1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	WILLIAM ROUSER,
11	Plaintiff, No. CIV S-07-1107 JAM GGH P
12	VS.
13	K. RUTHERFORD, et al.,
14	Defendants. <u>ORDER</u>
15	
16	On July 31, 2009, plaintiff filed an opposition to the magistrate judge's order filed
17	July 20, 2009, denying his motion for the appointment of counsel. The court construes
18	plaintiff's opposition as a request for reconsideration.
19	Pursuant to E.D. Local Rule 72-303(f), a magistrate judge's orders shall be upheld
20	unless "clearly erroneous or contrary to law." Upon review of the entire file, the court finds that
21	it does not appear that the magistrate judge's ruling was clearly erroneous or contrary to law.
22 23	Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, upon reconsideration, the order of the
24	magistrate judge filed July 20, 2009, is affirmed. DATED: August 31, 2009
25	/s/ John A. Mendez
26	U. S. District Court Judge
	1

(PC) Rouser v. Rutherford et al

Doc. 44