hear an anticipated motion to compel. (Docket No. 14.)

In light of counsel's repeated requests, the court

28

finds it necessary to re-state the effect of its Order of July 20, 2009: this matter has been referred to the assigned magistrate judge and any motions, including defendant's pending motion to dismiss, shall be heard before the assigned magistrate judge. As Local Rule 72-302 emphasizes, while the undersigned could have retained jurisdiction over this matter, "[a]pplications for retention . . . are looked upon with disfavor and granted only in unusual and compelling circumstances." Defendant's argument that the exercise of jurisdiction by a particular court is unconstitutional is neither an unusual argument by a pro se party nor a compelling reason for the undersigned to retain this action. Therefore, to the extent plaintiff's July 21, 2009 letter was intended to serve as an application for reconsideration of the Order of July 20, 2009, it is DENIED. Any further motions in this matter shall be addressed to the assigned magistrate judge pursuant to this court's Order of July 20, 2009.

19

20

21

2

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

DATED: September 1, 2009

WILLIAM B. SHUBB

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Shibt

2223

24

25

26

27

28