(PC) Evans	s v. Sisto et al	
1		
1		
2		
3		
4		
5	5	
6		
7	7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	JAMES EVANS,	
11	Plaintiff, No	. 2:09-cv-0292 WBS JFM (PC)
12	vs.	
13	FELKER, et al.,	
14	Defendants. OR	<u>IDER</u>
15	5	
16	On August 13, 2010, plaintiff filed a document styled as objections to the	
17	magistrate judge's order filed August 6, 2010, granting defendants leave to conduct plaintiff's	
18	deposition by videoconference. The court construes plaintiff's objections as a request for	
19	reconsideration of that order. Pursuant to E.D. Local Rule 303(f), a magistrate judge's orders	
20	shall be upheld unless "clearly erroneous or contrary to law." Upon review of the entire file, the	
21	court finds that it does not appear that the magistrate judge's ruling was clearly erroneous or	
22	contrary to law.	
23		
24		
25		
26	5 /////	
		1

Doc. 79

Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, upon reconsideration, the order of the magistrate judge filed August 6, 2010, is affirmed.

DATED: September 9, 2010

WILLIAM B. SHUBB

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE