1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
8	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9	WILLIAM MOORE,) CASE NO. 2007 and 422 PIP
10	Petitioner,) CASE NO. 2:07-cv-423 BJR
11	v.) ORDER DENYING MOTION) FOR RECONSIDERATION
12	KEN CLARK,) Respondent.
13	
14	Petitioner is a California state prisoner proceeding pro se with a petition for writ of
15 16	
17	habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. On August 8, 2010, the petition was denied and
18	judgment was entered in favor of Respondent. On September 13, 2010, Petitioner filed a motion
19	for reconsideration.
20	The court construes Petitioner's motion as a Rule 60(b) motion for reconsideration.
21	Fed.R.Civ.P. 60(b) provides for reconsideration only upon a showing of "(1) mistake, surprise,
22	or excusable neglect; (2) newly discovered evidence; (3) fraud; (4) a void judgment; (5) a
23	satisfied or discharged judgment; or (6) 'extraordinary circumstances' which would justify
24	relief." School Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah County v. Acands, Inc., 5 F.3d 1255, 1263 (9th Cir.
25	1993). Motions to reconsider are committed to the discretion of the trial court. <i>Rodgers v. Watt</i> ,
	722 F.2d 456, 460 (9 th Cir. 1983) (en banc).
	1

(HC) Moore v. Clark

Doc. 68

Petitioner has offered no new theory, legal authority, or argument as to why habeas relief was improperly denied. Instead, Petitioner simply reargues the claims previously raised in his habeas petition. As such, Petitioner has not demonstrated relief pursuant to Rule 60(b), and his motion is therefore DENIED. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED this 20th day of September, 2010. /s/ Barbara Jacobs Rothstein Barbara Jacobs Rothstein U.S. District Court Judge