1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	STEVEN WAYNE BONILLA,	Case No. 1:18-cv-00700-AWI-BAM (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S SECOND AND THIRD MOTIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION
13	v.	
14	JUDGE DEAN T. STOUT,	(ECF Nos. 17, 18)
15	Defendant.	
16		
17	Plaintiff Steven Wayne Bonilla ("Plaintiff"), a state prisoner, proceeded pro se in this civil	
18	rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.	
19	On June 19, 2018, the assigned Magistrate Judge issued findings that Plaintiff was subject	
20	to the three strikes bar under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g), and his complaint did not satisfy the imminent	
21	danger exception. The Magistrate Judge recommended that the action be dismissed, without	
22	prejudice, due to Plaintiff's failure to pay the filing fee. (ECF No. 9.) On August 22, 2018, after	
23	a de novo review of the case, the Court adopted the findings and recommendations in full and	
24	dismissed this action. (ECF No. 13.) Judgment was entered the same date. (ECF No. 14.)	
25	On October 29, 2018, Plaintiff filed a motion for reconsideration. (ECF No. 15.) The	
26	motion was denied, as Plaintiff presented no grounds for reconsideration of the Court's final order	
27	and judgment dismissing this action. (ECF No. 16.)	
28		
		1

Currently before the Court are Plaintiff's objections to the Court's ruling and a call for the disbarment of Magistrate Judge McAuliffe, filed November 14, 2018, and Plaintiff's notice alleging violation of 18 U.S.C. § 242 by the undersigned, filed November 30, 2018. (ECF Nos. 17, 18.) In his filings, Plaintiff repeats his attempts to overturn an Alameda County conviction by arguing that the trial court's ruling is a void judgment. Plaintiff argues that both the undersigned and Magistrate Judge McAuliffe have deprived him of his rights under the Constitution by refusing to find that his conviction is void on its face. (Id.) The Court construes these submissions as Plaintiff's second and third motions for reconsideration.

As Plaintiff's filings again fail to raise any basis for overturning the Court's ruling that he is obligated to pay the filing fee in this action, and that he failed to do so, the Court finds no basis to grant Plaintiff relief from the judgment. The Court further finds that the requests for sanctions or other legal action against the undersigned or Magistrate Judge McAuliffe are without merit. The Court strongly discourages Plaintiff from submitting additional filings based on the same arguments he has now repeatedly presented, and that have been repeatedly rejected by this Court and others. Further submissions to this closed action, based on these same arguments, will be stricken from the record.

Accordingly, Plaintiff's second and third motions for reconsideration, (ECF Nos. 17, 18), are DENIED.

20 IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 11, 2019

SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ The Court notes that in 2018 alone, Plaintiff filed more than 100 civil rights actions and habeas corpus petitions, all also attempting to obtain relief related to Plaintiff's Alameda County conviction, which has resulted in Plaintiff being declared a vexatious litigant. See Bonilla v. Fresno County, Case No. 2:18-cv-02544-JAM-KJN (E.D. Cal.).