

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

BERLAN LYNELL DICEY,

Plaintiff,

No. 2:08-cv-2608 JAM JFM (PC)

vs.

W. R. HARRISON, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

\_\_\_\_\_ /

On January 31, 2011, plaintiff filed a motion for reconsideration of the magistrate judge’s order filed January 4, 2011, denying in part plaintiff’s motion for a sixty day extension of time to conduct discovery in this action.<sup>1</sup> Defendants oppose the motion. Pursuant to E.D. Local Rule 303(f), a magistrate judge’s orders shall be upheld unless “clearly erroneous or contrary to law.” Upon review of the entire file, the court finds that it does not appear that the magistrate judge’s ruling was clearly erroneous or contrary to law.

////

////

\_\_\_\_\_

<sup>1</sup> The magistrate judge granted plaintiff a thirty day period of time in which to file and serve a motion to compel further responses to a request for production of documents referred to in the motion for extension of time but denied the motion in all other respects.

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

Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, upon reconsideration, the order of the  
magistrate judge filed January 4, 2011, is affirmed.

DATED: March 3, 2011

/s/ John A. Mendez  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE