1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff, Plainti, Plainti, Plainti, Plainti,		
3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	1	
4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) 12 Plaintiff,) 13 v. 14 SIERRA PACIFIC INDUSTRIES, et) 15 16 17 Defendants. 18 Defendants. 19 "Motion for Reconsideration of Recusal Order" (Doc # 106). 11 In accordance with Local Rule 303(f), 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A) 12 and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a), this Court has conducted a de novo 13 review of this matter. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, 14 the Court finds Magistrate Judge Brennan's Recusal Order (Doc # 91) 15 to be supported by the record and by proper analysis. There is 16 17 18 Defendant Sierra Pacific Industries (SPI) has filed its 19 "Motion for Reconsideration of Recusal Order" (Doc # 106). 11 In accordance with Local Rule 303(f), 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A) 10	2	
5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff, ORDER DENYING SIERRA PACIFIC 12 Plaintiff,	3	
6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) Case No. 2:09-CV-02445 JAM-EFB 12 Plaintiff,) 13 v. 14 SIERRA PACIFIC INDUSTRIES, et) 15 Defendants.) 16	4	
7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff, Plainti, Plaintiff, Plainti, Plainti	5	
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Case No. 2:09-CV-02445 JAM-EFB 11 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Case No. 2:09-CV-02445 JAM-EFB 12 Plaintiff, ORDER DENYING SIERRA PACIFIC 13 v. INDUSTRIES' MOTION FOR 14 SIERRA PACIFIC INDUSTRIES, et Pefendants. 16 Defendants. JUDGE BRENNAN'S RECUSAL ORDER 17 Defendants. Plaintiff has filed its opposition to this Motion (Doc # 106). 18 Defendants filed its opposition to this Motion (Doc # 111). 19 "Motion for Reconsideration of Recusal Order" (Doc # 106). 20 Plaintiff has filed its opposition to this Motion (Doc # 111). 21 In accordance with Local Rule 303(f), 28 U.S.C. \$ 636(b)(1)(A) 22 and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a), this Court has conducted a de novo 23 review of this matter. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, 24 the Court finds Magistrate Judge Brennan's Recusal Order (Doc # 91) 25 to be supported by the record and by proper analysis. There is 26 nothing in the Recusal Order that is clearly erroneous or contrary	6	
9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Case No. 2:09-CV-02445 JAM-EFB 12 Plaintiff, Case No. 2:09-CV-02445 JAM-EFB 13 V. Case No. 2:09-CV-02445 JAM-EFB 14 Plaintiff, Case No. 2:09-CV-02445 JAM-EFB 15 N. Case No. 2:09-CV-02445 JAM-EFB 16 Plaintiff, Case No. 2:09-CV-02445 JAM-EFB 17 Defendants. JUDGE DENYING SIERRA PACIFIC 18 Defendant Sierra Pacific Industries (SPI) has filed its 19 "Motion for Reconsideration of Recusal Order" (Doc # 106). 19 Plaintiff has filed its opposition to this Motion (Doc # 111). 11 In accordance with Local Rule 303(f), 28 U.S.C. \$ 636(b)(1)(A) 22 and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a), this Court has conducted a <u>de novo</u> 23 review of this matter. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, 24 the Court finds Magistrate Judge Brennan's Recusal Order (Doc # 91) 25 to be supported by the record and by proper analysis. There is 16 nothing in the Recusal Order that is clearly erroneous or contrary	7	
10 11 11 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff, Case No. 2:09-CV-02445 JAM-EFB 12 Plaintiff, 13 v. 14 SIERRA PACIFIC INDUSTRIES, et al., ORDER DENVING SIERRA PACIFIC INDUSTRIES' MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE BRENNAN'S RECUSAL ORDER 16 Defendants. JUDGE BRENNAN'S RECUSAL ORDER 17 Defendants. JUDGE DERVING SIERRA PACIFIC 18 Defendants. JUDGE BRENNAN'S RECUSAL ORDER 19 "Notion for Reconsideration of Recusal Order" (Doc # 106). 10 Plaintiff has filed its opposition to this Motion (Doc # 111). 11 In accordance with Local Rule 303(f), 28 U.S.C. \$ 636(b)(1)(A) 12 and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a), this Court has conducted a <u>de novo</u> 13 review of this matter. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, 14 the Court finds Magistrate Judge Brennan's Recusal Order (Doc # 91) 15 to be supported by the record and by proper analysis. There is 16 nothing in the Recusal Order that is clearly erroneous or contrary	8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
<pre>11 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,</pre>	9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
12 Plaintiff, 13 v. 14 SIERRA PACIFIC INDUSTRIES, et 15 Defendants. 16 Defendants. 17 Defendant Sierra Pacific Industries (SPI) has filed its 18 Defendant for Reconsideration of Recusal Order" (Doc # 106). 20 Plaintiff has filed its opposition to this Motion (Doc # 111). 21 In accordance with Local Rule 303(f), 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A) 22 review of this matter. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, 24 the Court finds Magistrate Judge Brennan's Recusal Order (Doc # 91) 25 to be supported by the record and by proper analysis. There is 26 nothing in the Recusal Order that is clearly erroneous or contrary	10	
13 v. ORDER DENYING SIERRA PACIFIC INDUSTRIES' MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE BRENNAN'S RECUSAL ORDER 14 SIERRA PACIFIC INDUSTRIES, et al., JUDGE BRENNAN'S RECUSAL ORDER 15 Defendants. JUDGE BRENNAN'S RECUSAL ORDER 16 JUDGE BRENNAN'S RECUSAL ORDER 17 Defendants. 18 Defendant Sierra Pacific Industries (SPI) has filed its 19 "Motion for Reconsideration of Recusal Order" (Doc # 106). 20 Plaintiff has filed its opposition to this Motion (Doc # 111). 21 In accordance with Local Rule 303(f), 28 U.S.C. \$ 636(b)(1)(A) 22 and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a), this Court has conducted a <u>de novo</u> 23 review of this matter. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, 24 the Court finds Magistrate Judge Brennan's Recusal Order (Doc # 91) 25 to be supported by the record and by proper analysis. There is 26 nothing in the Recusal Order that is clearly erroneous or contrary	11	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) Case No. 2:09-CV-02445 JAM-EFB
<pre>13 v. <u>INDUSTRIES' MOTION FOR</u> 14 SIERRA PACIFIC INDUSTRIES, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 Defendant Sierra Pacific Industries (SPI) has filed its 17 Defendant Sierra Pacific Industries (SPI) has filed its 18 Defendant Sierra Pacific Industries (SPI) has filed its 19 "Motion for Reconsideration of Recusal Order" (Doc # 106). 20 Plaintiff has filed its opposition to this Motion (Doc # 111). 21 In accordance with Local Rule 303(f), 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) (1) (A) 22 and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a), this Court has conducted a <u>de novo</u> 23 review of this matter. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, 24 the Court finds Magistrate Judge Brennan's Recusal Order (Doc # 91) 25 to be supported by the record and by proper analysis. There is 26 nothing in the Recusal Order that is clearly erroneous or contrary</pre>	12	· · · ·
<pre>14 SIERRA PACIFIC INDUSTRIES, et) al., 15 16 16 17 18 Defendant Sierra Pacific Industries (SPI) has filed its 19 "Motion for Reconsideration of Recusal Order" (Doc # 106). 10 Plaintiff has filed its opposition to this Motion (Doc # 111). 11 accordance with Local Rule 303(f), 28 U.S.C. \$ 636(b)(1)(A) 20 and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a), this Court has conducted a <u>de novo</u> 23 review of this matter. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, 24 the Court finds Magistrate Judge Brennan's Recusal Order (Doc # 91) 25 to be supported by the record and by proper analysis. There is 26 nothing in the Recusal Order that is clearly erroneous or contrary</pre>	13	v.) INDUSTRIES' MOTION FOR
<pre>15 Defendants.) 16 Defendants.) 17 18 Defendant Sierra Pacific Industries (SPI) has filed its 19 "Motion for Reconsideration of Recusal Order" (Doc # 106). 20 Plaintiff has filed its opposition to this Motion (Doc # 111). 21 In accordance with Local Rule 303(f), 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A) 22 and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a), this Court has conducted a <u>de novo</u> 23 review of this matter. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, 24 the Court finds Magistrate Judge Brennan's Recusal Order (Doc # 91) 25 to be supported by the record and by proper analysis. There is 26 nothing in the Recusal Order that is clearly erroneous or contrary</pre>	14	SIERRA PACIFIC INDUSTRIES, et) JUDGE BRENNAN'S RECUSAL ORDER
16 17 18 Defendant Sierra Pacific Industries (SPI) has filed its 19 "Motion for Reconsideration of Recusal Order" (Doc # 106). 20 Plaintiff has filed its opposition to this Motion (Doc # 111). 21 In accordance with Local Rule 303(f), 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A) 22 and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a), this Court has conducted a <u>de novo</u> 23 review of this matter. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, 24 the Court finds Magistrate Judge Brennan's Recusal Order (Doc # 91) 25 to be supported by the record and by proper analysis. There is 26 nothing in the Recusal Order that is clearly erroneous or contrary	15)
 Defendant Sierra Pacific Industries (SPI) has filed its "Motion for Reconsideration of Recusal Order" (Doc # 106). Plaintiff has filed its opposition to this Motion (Doc # 111). In accordance with Local Rule 303(f), 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a), this Court has conducted a <u>de novo</u> review of this matter. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court finds Magistrate Judge Brennan's Recusal Order (Doc # 91) to be supported by the record and by proper analysis. There is nothing in the Recusal Order that is clearly erroneous or contrary 	16	Defendants.)
¹⁹ "Motion for Reconsideration of Recusal Order" (Doc # 106). ²⁰ Plaintiff has filed its opposition to this Motion (Doc # 111). ²¹ In accordance with Local Rule 303(f), 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A) ²² and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a), this Court has conducted a <u>de novo</u> ²³ review of this matter. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, ²⁴ the Court finds Magistrate Judge Brennan's Recusal Order (Doc # 91) ²⁵ to be supported by the record and by proper analysis. There is ²⁶ nothing in the Recusal Order that is clearly erroneous or contrary	17)
Plaintiff has filed its opposition to this Motion (Doc # 111). In accordance with Local Rule 303(f), 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a), this Court has conducted a <u>de novo</u> review of this matter. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court finds Magistrate Judge Brennan's Recusal Order (Doc # 91) to be supported by the record and by proper analysis. There is nothing in the Recusal Order that is clearly erroneous or contrary	18	Defendant Sierra Pacific Industries (SPI) has filed its
In accordance with Local Rule 303(f), 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a), this Court has conducted a <u>de novo</u> review of this matter. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court finds Magistrate Judge Brennan's Recusal Order (Doc # 91) to be supported by the record and by proper analysis. There is nothing in the Recusal Order that is clearly erroneous or contrary	19	"Motion for Reconsideration of Recusal Order" (Doc # 106).
and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a), this Court has conducted a <u>de novo</u> review of this matter. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court finds Magistrate Judge Brennan's Recusal Order (Doc # 91) to be supported by the record and by proper analysis. There is nothing in the Recusal Order that is clearly erroneous or contrary	20	Plaintiff has filed its opposition to this Motion (Doc $\#$ 111).
23 review of this matter. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, 24 the Court finds Magistrate Judge Brennan's Recusal Order (Doc # 91) 25 to be supported by the record and by proper analysis. There is 26 nothing in the Recusal Order that is clearly erroneous or contrary	21	In accordance with Local Rule 303(f), 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A)
the Court finds Magistrate Judge Brennan's Recusal Order (Doc # 91) to be supported by the record and by proper analysis. There is nothing in the Recusal Order that is clearly erroneous or contrary	22	and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a), this Court has conducted a <u>de</u> novo
25 to be supported by the record and by proper analysis. There is 26 nothing in the Recusal Order that is clearly erroneous or contrary	23	review of this matter. Having carefully reviewed the entire file,
26 nothing in the Recusal Order that is clearly erroneous or contrary	24	the Court finds Magistrate Judge Brennan's Recusal Order (Doc # 91)
	25	to be supported by the record and by proper analysis. There is
27 to law.	26	nothing in the Recusal Order that is clearly erroneous or contrary
	27	to law.
28	28	

1

1	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that SPI's Motion for
2	Reconsideration of Recusal Order is DENIED.
3	
4	IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: December 6, 2010
5	Dated: December 6, 2010
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	