IN THE LIMITED OF	ATES DISTRICT COLIDT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
	Case No. 1:12-cv-01787 AWI MJS (HC)
·	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION
, i	
V.	[Doc. 50]
·	
Respondent.	
Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding <i>pro se</i> with a petition for writ of habeas	
corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.	
On March 25, 2015, the undersigned denied the petition on the merits. On	
October 24, 2016, Petitioner filed this motion for reconsideration pursuant to Federal	
Rules of Civil Procedure § 60(b). (ECF No. 50.)	
Rule 60(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides:	
On motion and just terms, the court may relieve a party or its legal	
representative from a final judgment, order, or proceeding for the following reasons:	
(1) mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect;	
could not have been disco	lence that, with reasonable diligence, overed in time to move for a new trial
	iously called intrinsic or extrinsic),
	RAREEM BROWN, Petitioner, V. AMY MILLER, Warden, Respondent. Petitioner is a state prisoner procector corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. On March 25, 2015, the understance of Civil Procedure § 60(b). (ECF Note Rule 60(b) of the Federal Rules of On motion and just terms, the representative from a final judgme reasons: (1) mistake, inadvertence, so (2) newly discovered evidence of the could not have been discovered relations.

misrepresentation, or misconduct by an opposing party: (4) the judgment is void; (5) the judgment has been satisfied, released, or discharged; it is based on an earlier judgment that has been reversed or vacated; or applying it prospectively is no longer equitable; or (6) any other reason that justifies relief. Petitioner does not set forth any arguments or items of evidence not already considered by this Court. He presents arguments that were previously raised and adjudicated in his petition, including that the trial court erred in failing to instruct on a provocation defense and that the prosecution failed to prove that he acted with malice aforethought. The Court's prior ruling addressed the same claims presented in this motion for reconsideration. Petitioner has presented no grounds upon which the Court might determine that its prior decision was erroneous. Accordingly, Petitioner is not entitled to post-judgment relief. Petitioner's motion for reconsideration is DENIED. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: <u>April 21, 2017</u> SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE