1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 ARMAH JOHNSON, No. 1:16-cv-00082-DAD-JLT 12 Plaintiff. 13 ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION v. FOR REHEARING 14 J. COTTA, et al., (Doc. No. 21) 15 Defendants. 16 17 Plaintiff, Armah Johnson, a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on January 20, 2016. (Doc. No. 1.) 18 19 However, on July 27, 2016, the action was dismissed after this court concluded it lacked 20 jurisdiction since plaintiff's claims of the unauthorized deprivation of his property by prison 21 officials failed to state a cognizable due process claim. (Doc. No. 17 at 2–3.) 22 On January 13, 2017, plaintiff filed a "motion for rehearing." (Doc. No. 21.) In his motion, plaintiff states a rehearing is necessary because "the state failed to provide meaningful 23 24 post deprivity [sic] remedy for loss occasion by intentional official misconduct." (Id.) While not entirely clear, the court takes this to mean plaintiff was unsuccessful in seeking redress in the 25 26 state courts. Even if this were the case, however, it would provide no cause for this court to 27 reconsider its prior determination that it lacked subject matter jurisdiction over plaintiff's claims.

Bianchi v. Rylaarsdam, 334 F.3d 895, 898 (9th Cir. 2003) ("[F]ederal courts lack jurisdiction to

28

1	hear appeals from state court decisions."). No other grounds are advanced by plaintiff in his
2	motion as to why this court should revisit its decision, which it has already declined to do once
3	(See Doc. No. 20.)
4	Accordingly, plaintiff's motion for rehearing (Doc. No. 21) is denied. No other orders
5	will issue in response to filings made by plaintiff in this closed case.
6	IT IS SO ORDERED.
7 8	Dated: April 28, 2017 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
77	