

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

MICHAEL C. WARNKEN and  
ALL CALIFORNIANS SIMILARLY  
SITUATED,

NO. CIV. S-08-2891 LKK/EFB

Plaintiffs,

v.

O R D E R

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER,  
Governor of California;  
DEBRA BOWEN, Secretary of  
State; JERRY BROWN, Attorney  
General; THE CALIFORNIA  
ASSEMBLY, and ONE TO  
UNKNOWN DOE ASSISTANTS,

Defendants.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

Plaintiff appears pro se seeking relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C.  
§ 1983. In accordance with the local rules, this action has been  
assigned to the magistrate judge. On February 25, 2009, the  
magistrate judge denied plaintiff's request to electronically file  
documents. On March 9, 2009, the plaintiff filed "Objections" to  
this order, which the court construes as a motion for

////

1 reconsideration.<sup>1</sup>

2 Pursuant to Eastern District of California Local Rule 72-  
3 303(f) and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A), a magistrate judge's order  
4 shall be upheld unless "clearly erroneous or contrary to law." Upon  
5 review of the entire file, the court finds that it does not appear  
6 that the magistrate judge's ruling was clearly erroneous or  
7 contrary to law.

8 Accordingly, it is ordered that plaintiff's objections,  
9 construed as a motion for reconsideration, (Doc. No. 40) is DENIED.

10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 DATED: April 3, 2009.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18


19

20

21

22

23

  
LAWRENCE K. KARLTON  
SENIOR JUDGE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

24

25

26

---

<sup>1</sup>Per Local Rule 72-302(c)(21), the magistrate judge may resolve all dispositive and non-dispositive matters in cases in which all plaintiffs or all defendants are proceeding *in propria persona*. This court reviews the magistrate judge's decisions in such cases through a motion for reconsideration. Local Rule 72-303(c).