

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

AZHAR LAL,

Plaintiff,

No. 2:07-cv-2060 KJM EFB P

vs.

FELKER, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

\_\_\_\_\_ /

Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this civil rights action seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge as provided by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On June 22, 2012, the magistrate judge filed both an order discharging an order to show cause, and findings and recommendations recommending that plaintiff’s motion for a preliminary injunction be denied. The findings and recommendations were served on all parties and contained notice to all parties that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days from the date the findings and recommendations were served. The court has reviewed the file and finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by the magistrate judge’s analysis.

///

1           After the magistrate judge issued the June 22, 2012 order and findings and  
2 recommendations, plaintiff filed “objections.” The objections do not challenge the magistrate  
3 judge’s recommendation to deny plaintiff’s motion for a preliminary injunction. Rather, plaintiff  
4 states that the “only issue” he wishes to address is the order discharging the order to show cause.  
5 See Dckt. No. 169 at 1; see also June 22, 2012 Order (Dckt. No. 157) at 2-3 (discharging order  
6 for “defense counsel to show cause why he should not be sanctioned for submitting an untrue  
7 declaration regarding the existence of certain documents concerning prison policies about the  
8 distribution of evening ‘nourishment bags’ to diabetic inmates.”).

9           Plaintiff’s stated purpose for filing his objections is to preserve the issue for  
10 appeal “in the event that an appeal is filed in this action so that this issue is not deemed waived.”  
11 Dckt. No. 169 at 1. However, plaintiff’s objections also appear to seek various forms of relief  
12 from this court. See id. at 14-15 (requesting sanctions against defense counsel including  
13 judgment in plaintiff’s favor, disclosure of “the Henderson litigation,” and leave to name seven  
14 new defendants). In an abundance of caution, the court addresses those requests, and for the  
15 reasons stated below, denies them.

16           In seeking sanctions against defense counsel and judgment in his favor pursuant  
17 to Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, plaintiff appears to seek reconsideration of  
18 the magistrate judge’s June 22, 2012 order. Despite its detail and length, plaintiff’s request does  
19 not describe new or different facts or circumstances that would warrant reconsideration of that  
20 order. See E.D. Cal. Local Rule 230(j)(3)-(4) (requiring that a motion for reconsideration state  
21 “what new or different facts or circumstances are claimed to exist which did not exist or were  
22 not shown upon such prior motion, or what other grounds exist for the motion,” and “why the  
23 facts or circumstances were not shown at the time of the prior motion”). Plaintiff’s filing,  
24 construed as a request for reconsideration, is therefore denied.

25 ///

26 ///


1 To the extent plaintiff seeks leave to conduct further discovery or to amend the  
2 complaint, those requests are denied as untimely. See Aug. 20, 2012 Order (Dckt. No. 163)  
3 (closing discovery); June 15, 2009 Order (Dckt. No. 43) (setting September 25, 2009 as deadline  
4 for filing motions to amend).

5 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 6 1. The findings and recommendations filed June 22, 2012, are adopted in full.
- 7 2. Plaintiff's February 27, 2012 motion for a preliminary injunction (Dckt. No.  
8 146) is denied.
- 9 3. Plaintiff's requests, contained within his September 6, 2012 objections (Dckt.  
10 No. 169), are denied.

11 So ordered.

12 DATED: September 27, 2012.

13   
14 \_\_\_\_\_  
15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26