WO

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Thomas Eugene Jones, Plaintiff, v. Verra Mobility Corporation, et al., Defendants.	No. CV-24-01596-PHX-KML **ORDER**

Plaintiff Thomas Eugene Jones filed a motion to amend his complaint. (Doc. 14.) The proposed amended complaint differs from the original only by including a check mark on the box indicating Title VII as an additional basis for jurisdiction. (Doc. 14 at 1.) Jones explains the amendment is necessary "to ensure that the Complaint accurately represents the claims and legal basis for this action." (Doc. 14 at 2.) It is not clear if Jones's proposed amendment is because he believes he is pursuing a claim under Title VII, if Jones believes Title VII provides an additional jurisdictional basis for his claim under the Americans with Disabilities Act, or if Jones wishes to check the Title VII box for some third reason.

When Jones filed his original complaint he attached a copy of the "charge of discrimination" he filed with the Arizona Attorney General involving his alleged mistreatment by defendants. (Doc. 1-1 at 3.) That charge included allegations of disability discrimination but did not include allegations regarding sex or race. If that is the only administrative charge Jones filed, he may be unable to pursue a Title VII claim in this case, even if he wished to do so. *See B.K.B. v. Maui Police Dep't*, 276 F.3d 1091, 1100 (9th Cir.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

2002) ("Allegations of discrimination not included in the plaintiff's administrative charge 'may not be considered by a federal court unless the new claims are "like or reasonably related to the allegations contained in the EEOC charge."'") (quoting *Green v. L.A. Cnty. Superintendent of Schs.*, 883 F.2d 1472, 1475–76 (9th Cir.1989)). Alternatively, the court has jurisdiction to hear Jones's ADA claim and an additional basis for jurisdiction is unnecessary. Finally, if Jones has some other reason for seeking to amend his complaint, he has not identified it with sufficient clarity.

Given the uncertainty surrounding the intent behind or need for Jones's proposed amendment, the motion to amend is denied.

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED the Motion to Amend (Doc. 14) is **DENIED**. Defendants' response to the original complaint remains due on **October 16, 2024**.

Dated this 2nd day of October, 2024.

Honorable Krissa M. Lanham
United States District Judge