1		
2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
3	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
4		
5	HUGO LUA,	1:14-cv-19-LJO-MJS
6	Plaintiff,	ORDER RE PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
7	v.	FOR RECONSIDERATION (Doc. 29)
8	O. SMITH, et al.,	
9	Defendants.	
10		
11	On September 30, 2015, the Court dismissed Plaintiff's complaint without leave to amend and	
12	closed the case. Doc. 22. Approximately three months later, Plaintiff appealed the Court's order to the	
13	United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. Docs. 24, 25. The Ninth Circuit dismissed the case	
14	for lack of jurisdiction because Plaintiff's notice of appeal was untimely. See Doc. 27.	
15	On March 21, 2016, Plaintiff filed a motion for reconsideration of the Court's September 30,	
16	2015 order. See Doc. 29. Although so styled, Plaintiff's motion is directed to the Ninth Circuit—he	
17	argues that his appeal should not have been dismissed as untimely. See id. at 1. Plaintiff's motion should	
18	have been filed in the Ninth Circuit, not this Court, which has no authority to alter the decisions of the	
19	Ninth Circuit. Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Doc. 29) is DENIED.	
20		
21	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
22	Dated:	/s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill
23	UN	NITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
24		
25		
	1	l