

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 SONNY BARGER II,
12 aka GARY FRANCIS FISHER,
13 aka GARY DALE BARGER,

14 Plaintiff,

15 vs.

16 KERN COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT,

17 et al.,

18 Defendants.
19
20

1:17-cv-00424-AWI-GSA-PC

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION
(ECF No. 10.)

21
22 Sonny Barger II, aka Gary Francis Fisher, aka Gary Dale Barger (“Plaintiff”), is a state
23 prisoner who filed this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 civil rights case *pro se*. On February 24, 2017,
24 Plaintiff filed the Complaint commencing this action. (ECF No. 1.) On April 7, 2016, this case
25 was dismissed under 29 U.S.C. § 1915(g), without prejudice to refile with payment of the
26 filing fee. (ECF No. 8.) Judgment was entered the same day. (ECF No. 9.) On April 10,
27 2017, Plaintiff filed a motion for reconsideration of the dismissal of this case. (ECF No. 10.)
28

1 In seeking reconsideration of an order, Local Rule 230 requires Plaintiff to show “what
2 new or different facts or circumstances are claimed to exist which did not exist or were not
3 shown upon such prior motion, or what other grounds exist for the motion.” Local Rule 230(j).
4 “A motion for reconsideration should not be granted, absent highly unusual circumstances,
5 unless the district court is presented with newly discovered evidence, committed clear error, or
6 if there is an intervening change in the controlling law.” Marlyn Nutraceuticals, Inc. v. Mucos
7 Pharma GmbH & Co., 571 F.3d 873, 880 (9th Cir. 2009). “A party seeking reconsideration
8 must show more than a disagreement with the Court’s decision, and recapitulation of the cases
9 and arguments considered by the court before rendering its original decision fail to carry the
10 moving party’s burden.” Arteaga v. Asset Acceptance, LLC, 733 F.Supp.2d 1218, 1236 (E.D.
11 Cal. 2010); United States v. Westlands Water Dist., 134 F.Supp.2d 1111, 1131 (E.D. Cal.
12 2001). To succeed, a party must set forth facts or law of a strongly convincing nature to induce
13 the court to reverse its prior decision. See Arteaga, 733 F.Supp.2d at 1236; Westlands Water,
14 134 F.Supp.2d at 1131.

15 Here, Plaintiff has not set forth facts or law of a strongly convincing nature in his
16 motion for reconsideration to induce the court to reverse its prior decision. Therefore, the
17 motion for reconsideration shall be denied.

18
19 **ORDER**

20 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 21 1. Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration, filed on April 10, 2017, is DENIED;
22 2. No further motions for reconsideration or clarification will be entertained; and
23 3. This case remains CLOSED

24 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25 Dated: April 20, 2017

26 
27 _____
28 SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE