

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

JAMES BOWELL,

Plaintiff,

No. 2:10-cv-0397 JAM DAD (PC)

vs.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

_____/

On March 31, 2011, plaintiff filed a document styled as objections to the magistrate judge’s March 9, 2011 order denying plaintiff’s motion for a court-appointed investigator. The court construes this as a request for reconsideration of that order. Pursuant to E.D. Local Rule 303(f), a magistrate judge’s orders shall be upheld unless “clearly erroneous or contrary to law.” Upon review of the entire file, the court finds that it does not appear that the magistrate judge’s ruling was clearly erroneous or contrary to law.¹

////

¹ To the extent that plaintiff’s March 31, 2011 motion includes a request for appointment of counsel or a motion to compel further discovery responses, it is not properly before the district court. See Local Rule 302(c)(17). If in fact plaintiff intends to move to compel discovery responses and/or for appointment of counsel, he should file proper motion(s) before the magistrate judge in accordance with the schedule set for this action.

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

Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, upon reconsideration, the order of the
magistrate judge filed March 9, 2011, is affirmed.

DATED: May 2, 2011

/s/ John A. Mendez
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE