

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

THOMAS GOOLSBY,)	1:11cv01773 DLB PC
)	
Plaintiff,)	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION
)	FOR RECONSIDERATION AS MOOT
vs.)	(Document 15-1)
)	
CATE, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

Plaintiff Thomas Goolsby (“Plaintiff”) is a prisoner in the custody of the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (“CDCR”). Plaintiff is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff filed this action on October 25, 2011.

On January 18, 2013, the Court issued an order requiring Plaintiff to either file an amended complaint or notify the Court of his willingness to proceed on the First Amendment retaliation claim.

On February 6, 2013, Plaintiff filed a First Amended Complaint. He attached a Motion for Reconsideration to the back of the First Amended Complaint. Plaintiff seeks reconsideration of the Court’s January 18, 2013, screening order. However, Plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint sets forth the claims at issue in the Motion for Reconsideration. Therefore, because the Court

1 will screen the First Amended Complaint, Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration is
2 unnecessary.¹ Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration is DENIED AS MOOT.

3
4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 Dated: May 9, 2013

6 /s/ Dennis L. Beck
7 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

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

¹ If relevant, the Court will consider Plaintiff's arguments in the motion when screening the First Amended Complaint.