## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

	JEREMY JONES,	Case No. 1:14-cv-02045-DAD-SAB (PC)
	Plaintiff, v. JIMENEZ, et al.,	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO RECONSIDER ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO MODIFY THE DISCOVERY AND SCHEDULING ORDER
	Defendants.	(ECF No. 103]
I		) )

Plaintiff Jeremy Jones is appearing pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

On April 30, 2018, the Court denied Plaintiff's motion to modify the scheduling order to extend the discovery cut-off date. (ECF No. 99.) Currently before the Court is Plaintiff's motion to reconsider that order. (ECF No. 103.)

Reconsideration motions are committed to the discretion of the trial court. Rodgers v. Watt, 722 F.2d 456, 460 (9th Cir. 1983) (en banc); Combs v. Nick Garin Trucking, 825 F.2d 437, 441 (D.C. Cir. 1987). A party seeking reconsideration must set forth facts or law of a strongly convincing nature to induce the court to reverse a prior decision. See, e.g., Kern-Tulare Water Dist. v. City of Bakersfield, 634 F.Supp. 656, 665 (E.D. Cal. 1986), rev'd in part on other grounds, 828 F.2d 514 (9th Cir. 1987).

Plaintiff's prior motion to extend the discovery deadline was untimely and did not show any diligence and good cause for the requested extension, particularly as he had waited over six months to begin initiating discovery, without any explanation. (See ECF No. 99, at 4.) In the current motion,

Plaintiff explains that he was making good-faith efforts to negotiate a settlement. This does not present good cause for his lack of diligence in conducting discovery, nor does it explain why he waited until after the deadline passed before seeking an extension of the discovery deadline. Although the Court encourages good-faith settlement negotiations, such negotiations are not sufficient cause for failing to initiate any discovery for over six months. Thus, Plaintiff has not presented sufficient grounds for the Court to reconsider its prior order.

For these reasons, Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration is HEREBY DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 12, 2018
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE