

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

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

WILLIAM MOORE,	)	
Petitioner,	)	CASE NO.    2:07-cv-423 BJR
	)	
v.	)	
	)	ORDER DENYING MOTION
	)	FOR RECONSIDERATION
KEN CLARK,	)	
Respondent.	)	

Petitioner is a California state prisoner proceeding pro se with a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. On August 8, 2010, the petition was denied and judgment was entered in favor of Respondent. On September 13, 2010, Petitioner filed a motion for reconsideration.

The court construes Petitioner’s motion as a Rule 60(b) motion for reconsideration. Fed.R.Civ.P. 60(b) provides for reconsideration only upon a showing of “(1) mistake, surprise, or excusable neglect; (2) newly discovered evidence; (3) fraud; (4) a void judgment; (5) a satisfied or discharged judgment; or (6) ‘extraordinary circumstances’ which would justify relief.” *School Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah County v. Acands, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1263 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1993). Motions to reconsider are committed to the discretion of the trial court. *Rodgers v. Watt*, 722 F.2d 456, 460 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1983) (en banc).

