

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

EDWARD DAVID JONES,
Plaintiff,
v.
ARNOLD, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 1:16-cv-00473-LJO-BAM (PC)
ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION
FOR RECONSIDERATION
(ECF No. 7)

Plaintiff Edward David Jones (“Plaintiff”), a state prisoner proceeding pro se, initiated this civil action on April 1, 2016. On August 4, 2016, the Court dismissed this action as duplicative of case number 1:16-cv-00469-DAD-BAM. (Doc. 3.) Judgment was entered accordingly that same day. (Doc. 4.) On August 15, 2016, Plaintiff filed a motion for acknowledgments. (Doc. 5.) The Court construed it as a motion for reconsideration pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 60(b)(6), and denied the motion. (Doc. 6.)

Currently before the Court is Plaintiff’s motion filed on April 19, 2017. The motion is difficult to understand, containing unrelated statements about deliberate indifference, reprisals, Valley Fever cocci, an incident involving a fight between inmates,¹ issues involving medical care, administrative segregation unit placement, negligence, lack of supervision of inmates by floor staff officers, and other issues. The matters discussed in the motion appear to have occurred

¹ It is unclear whether Plaintiff is referring to an incident involving himself, or between other inmates.

1 during March 2017. Plaintiff asks for the Court to consider “the Defendants deliberated
2 intentions, obstruction, and negligences.” (Doc. 7, at p. 2) (errors in original). No specific form
3 of relief is requested.

4 To the extent Plaintiff seeks reconsideration of the Court’s orders dismissing this action as
5 duplicative and denying his earlier motion for reconsideration, (Docs. 3, 6), Plaintiff has
6 presented no grounds for reconsideration of the dismissal of this action. See *Marlyn*
7 *Nutraceuticals, Inc. v. Mucos Pharma GmbH & Co.*, 571 F.3d 873, 880 (9th Cir. 2009).

8 This action has been closed for eight months when Plaintiff filed this motion. The motion
9 concerns events occurring long after the action was closed, and that are unrelated to this case.
10 The Court will not entertain another motion to reconsider the judgment in this case based on
11 arguments the Court has previously rejected, nor will it entertain motions on matters completely
12 unrelated to this case. To the extent Plaintiff believes his rights have been violated after this
13 action was terminated, the appropriate procedure for pursuing those claims is to file a new
14 complaint.

15 Accordingly, Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration, filed on April 19, 2017 (Doc. 7), is
16 **HEREBY DENIED.**

17
18 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

19 Dated: **May 3, 2017**

/s/ Lawrence J. O’Neill
UNITED STATES CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE