

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WILLIAM TOWNSEND,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-09-2342 KJM P

vs.

D.K. SISTO, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

On September 21, 2009, this court denied petitioner’s motion for the appointment of counsel. Petitioner has now filed a motion to reconsider that order.

Under Local Rule 78-230(k), a person who seeks reconsideration of an order must describe the “new or different facts or circumstances” which “did not exist or were not shown upon such prior motion. . . .” Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration is supported by a number of attachments, which were also included with the initial motion, and is based only on the arguments he presented in the initial motion. He has not shown any basis for reconsideration of the earlier ruling.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that petitioner’s motion for reconsideration (docket no. 9) is denied.

DATED: November 19, 2009.

2/town2342.rec

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE