UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JAMES EDWARD BOWELL,

Plaintiff,

٧.

A. DIAZ, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:11-cv-01350-AWI-MJS (PC)

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR FURTHER SETTLEMENT NEGOTIATION

(ECF No. 64)

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The action, now closed, proceeded against Defendants Diaz and Rodriguez on Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment failure to protect claim.

On February 26, 2015, the parties appeared for a settlement conference before Magistrate Judge Craig M. Kellison, and the matter settled. (ECF No. 57.) The action was dismissed pursuant to the parties' stipulation on March 5, 2015. (ECF No. 61.)

Before the Court is Plaintiff's April 13, 2015 motion seeking further settlement negotiations. (ECF No. 64.) Plaintiff believes the action is still pending because he has not been paid the monetary settlement agreed to at the conference. Plaintiff wishes to discharge the monetary settlement in exchange for his release from custody.

This action was dismissed pursuant to the parties' stipulation, and no further relief is available to Plaintiff in this action in relation to his claims. To the extent Plaintiff

wishes to enforce the settlement agreement, he must do so in state court. Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co. of Am., 511 U.S. 375, 382 (1994). Plaintiff's desire for a more favorable settlement does not entitle him to relief from judgment. Although voluntary dismissals may be considered judgments from which Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 60(b) relief can be granted, see In re Hunter, 66 F.3d 1002, 1004-05 (9th Cir. 1995), Plaintiff presents no basis for such relief.

Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion for further settlement negotiations (ECF No. 64) is HEREBY DENIED and the action shall remain closed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: <u>April 30, 2015</u>

SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE

hlii