1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
8	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
9		
10	RICKY TYRONE FOSTER,	Case No. 1:22-cv-00799-DAD-EPG
11	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF FINDINGS
12	v.	AND RECOMMENDATIONS AND REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO
13	LISA GAMOIAN, et al.,	PAY THE \$402.00 FILING FEE
14	Defendants.	(ECF No. 5)
15		
16		
17	Plaintiff Ricky Tyrone Foster is a state prisoner proceeding pro se in this civil rights	
18	action filed under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (ECF No. 1). On June 27, 2022, Plaintiff file an application	
19	to proceed in forma pauperis in this action. (ECF No. 3). On July 7, 2022, this Court issued	
20	findings and recommendations, recommending that Plaintiff's application be denied and that he	
21	be required to pay the \$402 filing fee in full if he wants to proceed with the action because he had	
22	at least three "strikes" under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) prior to filing this action. (ECF No. 4). The	
23	findings and recommendations gave Plaintiff fourteen days to file any objections, and Plaintiff	
24	has filed no objections to date.	
25	However, Plaintiff has filed a request for reconsideration of the findings and	
26	recommendations and request for extension of time to pay the filing fee. (ECF No. 5). As grounds	
27	for both requests, Plaintiff argues that COVID-19 quarantine procedures at his prison have made	
28	it difficult for him to access legal resources and to communicate with his family regarding	
		1

obtaining the filing fee for this case.

As to the request for reconsideration, the Court finds Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) most applicable, which permits a court to reconsider an order if "presented with newly discovered evidence, [if it is shown that the Court] committed clear error, or if there is an intervening change in the controlling law." 389 Orange St. Partners v. Arnold, 179 F.3d 656, 665 (9th Cir. 1999). Here, Plaintiff has shown none of the above reasons for the Court to reconsider its recommendation that he be required to pay the filing fee. As to the request for an extension of time to pay the filing fee, the Court notes that its findings and recommendations remain pending for the District Judge's consideration. Accordingly, there is no current deadline for Plaintiff to pay the filing fee; rather, the District Judge will set such a deadline if the findings and recommendations are adopted. Based on the forgoing, IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff's request for reconsideration of the findings and recommendations and request for extension of time to pay the filing fee (ECF No. 5) are denied. IT IS SO ORDERED. 18/ Encir P. Grong Dated: __July 25, 2022 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE