

1 Under this standard, the Court must accept the magistrate judge's
2 decision unless it has a "definite and firm conviction that a
3 mistake has been committed." Concrete Pipe & Products of Cal.,
4 Inc. v. Constr. Laborers Pension Trust for So. Cal., 508 U.S.
5 602, 622 (1993). If the Court believes the conclusions reached
6 by the magistrate judge were at least plausible, after
7 considering the record in its entirety, the Court will not
8 reverse even if convinced that it would have weighed the evidence
9 differently. Phoenix Eng. & Supply Inc. v. Universal Elec. Co.,
10 Inc., 104 F.3d 1137, 1141 (9th Cir. 1997).

11 All but one of Plaintiff's challenges here are to the
12 magistrate judge's refusal to order the taking of additional or
13 reconvened depositions because there was insufficient time to
14 conduct those proceedings prior to the July 21, 2011, non-expert
15 discovery cutoff. On the same day Plaintiff filed her instant
16 Request, this Court denied Plaintiff's then-pending request to
17 amend the Pretrial Scheduling Order to extend the above deadline.
18 Accordingly, given the fact that non-expert discovery is now
19 closed, the magistrate judge did not clearly err in refusing to
20 order the taking of additional depositions.

21 Plaintiff's remaining challenge is to the magistrate judge's
22 denial of Plaintiff's request for an order directing Defendant
23 Town of Paradise to supplement its Amended Rule 26 Disclosure
24 Statement regarding the anticipated testimony of a potential
25 witness, Yvette Streeter. More specifically, Plaintiff contends
26 Defendant's disclosure statement was incomplete, necessitating
27 the further disclosure of additional information.

28 ///

1 The magistrate judge denied Plaintiff's request as untimely,
2 however, and Plaintiff makes no real argument, nor points this
3 Court to any relevant authority, indicating that the magistrate
4 judge clearly erred in reaching his conclusion.

5 Accordingly, Plaintiff's Request for Reconsideration of
6 Magistrate Judge's Order (ECF No. 84) is hereby DENIED.

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 Dated: July 28, 2011

9
10 

11 MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR.
12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28