

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

9 MADY CHAN,

10 Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-09-2006 MCE GGH P

11 vs.

12 COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, et al.,


13 Defendants.

ORDER

14 _____/
15 On July 21, 2010, plaintiff filed a request for reconsideration of the magistrate
16 judge's order filed July 8, 2010, denying plaintiff's motions for sanctions. Pursuant to E.D.
17 Local Rule 303(f), a magistrate judge's orders shall be upheld unless "clearly erroneous or
18 contrary to law." Upon review of the entire file, the court finds that it does not appear that the
19 magistrate judge's ruling was clearly erroneous or contrary to law.

20 Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, upon reconsideration, the order of the
21 magistrate judge filed July 8, 2010, (Docket No. 42), is affirmed.

22 Dated: July 27, 2010

23 
24 MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR.
25 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
26