| 4 | | |
|--------|--|--|
| 1 | | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 4 | | |
| 4 5 | | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
| 9 | EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | JIMMIE STEPHEN, | No. 2:09-cv-1516 MCE CKD |
| 12 | Plaintiff, | |
| 13 | V. | ORDER |
| 14 | F. ZHANG., | |
| 15 | Defendants. | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | Jimmie Stephen's ("Plaintiff") case is closed. The Court denied Plaintiff's motion | |
| 18 | to reopen the case on December 6, 2012 (ECF No. 164). On January 9, 2013, Jimmie | |
| 19 | Stephen ("Plaintiff") filed a Motion asking the Court to reconsider Magistrate Judge | |
| 20 | Delany's January 2, 2013 Order. (ECF Nos. 166 and 168). | |
| 21 | Judge Delany's Order states: | |
| 22 | | on March 1, 2012. Plaintiff is advised |
| 23 | that documents filed after the closing date will be disregarded and no orders will issue in response to future filings. (ECF No. 166). | |
| 24 | In reviewing a magistrate judge's determination, the assigned judge shall apply | |
| 25 | the "clearly erroneous or contrary to law" standard of review set forth in Local Rule | |
| 26 | 303(f), as specifically authorized by Rule 72(a) and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A). Under this | |
| 27 | standard, the Court must accept the Magistrate Judge's decision unless it has a "definite | |
| 28 | and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed." | |
| | | 1 |

| 1 | Concrete Pipe & Prods. of Cal., Inc. v. Constr. Laborers Pension Trust for S. Cal., | |
|----|---|--|
| 2 | 508 U.S. 602, 622 (1993). If the Court believes the conclusions reached by the | |
| 3 | Magistrate Judge were at least plausible, after considering the record in its entirety, the | |
| 4 | Court will not reverse even if convinced that it would have weighed the evidence | |
| 5 | differently. Phoenix Eng. & Supply Inc. v. Universal Elec. Co., Inc., 104 F.3d 1137, 1141 | |
| 6 | (9th Cir.1997). | |
| 7 | Upon review of the entire file, the Court finds that the Magistrate Judge's ruling | |
| 8 | was not clearly erroneous or contrary to law. The January 2, 2013, Order is therefore | |
| 9 | affirmed. | |
| 10 | Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: | |
| 11 | 1. The Motion for Reconsideration (ECF No. 168) is DENIED; | |
| 12 | 2. The Magistrate Judge's Order (ECF No. 166) is AFFIRMED; and | |
| 13 | 3. Documents filed after this Order is issued will be disregarded and no | |
| 14 | orders will be issued in response to future filings. | |
| 15 | IT IS SO ORDERED. | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | Dated: January 17, 2013 | |
| 18 | MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR, CHIEF JUDGE | |
| 19 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | | |
| 28 | | |
| | 2 | |