1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		Case No. 1:14-cv-01113 LJO MJS (HC)
11	CLARENCE LEON DEWS,	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
12	Petitioner,	RECONSIDERATION
13	V.	[Doc. 13]
14		
15	WARDEN,	
16	Respondent.	
17		
18	Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a petition for writ of habeas	
19	corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.	
20	On September 15, 2014, the undersigned dismissed the petition as successive	
21	under 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(1). On September 26, 2014, Petitioner filed a motion for	
22	reconsideration pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure § 60(b).	
23	Rule 60(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides:	
24	On motion and just terms, the court may relieve a party or its legal	
25	representative from a final judgment, order, or proceeding for the following reasons:	
26	(1) mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect;	
27	(2) newly discovered evidence that, with reasonable diligence, could not have been discovered in time to move for a new trial	
28	under Rule 59(b); (3) fraud (whether prev	viously called intrinsic or extrinsic),

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 evidence that have not already been considered by this Court. The Court finds that its prior ruling that the petition was successive and required to be dismissed was correct. To the extent Petitioner seeks permission to file a successive petition, he should file a request directly with the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeal. Accordingly, Petitioner's motion for reconsideration is DENIED. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: **September 30, 2014** /s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE