

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS

ANTHONY L. DAVIS,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CIVIL ACTION
No. 05-3172-SAC

PAUL CLARK, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

Plaintiff proceeds pro se and in forma pauperis on a complaint, as later supplemented, filed under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The court dismissed the supplemented complaint in an order dated June 21, 2005.

By an order dated March 22, 2006, the court granted plaintiff's motion to alter and amend to designate that plaintiff's habeas claims were dismissed without prejudice, and to designate that plaintiff's due process claim regarding the denial of an initial parole hearing in 2003 was dismissed as stating no claim for relief under § 1983. In that same order, the court denied all of plaintiff's pending motions, including plaintiff's motion to amend the complaint, and motion for service of summons.

Before the court is plaintiff's supplement to his previous motion to amend the complaint, and plaintiff's proposed amended complaint (Doc. 18). Also before the court is plaintiff's motion for service of summons and the proposed amended complaint (Doc. 17). The court denies this motion.

In the orders entered on June 21, 2005, and March 22, 2006, the court dismissed all of plaintiff's claims. To the extent plaintiff now maintains the order dated March 22, 2006, allows him to proceed further in this action on the proposed amended complaint, plaintiff's reading of that court order is flawed.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for service of summons (Doc. 17) of his proposed amended complaint is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: This 6th day of April 2006 at Topeka, Kansas.

s/ Sam A. Crow
SAM A. CROW
U.S. Senior District Judge