

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11 DANIEL HARVEY GRIDLEY,

No. 2:08-cv-02659-MCE-EFB P

12 Petitioner,

13 vs.

ORDER

14 JAMES D. HARTLEY,

15 Respondent. \_\_\_\_\_  
16 \_\_\_\_\_/

17 On August 17, 2009, petitioner filed “objections” to the magistrate judge’s order filed  
18 July 31, 2009, denying petitioner’s request for the appointment of counsel. The court construes  
19 petitioner’s “objections” as a request for reconsideration of the magistrate judge’s order.  
20 Pursuant to E.D. Local Rule 72-303(f), a magistrate judge’s orders shall be upheld unless “clearly  
21 erroneous or contrary to law.” Upon review of the entire file, the court finds that it does not  
22 appear that the magistrate judge’s ruling was clearly erroneous or contrary to law.

23 ///


24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

1           Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, upon reconsideration, the order of the  
2 magistrate judge filed July 31, 2009, is affirmed.

3       Dated: August 28, 2009

4   
5 MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR.  
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26