

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

RICHARD JACKSON,

 Plaintiff,

 v.

MIKE PALOMBO, et al,

 Defendants.

Case No. 1:13-cv-00986-LJO-BAM (PC)

ORDER SUMMARILY DENYING
PLAINTIFF'S FOURTH AND FIFTH
MOTIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION

(ECF Nos. 27, 28)

Plaintiff Richard Jackson (“Plaintiff”), a state prisoner, proceeded pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

The Court has reviewed Plaintiff’s fourth and fifth motions for reconsideration, filed on December 7, 2017. (ECF Nos. 27, 28.) As Plaintiff has been previously, and repeatedly, informed, his claims in this action are barred by the favorable termination rule. Plaintiff was further warned that the Court will not entertain additional motions to reconsider this judgment based on the same arguments repeatedly presented to and rejected by the Court. (ECF No. 26, p. 4.) Plaintiff’s fourth and fifth motions for reconsideration once again set forth no grounds entitling him to reconsideration of the Court’s order dismissing this action.

Accordingly, Plaintiff’s fourth and fifth motions for reconsideration, (ECF Nos. 27, 28), are **SUMMARILY DENIED**. Should another such motion be sent for filing, it will be stricken from the record and wholly ignored with no further notice to the Plaintiff. Enough resources have been expended on motions that were ordered not to be filed.
IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **December 8, 2017**

/s/ Lawrence J. O’Neill
UNITED STATES CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE