1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 ----00000----11 12 WILLIAM STEWART NEELY, No. 2:08-cv-01416 WBS CKD 13 Petitioner, 14 v. ORDER 15 DIRECTOR, CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, et 16 al., 17 Respondents. 18 ----00000----19 Defendant's Motion for Relief from Judgment Pursuant to 20 FRCP 60(b) (Docket No. 57) is hereby REFERRED to the assigned 2.1 Magistrate Judge for findings and recommendation pursuant to 28 2.2 U.S.C. \S 636(b)(1)(B), for determination as to (1) whether 23 petitioner has presented newly discovered evidence, (2) whether 24 petitioner has shown that the district court committed clear 25 error or that the court's denial of his writ of habeas corpus was 26

manifestly unjust, and (3) any other appropriate determinations

as to petitioner's motion. See Sch. Dist. Number. 1J, Multnomah

27

28

1	County v. ACandS, Inc., 5 F.3d 1255, 1262 (9th Cir. 1993).
2	IT IS SO ORDERED.
3	1.
4	Dated: August 16, 2022 Milliam & Shibt
5	WILLIAM B. SHUBB UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
6	
7	
8	
9	
LO	
L1	
L2	
L3	
L4	
L5	
L 6	
L7	
L8	
L 9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	