



1 judgment, order, or proceeding was entered or taken.” Id.

2           Moreover, when filing a motion for reconsideration, Local Rule 230(j) requires a party to show  
3 the “new or different facts or circumstances claimed to exist which did not exist or were not shown  
4 upon such prior motion, or what other grounds exist for the motion.” Motions to reconsider are  
5 committed to the discretion of the trial court. Combs v. Nick Garin Trucking, 825 F.2d 437, 441 (D.C.  
6 Cir. 1987); Rodgers v. Watt, 722 F.2d 456, 460 (9th Cir. 1983) (en banc). To succeed, a party must set  
7 forth facts or law of a strongly convincing nature to induce the court to reverse its prior decision. See,  
8 e.g., Kern-Tulare Water Dist. v. City of Bakersfield, 634 F.Supp. 656, 665 (E.D. Cal. 1986), *aff’d in*  
9 *part and rev’d in part on other grounds*, 828 F.2d 514 (9th Cir. 1987).

10           Here, Petitioner fails to meet any of the requirements for granting a motion for reconsideration:  
11 He has not shown “mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect;” he has not shown the  
12 existence of either newly discovered evidence or fraud; he has not established that the judgment is  
13 either void or satisfied; and, finally, Petitioner has not presented any other reasons justifying relief from  
14 judgment. Moreover, pursuant to the Court’s Local Rules, Petitioner has not shown “new or different  
15 facts or circumstances claimed to exist *which did not exist or were not shown upon such prior motion*,  
16 or what other grounds exist for the motion.” Local Rule 230(j). (Emphasis supplied).

17           Indeed, in his response to the Order to Show Cause, Petitioner argued, as he does here, that his  
18 lack of legal understanding, liberal construction of pro se petitioners’ pleadings, and his lack of a  
19 “jailhouse lawyer,” constitute grounds for equitable tolling that should preserve the petition. (Doc. 9).  
20 In the order of dismissal, however, the Court expressly considered those points and rejected them.  
21 (Doc. 7). In sum, Petitioner provides no evidence or circumstances that would satisfy the requirements  
22 of Rule 60(b), and therefore his motion for reconsideration must be denied.

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

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

**ORDER**

Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED that Petitioner's motion for reconsideration (Doc. 9), is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 22, 2015

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE