

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

HENRY A. JONES,

Plaintiff,

No. 2:10-cv-3206 MCE EFB P

vs.

SAHOTA, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

_____ /


Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this civil rights action seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On February 8, 2012, the undersigned denied plaintiff’s requests for injunctive relief. (ECF No. 62.) Through three separate filings, plaintiff seeks reconsideration of that order. (ECF Nos. 65, 66, 69.) Reconsideration is appropriate if the court (1) is presented with newly discovered evidence, (2) committed clear error or the initial decision was manifestly unjust, or (3) if there is an intervening change in controlling law. Sch. Dist. No. 1J v. ACandS, Inc., 5 F.3d 1255, 1263 (9th Cir. 1993). Local Rule 230(j) requires that a motion for reconsideration state “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.” E.D. Cal., Local Rule 230(j)(3)-(4).

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

Plaintiff fails to describe new or different facts or circumstances that would warrant reconsideration of the Court's order.

Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (ECF Nos. 65, 66, 69) is DENIED.

Dated: August 21, 2012


MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE