

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

February 5, 2021

Christopher M. Wolpert  
Clerk of Court

---

RAMON M. DEL CAMPO,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

COMMUNITY OF HOPE; NICOLE  
MARTINEZ,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 20-2114  
(D.C. No. 2:20-CV-00639-RB-CG)  
(D. N.M.)

---

RAMON M. DEL CAMPO,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

DONA ANA COUNTY DETENTION  
CENTER; BRYAN BAKER,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 20-2136  
(D.C. No. 2:20-CV-00636-JAP-SMV)  
(D. N.M.)

---

**ORDER AND JUDGMENT\***

---

Before **HOLMES**, **MATHESON**, and **PHILLIPS**, Circuit Judges.

---

\* After examining the briefs and appellate record, this panel has determined unanimously that oral argument would not materially assist in the determination of this appeal. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); 10th Cir. R. 34.1(G). The case is therefore ordered submitted without oral argument. This order and judgment is not binding precedent, except under the doctrines of law of the case, *res judicata*, and collateral estoppel. It may be cited, however, for its persuasive value consistent with Fed. R. App. P. 32.1 and 10th Cir. R. 32.1.

---

Ramon M. Del Campo appeals the dismissal of two cases. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291.<sup>1</sup>

In each case, Mr. Del Campo filed a form civil rights complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Rather than allege facts to establish a § 1983 claim, each complaint asked the reader to “[p]lease view” information from a different case that he had filed.<sup>2</sup> In each case, the district court notified Mr. Del Campo that it would not “comb the record of this or other cases,” and it granted him leave to file an amended complaint.<sup>3</sup> In response, Mr. Del Campo filed various motions, but he did not file an amended complaint. The district court then dismissed each case without prejudice under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) for failure to state a claim. Mr. Del Campo appealed both dismissals.

The briefs Mr. Del Campo has filed in each appeal do not explain why he failed to file amended complaints or why his original complaints stated a claim. We therefore affirm the district court judgment in each case. In 20-2114, we deny Mr. Del Campo’s

---

<sup>1</sup> Because Mr. Del Campo is pro se, we construe his filings liberally, but we do not act as his advocate. *Yang v. Archuleta*, 525 F.3d 925, 927 n.1 (10th Cir. 2008).

<sup>2</sup> 20-2114, ROA at 5, 10; 20-2136, ROA Vol. I, at 10.

<sup>3</sup> 20-2114, ROA at 50; 20-2136, ROA Vol. I, at 62.

motion to expand the record. In 20-2136, we deny his motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*, so his filing fee is due in full.

Entered for the Court

Scott M. Matheson, Jr.  
Circuit Judge