

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

MICHAEL JAMES WALKER,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-10-0053 WBS EFB P

vs.

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, et al.,

Defendants

ORDER


_____/

On September 15, 2010, plaintiff requested reconsideration of the undersigned’s orders denying plaintiff’s request that a fellow inmate and non-attorney, be appointed as plaintiff’s counsel of choice. *See* Dckt. Nos. 13, 17, 18. Although motions to reconsider are directed to the sound discretion of the court, *Frito-Lay of Puerto Rico, Inc. v. Canas*, 92 F.R.D. 384, 390 (D.C. Puerto Rico 1981), considerations of judicial economy weigh heavily in the process. Thus, Local Rule 230(j) requires that a party seeking reconsideration of a district court’s order must brief the “new or different facts or circumstances . . . [which] were not shown upon such prior motion, or what other grounds exist for the motion.” The rule derives from the “law of the case” doctrine which provides that the decisions on legal issues made in a case “should be followed unless there is substantially different evidence . . . new controlling authority, or the prior decision was clearly erroneous and would result in injustice.” *Handi Investment Co. v. Mobil Oil*

1 *Corp.*, 653 F.2d 391, 392 (9th Cir. 1981); *see also Waggoner v. Dallaire*, 767 F.2d 589, 593 (9th
2 Cir. 1985), *cert. denied*, 475 U.S. 1064 (1986). Plaintiff has failed to demonstrate any new or
3 different facts or circumstances which did not exist or were not shown upon the prior motions,
4 and thus, his motion is denied. *See* L.R. 230(j).

5 Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's September 15, 2010 motion for
6 reconsideration is denied.

7 DATED: October 7, 2010.


EDMUND F. BRENNAN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26