(PC) Finley v	v. Griggs et al
1	
2	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	JOWELL FINLEY,
11	Plaintiff, No. CIV S-07-2344 KJM EFB P
12	VS.
13	R.L. GRIGGS, et al.,
14	Defendants. <u>ORDER</u>
15	
16	On April 8, 2011, the court issued an order memorializing that this case had been settled.
17	Dckt. No. 97. Plaintiff has filed objections to the court's November 7, 2011 order, which the
18	court construes as a request for reconsideration. Dckt. No. 119.
19	Local Rule 230(j) requires that a motion for reconsideration state "what new or different
20	facts or circumstances are claimed to exist which did not exist or were not shown upon such
21	prior motion, or what other grounds exist for the motion," and "why the facts or circumstances
22	were not shown at the time of the prior motion." E.D. Cal., Local Rule 230(j)(3)-(4).
23	In the November 7, 2011 order, the court discharged an order for defendants to show
24	cause why they should not be sanctioned and directed defendants to file dispositional documents
25	within 30 days. The parties' stipulation of voluntary dismissal was timely filed on November 16,
26	2011. Dckt. No. 117. It appears that plaintiff drafted his motion for reconsideration before the
	1

Doc. 120

dispositional documents were timely filed.¹ Additionally, the motion does not describe new or different facts or circumstances that would warrant reconsideration of the November 7, 2011 order. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's November 21, 2011 motion is denied. DATED: May 7, 2012. UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

¹ The proof of service is dated *October* 9, 2011, but references the court's *November* 7, 2011 order. Dckt. No. 119 at 3. Plaintiff misstated the month, as his motion could not have been drafted or mailed in October.