

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
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RONNIE E. BARRON,
Plaintiff,
v.
M. MARTEL, et al.,
Defendant.

No. 2:10-cv-1567 MCE DB P


ORDER

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis with a civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. In an order signed September 30 and filed October 3, 2016, the court denied plaintiff’s motions for production of documents and for the issuance of a subpoena duces tecum. (ECF No. 116.) Plaintiff has filed an “objection” to the denials of those motions. (ECF No. 117.) The court construes plaintiff’s objections as a motion for reconsideration of the court’s order.

Under Local Rule 230(j), a party may seek reconsideration of the denial of a motion by showing, among other things, “what new or different facts or circumstances are claimed to exist which did not exist or were not shown upon such prior motion, or what other grounds exist for the motion,” and “why the facts or circumstances were not shown at the time of the prior motion.” Plaintiff reiterates the arguments made previously in his May 31, 2016 motion for production of documents (ECF No. 107) and his September 23, 2016 motion for the issuance of a subpoena

1 duces tecum (ECF No. 114). Because plaintiff has not shown that something new or different
2 from what he argued previously justifies reconsideration of the court's order denying his motion,
3 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's "Objection" (ECF No. 117) filed here on October 17,
4 2016 is denied.

5 Dated: October 20, 2016

6
7
8 
9 DEBORAH BARNES
10 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
11
12
13
14

15 DLB9
16 DLB1/prisoner-civil rights/Barr1567.recon
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28