

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
27

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Kennard Davis,

Plaintiff,

v.

James Walker, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:08-cv-0593-KJM-DB

Kennard Davis,

Plaintiff,

v.

James Walker, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:10-cv-2139-KJM-DB

ORDER

Plaintiff Kennard Davis objects to the magistrate judge’s recent order, which was filed in both of the cases captioned above. *See* Objections, Case No. 08-593, ECF No. 287; Objections, Case No. 10-2139, ECF No. 364. The court construes these objections as untimely requests for reconsideration under Local Rule 303(c) and extends the deadline for reconsideration on its own motion.


1 When a litigant asks a district judge to review a magistrate judge’s orders under Local
2 Rule 303, the district judge must decide whether the magistrate judge’s order was “clearly
3 erroneous or contrary to law.” E.D. Cal. L.R. 303(f); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A); Fed. R. Civ. P.
4 72(a). The magistrate judge’s order is not clearly in error, and it is not contrary to law.

5 **Plaintiff’s objections, construed as motions to reconsider, are denied.** This order resolves
6 ECF No. 287 in Case No. 08-593 and ECF No. 364 in Case No. 10-2139.

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 DATED: March 24, 2023.

9



CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE