

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

GREGORY LYNN NORWOOD,

Plaintiff,

vs.

MATTHEW L. CATE, et al.,

Defendants

CASE NO. 1:09-cv-00330-OWW-GBC

ORDER REGARDING OPPOSITION
TO COURT ORDERS

(Doc. 62)

Plaintiff Gregory Lynn Norwood ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This action is proceeding on Plaintiff's first amended complaint, filed on August 14, 2009, against Defendants Kenneth Clark Allison, T. P. Wan, J. Reynoso and W. J. Sullivan. (Docs. 11, 15, 17, 19, 20). On September 2, 2011, Plaintiff filed an opposition to the Court's denial of Plaintiff's discovery motions. (Doc. 62). An opposition to an order is not a recognized avenue of relief and if Plaintiff wishes to seek reconsideration, he can file a noticed motion for reconsideration of the particular order and make the requisite showing pursuant to procedural rules.

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b) governs the reconsideration of final orders of the district court. The Rule permits a district court to relieve a party from a final order or judgment on grounds of: "(1) mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect; (3) fraud . . . of an adverse party, . . . or (6) any other reason justifying relief from the operation of the judgment." Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b). The motion for reconsideration must be made within a reasonable time, in any event "not more than one year after the judgment, order, or proceeding was entered or taken." *Id.*

///

1 As Plaintiff's redress is limited to filing a noticed motion for reconsideration , the court will not
2 consider an "opposition" to an order.

3

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5

Dated: November 16, 2011

6


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28