

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JOHN MARVIN BALLARD,

NO. CIV. S-07-2527 LKK/DAD P

Plaintiff,

v.

O R D E R

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendant.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

Petitioner is proceedings *pro se* and has petitioned for a writ of coram nobis. Pending before the court is the petitioner's appeal from the magistrate judge's December 17, 2008 order denying him a court order to permit regular access to the jail's law library, to make unmonitored telephone calls for legal purposes, and for defense funds. The court construes this as a motion for reconsideration of the magistrate judge's order.


Pursuant to Eastern District of California Local Rule 72-303(f) and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A), a magistrate judge's order shall be upheld unless "clearly erroneous or contrary to law." Upon review of the entire file, the court finds that it does not appear

1 that the magistrate judge's rulings were clearly erroneous or  
2 contrary to law.<sup>1</sup> The December 17, 2008 order is, therefore,  
3 affirmed.

4 Accordingly, plaintiff's request for reconsideration (docket  
5 no. 21) is DENIED.

6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 DATED: July 7, 2009.  
8

9  
10   
11 LAWRENCE K. KARLTON  
12 SENIOR JUDGE  
13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

---

24 <sup>1</sup>In his "appeal," the petitioner contends that he only sought  
25 an order stating that he is a *pro se* litigant, not granting him  
26 preferential access to the library. It appears, however, that there  
have been several orders issued in this case that identify  
petitioner as a *pro se* litigant. See Doc. Nos. 6, 9.