

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

GEORGE E. JACOBS, IV,

CASE NO. 1:05-cv-01625-SKO PC

Plaintiff,

ORDER RE MOTIONS

v.

(Docs. 33, 34)

W.J. SULLIVAN, et al.,

Defendants.

Plaintiff George E. Jacobs, IV (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Before the Court are two motions from Plaintiff.

On November 4, 2010, Plaintiff filed a motion requesting the Court to send him a copy of his third amended complaint. (Doc. #33.) Although the Court’s October 20, 2010 order instructed the Clerk’s Office to send Plaintiff a copy of his third amended complaint, Plaintiff contends that he did not receive a copy of the complaint. The Court will grant Plaintiff’s request and provide a second copy of Plaintiff’s third amended complaint. However, Plaintiff is advised that the Court does not provide copy services for litigants. In the future, the Court will not provide copies of documents on the docket regardless of whether or not Plaintiff has access to a photocopy machine.

On November 18, 2010, Plaintiff filed a motion requesting reconsideration of the Court’s October 20, 2010 order dismissing certain claims from Plaintiff’s complaint. Plaintiff appears to request reconsideration of the Court’s order by a district judge. However, Plaintiff consented to jurisdiction by U.S. Magistrate Judge on January 17, 2006. (Doc. #3.) Since Plaintiff is the only

1 party that has appeared before the Court, this action was transferred in its entirety to Magistrate
2 Judge Sheila K. Oberto pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c)(1). In other words, there is no District Judge
3 assigned to this case to rule on Plaintiff motion for reconsideration. Reconsideration by a District
4 Judge pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b) and Local Rule 303(c) only applies in cases
5 where the parties have not consented to jurisdiction by a U.S. Magistrate Judge. It, therefore, does
6 not apply to this case.

7 The Court notes that Plaintiff may request reconsideration of the October 20, 2010 order
8 pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60. However, Plaintiff's motion fails to raise any
9 grounds upon which reconsideration would be appropriate. The Court will, therefore, deny
10 Plaintiff's request for reconsideration.

11 Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 12 1. Plaintiff's November 4, 2010 motion is GRANTED. The Clerk's Office is directed
13 to send Plaintiff a copy of the May 5, 2010 third amended complaint; and
- 14 2. Plaintiff's November 18, 2010 motion requesting reconsideration is DENIED.

15
16 IT IS SO ORDERED.

17 **Dated:** November 29, 2010

/s/ Sheila K. Oberto
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE