

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHARLES T. DAVIS,

Plaintiff,

No. 2:05-cv-1898 JAM EFB P

vs.

D.L. RUNNELS, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

_____ /

On October 4, 2012, plaintiff filed objections to the magistrate judge’s order filed September 25, 2012, which denied plaintiff’s motion to compel and related motions for sanctions and to modify the scheduling order. The court construes plaintiff’s objections as a motion for reconsideration. Pursuant to E.D. Local Rule 303(f), a magistrate judge’s order shall be upheld unless “clearly erroneous or contrary to law.” Upon review of the entire file, the court finds that it does not appear that the magistrate judge’s ruling was clearly erroneous or contrary to law.

Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, upon reconsideration, the order of the magistrate judge filed September 25, 2012, is affirmed.

DATED: November 30, 2012

/s/ John A. Mendez
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE/