

1 On January 6, 2020, the assigned Magistrate Judge issued Findings and Recommendations
2 recommending that Plaintiff's motion to amend the complaint filed on December 2, 2019, be denied.
3 (ECF No. 87.) The Findings and Recommendations were served on the parties and contained notice
4 that objections were due within fourteen days. (Id.) Plaintiff filed objections on January 15, 2020.
5 (ECF No. 92.)

6 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the Court has conducted a *de*
7 *novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, including Plaintiff's objections,
8 the Court finds the Findings and Recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper
9 analysis.

10 In his objections, Plaintiff continues to argue, *inter alia*, that he was denied a copy of his
11 deposition, he is unable to depose certain witnesses, and he it was "unfair" to deny appointment of
12 counsel and appointment of an expert witness. (ECF No. 88.) Plaintiff's arguments were properly
13 addressed by orders issued by the assigned Magistrate Judge (ECF Nos. 35, 63, 72, 76, 80, 91), and
14 Plaintiff fails to demonstrate any basis for reconsideration. As stated by the Magistrate Judge,
15 Plaintiff's indigency and in forma pauperis status does not entitle him to counsel, a free copy of the
16 deposition transcript, or waiver of the fees necessary to depose witnesses. Plaintiff's mere
17 disagreement with any court order is not a valid basis for reconsideration. U.S. Westlands Water
18 Dist., 134 F.Supp.2d 1111, 1131 (E.D. Cal. 2001); see also In re Pacific Far East Lines, Inc., 889 F.2d
19 242, 250 (9th Cir. 1989) (Rule 60(b)(6) may provide relief where parties were confronted with
20 extraordinary circumstances but it does not provide a second chance for parties who made deliberate
21 choices).

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

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

Based on the foregoing, it is HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. The Findings and Recommendations issued on December 17, 2019, and January 6, 2020 (ECF Nos. 85 and 87) are adopted in full;
2. Plaintiff's motion to amend the complaint (ECF No. 82) is denied;
3. Defendants' motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 68) is granted; and
4. The Clerk of Court shall enter judgment in favor of Defendants.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 27, 2020

/s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE