



1 demonstrate either that he is entitled to relief under Rule 60(b)(6), or that his motion was timely  
2 under Rule 60(c)(1). See Lopez v. Ryan, 678 F.3d 1131, 1135-38 (9th Cir. 2012); Lal v.  
3 California, 610 F.3d 518, 524 (9th Cir. 2010). Further, the Court agrees that there is an  
4 insufficient basis for appointing/seeking voluntary assistance of counsel. Therefore, Plaintiffs'  
5 motions will be denied.

6  
7 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 8 1. The September 26, 2019, order, (Doc. No. 78) is converted to findings and  
9 recommendation;
- 10 2. The findings and recommendation (Doc. No. 78) is ADOPTED;
- 11 3. Plaintiff's motion to vacate and re-enter judgment (Doc. No. 75) and motion to  
12 appoint counsel (Doc. No. 76) are DENIED;
- 13 4. Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Doc. No. 79) is DENIED;
- 14 5. The Court will not accept any further motions for reconsideration relating to this order  
15 or Document Nos. 75 and 76; and
- 16 6. This case remains CLOSED.

17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 Dated: September 10, 2020

19   
20 SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE