(PC) Miller v	v. Stowell et al	
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	IN THE UNITED S	STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	ERNEST MILLER,	
11	Plaintiff,	No. CIV S-10-1605 GEB DAD P
12	VS.	
13	B. STOWELL, et al.,	
14	Defendants.	<u>ORDER</u>
15		
16	On July 22, 2010, plaintiff filed a document styled, "Notice of Motion Objections	
17	By Plaintiff," which the court construes as a request for reconsideration of the magistrate judge's	
18	order filed July 8, 2010. In that order, the magistrate judge found plaintiff ineligible to proceed	
19	in forma pauperis pursuant to 28 U.S.C. \S 1915(g) and ordered plaintiff to pay the \S 350.00 filing	
20	fee. Pursuant to E.D. Local Rule 303(f), a magistrate judge's orders shall be upheld unless	
21	"clearly erroneous or contrary to law." Upon review of the entire file, the court finds that it does	
22	not appear that the magistrate judge's ruling was clearly erroneous or contrary to law.	
23	Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:	
24	1. Upon reconsideration, the order of the magistrate judge filed July 8, 2010, is	
25	affirmed; and	
26	/////	
		1

Doc. 7

2. Within fifteen days from the service of this order, plaintiff shall pay the \$350.00 filing fee. Failure to pay the filing fee will result in the dismissal of this action without prejudice.

Dated: August 11, 2010

CARLAND E. BURKELL, GR. United States District Judge