

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

WO

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

Barry Louis Lamon,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Derral G. Adams; L. Zirkind; D. Hanson;
K. Elze; and J. Alvarez, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 1:07-cv-00829-DGC

ORDER

In an order dated June 30, 2011, the Court granted summary judgment in favor of Defendants. Doc. 111. The Clerk entered final judgment accordingly. Doc. 112. Plaintiff has filed a motion to vacate the judgment pursuant to Rule 59(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Doc. 113. The motion will be denied.

It is appropriate to alter or amend a judgment under Rule 59(e) in four circumstances: (1) newly discovered evidence has been presented, (2) the Court committed clear error, (3) the judgment is manifestly unjust, or (4) there is an intervening change in controlling law. *See United Nat’l Ins. Co. v. Spectrum Worldwide, Inc.*, 555 F.3d 772, 780 (9th Cir. 2009). Plaintiff has shown none of these circumstances. Nor do his “objections” (Doc. 114) to the Court’s decision warrant vacating the judgment.


IT IS ORDERED:

1. Plaintiff’s Rule 59(e) motion for the Court to vacate its order and judgment (Doc. 113) is **denied**.

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

2. No further motion for reconsideration shall be filed.

Dated this 22nd day of July, 2011.



David G. Campbell
United States District Judge