(PC) Davis v	v. Kissinger, et al
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	CHARLES T. DAVIS,
11	Plaintiff, No. CIV S-04-0878 GEB DAD P
12	VS.
13	C/O KISSINGER, et al.,
14	Defendants. <u>ORDER</u>
15	/
16	On March 8, 2010, plaintiff filed a request for reconsideration of the magistrate
17	judge's order filed February 25, 2010, denying his motion to compel. Pursuant to E.D. Local
18	Rule 303(f), a magistrate judge's orders shall be upheld unless "clearly erroneous or contrary to
19	law." Upon review of the entire file, the court finds that it does not appear that the magistrate
20	judge's ruling was clearly erroneous or contrary to law.
21	Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, upon reconsideration, the order of the
22	magistrate judge filed February 25, 2010, is affirmed.
23	Dated: March 11, 2010
24	105001
25	GARJAND E. BURRELL JR.
26	United States District Judge
	1

Doc. 202