



1 Plaintiff reasserts in his objections that the magistrate judge failed to fully account  
2 for his argument that, because of his facial disfigurement, he is “regarded as” having a disability  
3 under the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C.A. 12101 et seq. (See ECF 8.) Plaintiff  
4 appears to seek reconsideration of an order already reconsidered and ruled upon by the preceding  
5 district judge. (See ECF 7.) The court considers the earlier ruling as the law of the case and  
6 declines to reexamine the issue. See *One Industries, LLC v. Jim O’Neal Distributing, Inc.*, 578  
7 F.3d 1154, 1159 (9th Cir. 2009) (“the district court had an adequate opportunity to rule, and  
8 actually did rule, on the [i]ssue, making it the ‘law of the case’ and not subject to reopening”).

9 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

10 1. The findings and recommendations filed August 15, 2011, are adopted in  
11 full; and

12 2. All claims and defendants are dismissed except plaintiff’s § 1983 claim  
13 against defendant Williams based on retaliation.

14 DATED: March 23, 2012.

15   
16 \_\_\_\_\_  
17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26