

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

ANTHONY NGUYEN,

Plaintiff,

v.

BITER, M.D., et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 1:11-cv-00809-OWW-SKO PC

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION  
FOR RECONSIDERATION

(Doc. 10)

Plaintiff Anthony Nguyen, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, filed this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on May 18, 2011. On June 9, 2011, Plaintiff filed an objection to the Court’s order denying his motion for the appointment of counsel.

Although Plaintiff does not specifically seek reconsideration, to the extent his objections are so construed, his motion is denied. Plaintiff’s disagreement with the ruling is not grounds for reconsideration. Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(6); Local Rule 230(j); Marlyn Nutraceuticals, Inc. v. Mucos Pharma GmbH & Co., 571 F.3d 873, 880 (9th Cir. 2009); Harvest v. Castro, 531 F.3d 737, 749 (9th Cir. 2008). There is no entitlement to counsel in this case, Palmer v. Valdez, 560 F.3d 965, 970 (9th Cir. 2009); Storseth v. Spellman, 654 F.2d 1349, 1353 (9th Cir. 1981), and at this stage in the proceedings, the Court does not find that exceptional circumstances are present, Palmer, 560 F.3d at 970; Wilborn v. Escalderon, 789 F.2d 1328, 1331 (9th Cir. 1981).

///

///

///

1           Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration, filed June 9, 2011, is HEREBY  
2 DENIED.

3  
4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 **Dated: June 13, 2011**

/s/ Oliver W. Wanger  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

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