

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10  
11 TRACY SMITH, 1:11-cv-00193-GSA-PC

12 Plaintiff, ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION  
13 vs. FOR RECONSIDERATION  
(Doc. 15.)

14 CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF  
15 CORRECTIONS, et al.,

16 Defendants.

17 /

18 **I. BACKGROUND**

19 Tracy Smith ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with this civil rights action  
20 pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On August 19, 2009, Plaintiff consented to the jurisdiction of a  
21 United States Magistrate Judge, and no other party has appeared in this action. (Doc. 5.) Therefore,  
22 pursuant to Appendix A(k)(4) of the Local Rules of the Eastern District of California, the  
23 undersigned shall conduct any and all proceedings in the case until such time as reassignment to a  
24 District Judge is required. Local Rule Appendix A(k)(3).

25 This action was dismissed on April 14, 2011, without prejudice, based on Plaintiff's failure  
26 to obey the Court's order of February 8, 2011 which required him to either pay the filing fee for this  
27 action or submit an application to proceed in forma pauperis, within thirty days. (Doc. 13.) On May  
28 13, 2011, Plaintiff filed a motion entitled "Motion to Quash Federal Court Filing Fee and to Excuse

1 Complainant's Tardiness in Failing to Reply to Court Orders ...," which the Court shall treat as a  
2 motion for reconsideration of the Court's order dismissing this action. (Doc. 15.)

3 **II. MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

4 Rule 60(b)(6) allows the Court to relieve a party from an order for any reason that justifies  
5 relief. Rule 60(b)(6) "is to be used sparingly as an equitable remedy to prevent manifest injustice  
6 and is to be utilized only where extraordinary circumstances . . ." exist. Harvest v. Castro, 531 F.3d  
7 737, 749 (9th Cir. 2008) (internal quotations marks and citation omitted). The moving party "must  
8 demonstrate both injury and circumstances beyond his control . . ." Id. (internal quotation marks  
9 and citation omitted). In seeking reconsideration of an order, Local Rule 230(k) requires Plaintiff  
10 to show "what new or different facts or circumstances are claimed to exist which did not exist or  
11 were not shown upon such prior motion, or what other grounds exist for the motion."

12 "A motion for reconsideration should not be granted, absent highly unusual circumstances,  
13 unless the district court is presented with newly discovered evidence, committed clear error, or if  
14 there is an intervening change in the controlling law," Marlyn Nutraceuticals, Inc. v. Mucos Pharma  
15 GmbH & Co., 571 F.3d 873, 880 (9th Cir. 2009) (internal quotations marks and citations omitted,  
16 and "[a] party seeking reconsideration must show more than a disagreement with the Court's  
17 decision, and recapitulation . . ." of that which was already considered by the Court in rendering its  
18 decision," U.S. v. Westlands Water Dist., 134 F.Supp.2d 1111, 1131 (E.D. Cal. 2001).

19 Plaintiff moves the Court to re-open this case, excuse the payment of the filing fee, and grant  
20 him leave to file a federal writ of mandamus to compel an investigation by FBI officials into his  
21 allegations that defendants implanted him with a device. Plaintiff maintains that although he  
22 received the Court's order of February 8, 2011, he failed to respond because he was transferred from  
23 Sierra Conservation Center to Mule Creek State Prison and did not have access to his legal materials.

24 Plaintiff's argument that he required legal materials to comply with the Court's order is  
25 without basis. The Court's order required Plaintiff to either complete and return an application to  
26 proceed in forma pauperis, which the Court provided to Plaintiff, or pay the \$350.00 filing fee for  
27 this action. Neither of these options required Plaintiff to refer to legal materials. Plaintiff's case was  
28 dismissed without prejudice and without obligation to pay the \$350.00 filing fee. Plaintiff has not

1 shown clear error or other meritorious grounds for relief, and has therefore not met his burden as the  
2 party moving for reconsideration. Marlyn Nutraceuticals, Inc., 571 F.3d at 880. Therefore, the  
3 motion for reconsideration shall be denied.

4 **III. CONCLUSION**

5 Based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion for  
6 reconsideration, filed on May 13, 2011, is DENIED.

7  
8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 Dated: May 23, 2011

10 /s/ Gary S. Austin  
11 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28