1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	
11	DARIUS GAINES, No. 2:10-cv-00429-MCE-KJM P
12	Petitioner,
13	vs. <u>ORDER</u>
14	
14	DARRELL G. ADAMS,
14	Respondent.
15	
15 16	Respondent/
15 16 17	Respondent. / On August12, 2010, petitioner filed a document titled "request for rehearing."
15 16 17 18	Respondent. / On August12, 2010, petitioner filed a document titled "request for rehearing." The court construes this as a motion for reconsideration of the court's July 6, 2010 order
15 16 17 18 19	Respondent. / On August12, 2010, petitioner filed a document titled "request for rehearing." The court construes this as a motion for reconsideration of the court's July 6, 2010 order dismissing this case.
15 16 17 18 19 20	Respondent. / On August12, 2010, petitioner filed a document titled "request for rehearing." The court construes this as a motion for reconsideration of the court's July 6, 2010 order dismissing this case. A district court may reconsider a ruling under either Federal Rule of Civil
 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 	Respondent. / On August12, 2010, petitioner filed a document titled "request for rehearing." The court construes this as a motion for reconsideration of the court's July 6, 2010 order dismissing this case. A district court may reconsider a ruling under either Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) or 60(b). See Sch. Dist. Number. 1J, Multnomah County v. ACandS, Inc., 5
 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 	Respondent. / On August12, 2010, petitioner filed a document titled "request for rehearing." The court construes this as a motion for reconsideration of the court's July 6, 2010 order dismissing this case. A district court may reconsider a ruling under either Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) or 60(b). <u>See Sch. Dist. Number. 1J, Multnomah County v. ACandS, Inc.</u> , 5 F.3d 1255, 1262 (9th Cir. 1993). "Reconsideration is appropriate if the district court (1) is
 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 	Respondent. / On August12, 2010, petitioner filed a document titled "request for rehearing." The court construes this as a motion for reconsideration of the court's July 6, 2010 order dismissing this case. A district court may reconsider a ruling under either Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) or 60(b). <u>See Sch. Dist. Number. 1J, Multnomah County v. ACandS, Inc.</u> , 5 F.3d 1255, 1262 (9th Cir. 1993). "Reconsideration is appropriate if the district court (1) is presented with newly discovered evidence, (2) committed clear error or the initial decision was

Plaintiff fails to point to any evidence, law or anything else suggesting the court should reconsider its order dismissing this action. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's August 12, 2010 "request for rehearing" is denied.

Dated: August 18, 2010

Olun

MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR. UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE