

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

IN RE: ) 1:15-mc-00008-SAB  
 )  
 ) ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION  
 ) FOR RECONSIDERATION OF COURT'S  
 ) MARCH 27, 2015, ORDER  
 )  
 ) [ECF No. 11]  
 )  
 )  
 )  
 )  
 )

This miscellaneous action was initiated based on Plaintiff's claim that was being denied access to the electronic case filing system at Corcoran State Prison for purposes of filing a prisoner civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

On March 27, 2015, the Court denied Plaintiff's request for Court intervention as it was "clear that is the actions of Mr. Hill in failing to comply with Corcoran's procedures, and not prison officials, which have prevented him from utilizing the e-filing system." (ECF No. 8, Order at 6.) The Court found that Mr. Hill is required to comply with the normal procedures pursuant to this Court's Standing Order effective October 1, 2014 to have his complaint e-filed with the Court. (*Id.*) The Court directed the return of all documentation submitted to the Court by Mr. Hill, including the form complaint for purposes of re-filing. (*Id.*)

On April 9, 2015, Plaintiff filed a response to the Court's March 27, 2015, order which the Court construes as a motion for reconsideration. (ECF No. 11.) Plaintiff contends that March 27, 2015, was erroneous and prejudicial.

Pursuant to Local Rule 230(j), in filing an application for reconsideration, the moving party must include:

1 (1) when and to what Judge or Magistrate Judge the prior motion was made;

2 (2) what ruling, decision, or order was made thereon;

3 (3) what new or different facts or circumstances are claimed to exist which did not exist or

4 were not shown upon such prior motion, or what other grounds exist for the motion;

5 and

6 (4) why the facts or circumstances were not shown at the time of the prior motion.

Local Rule 230(j).

By the instant request for reconsideration, Plaintiff contends that he was denied access to the law library after his civil rights complaint was initially returned to him. Plaintiff submits that on April 2, 2015, he sent a request form to the law library for access to the e-filing system. However, this Court did not provide him with a deadline to file his complaint.

Plaintiff is advised that the purpose of opening this miscellaneous action was to determine solely the issue of whether Plaintiff had access to the e-filing system at Corcoran State Prison. Indeed, the Court February 12, 2015, order specifically stated, “[t]he Clerk of Court is directed to assign a miscellaneous case number to address only the use of the e-filing system at Corcoran State Prison as to inmate Tony Hill. No case as to the merits of Mr. Hill’s claims will be opened until the issue regarding the use of the e-filing system is resolved.” (ECF No. 1, Order at 2.) By order of March 27, 2015, the Court determined that Plaintiff has access to the e-filing system and must utilize such system to file his civil rights complaint, if he wishes to do so. The Court did not set a deadline because this miscellaneous action is closed and no deadlines are pending. If and when Plaintiff files a civil rights complaint by way of the e-filing system, a civil rights action will be opened and assigned a civil case number as set forth in the Court’s Standing Order which was previously provided to Plaintiff.

111

111

111

111

111

Because Plaintiff fails to demonstrate any basis for reconsideration, his motion for reconsideration is DENIED, and any future filings in this action will be stricken from the record without consideration.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 13, 2015

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE