

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
OHIO, EASTERN DIVISION

Jantz Clinkscale v. City of Youngstown, Ohio, et al.

Clinkscale · No. 4:25-CV-02092 · Decided January 6, 2026

SUMMARY

The court denied as moot five motions filed by pro se plaintiff Jantz Clinkscale concerning amendments, supplemental pleadings, and requests for rulings. The court ordered Plaintiff to file a single, concise amended complaint within 14 days containing all allegations, claims, parties, and exhibits, and warned that failure to comply could result in dismissal with prejudice.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, Eastern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Benita Y. Pearson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, Eastern Division
DECIDED	January 6, 2026
DOCKET	4:25-CV-02092
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court considered five pro se plaintiff motions seeking leave to amend or supplement the complaint and seeking immediate rulings. The court denied all five motions as moot and directed plaintiff to file one complete amended complaint.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied the standards governing amendment and supplementation of pleadings under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15 and the requirement under Rule 8 that pleadings contain short, plain, and concise statements.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court memorandum and order

TOPICS

- motion to amend
- pleadings
- civil procedure
- section 1983

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiff could proceed through multiple amendments, supplements, and requests for rulings rather than filing one coherent pleading.
2. What pleading must plaintiff file to present all factual allegations, legal claims, parties, and exhibits for adjudication.
3. Whether plaintiff's five pending motions for leave to amend or supplement and for immediate rulings should be granted.

HOLDINGS

1. A pro se litigant must organize his claims and allegations in a single, cogent pleading; neither the court nor defendants are required to comb through voluminous filings to identify the asserted causes of action.
2. The pending motions for leave to amend or supplement and for immediate rulings were denied as moot because the court directed plaintiff to file a single amended complaint containing all allegations, claims, parties, and exhibits.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Plaintiff shall file a single amended complaint not later than 14 days from the date of this Order." (3)

"And Plaintiff is forbidden to file any further supplements, amendments, motions for leave seeking the same, or requests for immediate ruling, without extraordinary cause to do so." (3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Jantz Clinkscale filed a civil-rights complaint against the City of Youngstown and several individual defendants. Within days, he filed several additional documents labeled as amended complaints or supplements, followed by multiple motions seeking leave to amend, leave to supplement, and immediate rulings. The court found that the filings were voluminous and did not present the claims and allegations in a single cogent document suitable for adjudication.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed an original federal complaint on October 1, 2025, followed by filings labeled as a first and second amended complaint. The court determined that those filings were supplements rather than true amendments, and defendants answered the complaint. Plaintiff then filed multiple additional amendments, supplements, and requests for rulings. The court ordered plaintiff to file a single amended complaint within 14 days and denied the pending motions as moot.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- August v. Caruso, 2015 WL 1299888, at *6 (E.D. Mich. Mar. 23, 2015)
- Pilgrim v. Littlefield, 92 F.3d 413, 416 (6th Cir. 1996)
- Looper v. Educ. Credit Mgmt. Corp., 2008 WL 2965887, at *8 (E.D. Tenn. July 30, 2008)
- Greer v. Home Realty Co. of Memphis Inc., 2010 WL 6512339, at *2 (W.D. Tenn. July 12, 2010)
- Laster v. Pramstaller, 2008 WL 1901250, at *2 (E.D. Mich. Apr. 25, 2008)
- Windsor v. Colorado Dep't of Corr., 9 Fed. Appx. 967, 968 (10th Cir. 2001)
- Hollon v. Eastern Ky. Corr. Complex, 2010 WL 2924091, at *2 (E.D. Ky. July 22, 2010)

OPINION

PEARSON, J. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO EASTERN DIVISION) JANTZ CLINKSCALE,) CASE NO. 4:25-CV-02092) Plaintiff,))
JUDGE BENITA Y. PEARSON v.)) CITY OF YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO, et al.,)
MEMORANDUM OF) OPINION AND ORDER Defendants.) [Resolving ECF Nos. 7, 9, 10, 11, 13]) The Court considers five motions filed by pro se Plaintiff Jantz Clinkscale: (1) a Motion for Leave to File a Third Amended Complaint (ECF No. 7); (2) a Motion for Leave to File a First Amended Supplemental Filing (ECF No. 9); (3) a Motion for Immediate Ruling (ECF No. 10); (4) a Motion for Leave to File a Supplemental Pleading (ECF No. 11); and (5) a Motion for Ruling (ECF No. 13).

All five motions are denied as moot. I. BACKGROUND Plaintiff filed a federal complaint against Defendants City of Youngstown, Charles Shasho, Kelly Morchak, Nikki Posterli, and John Doe on October 1, 2025. See ECF No. 1. He filed a “first amended complaint” the very next day, and a “second amended complaint” just one day later. See ECF Nos. 3, 4.

On closer review, those filings are not true amendments, but supplementations: the first seeks only to add one exhibit and modify another, while the second merely proposes the standard of review. See ECF Nos. 3, 4. Defendants promptly and timely answered. See ECF No. 5. Since then, Plaintiff has filed, inter alia, one motion for leave to file a third amended complaint (ECF No. 7), two motions for leave to supplement (ECF Nos. 9, 11) and two motions for an immediate ruling (ECF Nos. 10, 13).

Taken together, he appears to seek permission to add allegations and defendants to his original complaint. See, ECF No. 11. II. DISCUSSION A. Law In pro se litigation, a district court must balance the difficulties faced by an unrepresented plaintiff against the defendant’s right to just and speedy resolution. See August v. Caruso, 2015 WL 1299888, at *6 (E.D.

Mich. Mar. 23, 2015). The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure allow litigants to freely amend their pleadings once, as a matter of course, within twenty-one days of service. See Fed. R. Civ. P 15(a)

(1)(A). In all other cases, amendment is permitted only with opposing consent or leave of court. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(2).

As to supplementation, Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(d) allows a district court to permit a litigant—when moved and with reasonable notice—to serve a supplemental pleading setting out transactions, occurrences, or events arising after the date of the original pleading. While parties proceeding pro se are afforded leeway and lenient construction, such leniency has its limits.

See *Pilgrim v. Littlefield*, 92 F.3d 413, 416 (6th Cir. 1996). The absence of legal counsel does not excuse noncompliance with the Federal and Local Rules. See *Looper v. Educ. Credit Mgmt. Corp.*, 2008 WL 2965887, at *8 (E.D. Tenn. July 30, 2008); *Greer v. Home Realty Co. of Memphis Inc.*, 2010 WL 6512339, at *2 (W.D. Tenn. July 12, 2010) (“Although district courts may liberally construe the federal and local rules for pro se litigants, even pro se litigants are obligated to follow [them].”).

2. Analysis To date, Plaintiff has filed nine purported amendments, supplements, and requests for immediate attention. See ECF Nos. 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13. Neither the Court nor the Defendants herein are obligated to comb through Plaintiff’s voluminous entries to garner clear and succinct statements for each cause of action. It is Plaintiff’s responsibility to organize his claims and allegations within a single, cogent document worthy of adjudication in federal court.

See *Laster v. Pramstaller*, 2008 WL 1901250, at *2 (E.D. Mich. April 25, 2008) (citing *Windsor v. Colorado Dep’t of Corr.*, 9 Fed. Appx. 967, 968 (10th Cir. 2001); *Hollon v. Eastern Ky. Corr. Complex*, 2010 WL 2924091, at *2 (E.D. Ky. July 22, 2010)). Plaintiff has failed to comply with that requirement, thereby forestalling his desired resolution. III. CONCLUSION Plaintiff shall file a single amended complaint not later than 14 days from the date of this Order.

That amended complaint shall include all factual allegations, legal claims, parties, and exhibits that Plaintiff would like considered, while complying with Fed. R. Civ. P. 8’s requirement for shortness, plainness, and conciseness. If filed and accepted, that amended complaint will supersede all previous complaints and requests for supplementation in this case, and Plaintiff shall serve the amended complaint as required by Fed.

R. Civ. P. 4(m). If served, Defendants shall timely respond under Fed. R. Civ.12(a)(1). Because Plaintiff has had ample time to consider his case, the Court will not consider any material excluded from the amended complaint. And Plaintiff is forbidden to file any further supplements, amendments, motions for leave seeking the same, or requests for immediate ruling, without extraordinary cause to do so.

Failure to comply with the letter and spirit of this Order may result in the dismissal of this case with prejudice. Accordingly, Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave to File a Third Amended Complaint (ECF No. 7), Motion for Leave to File First Amended Supplemental Filing (ECF No. 9), Motion

for Immediate Ruling (ECF No. 10), Motion for Leave to File Supplemental Pleading (ECF No. 11), and Motion for Ruling (ECF No. 13) are denied as moot.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED. January 6, 2026 /s/ Benita Y. Pearson Date Benita Y. Pearson United States District Judge 4

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-northern-district-of-ohio-eastern-division-united-states-distri/2026/jantz-clinkscale-v-city-of-youngstown-ohio-et-al-m2q872hx>