1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
8	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
9	NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE	Case No. 1:05-cv-01207 LJO-EPG
10	COUNCIL, et al.,	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
11	Plaintiffs,	RECONSIDERATION OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S RULING
12	Vs. DAVID BERNHARDT, Acting Secretary,	(ECF NOS. 1336 & 1337)
13	U.S. Department of the Interior, et al.,	
14	Defendants.	
15	SAN LUIS & DELTA MENDOTA WATER AUTHORITY, et al.,	
16	Defendant-Intervenors. ANDERSON-COTTONWOOD IRRIGATION	
17	DISTRICT, et al.,	
18	Joined Parties.	
19		
20	Before the Court for decision is the one para	graph motion for reconsideration filed by Defendant
21	Intervenors, ECF No. 1336, joined (also in a one paragraph filing) by Federal Defendants. ECF No.	
22	1337. Rather than directing the Court's attention to any reasons why the moving parties believe the magistrate judge's ruling was "clear error," <i>see</i> L.R. 303, the moving parties have simply string-cited every brief they previously filed on the matter. The Court has afforded this motion for reconsideration	
23		
24		
25	every offer they previously fried on the matter. The	Court has arrorded this motion for reconstitution
		1

1	far more time and thought than did the moving parties. Having reviewed the magistrate judge's ruling in	
2	light of the record and applicable law, the motion is DENIED. See ECF Nos. 1311 & 1244; Fed. R. Civ.	
3	P. 45; U.S. Const., art. III, § 2.	
4		
5	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
6	Dated: April 8, 2019 /s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill	
7	UNITED STATES CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE	
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		