,	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	

RULING and ORDER

The plaintiff filed "amended complaint" (doc. #7) which consists only of a revised caption adding numerous defendants and a list of various additional causes of action. This is insufficient.

Plaintiff is advised that an amended complaint does not simply add to the first complaint. Once an amended complaint is filed, it completely replaces the original. Because it supersedes the original complaint, an amended complaint renders the former complaint of no legal effect.

Plaintiff must identify the defendants in both the caption and the body of the amended complaint. An amended complaint should include all the facts and claims a plaintiff seeks to have the court consider, all of requests for relief and all defendants against whom he seeks relief. See International Controls Corp. v. Vesco, 556 F.2d 665, 668 (2d Cir. 1977). An amended complaint must set forth factual allegations to support plaintiff's claims against each named defendant. Pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 8, the complaint

must "give fair notice of the claim being asserted so as to permit the adverse party the opportunity to file a responsive answer" and "prepare an adequate defense . . . ." Hudson v. Artuz, No. 95 CIV. 4768, 1998 WL 832708, at \*1 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 30, 1998).

The plaintiff's submission does not constitute an amended complaint and shall not be considered such. The operative complaint remains the complaint the plaintiff filed on June 10, 2016. (Doc. #1.)

SO ORDERED at Hartford, Connecticut this 12th day of August, 2016.

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
Donna F. Martinez  
United States Magistrate Judge