1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	
11	LONNIE WILLIAMS, No. 2:11-CV-0431-JAM-CMK-P
12	Plaintiff,
13	vs. <u>ORDER</u>
14	HIGGINS, et al.,
15	Defendants.
16	/
17	Plaintiff, a prisoner proceeding pro se, brings this civil rights action pursuant to
18	42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to
19	Eastern District of California local rules.
20	Plaintiff seeks reconsideration of the Magistrate Judge's June 28, 2012, order. ¹
21	Pursuant to Eastern District of California Local Rule 303(f), a Magistrate Judge's order shall be
22	upheld unless "clearly erroneous or contrary to law." Upon review of the entire file, the court
23	finds that it does not appear that the Magistrate Judge's ruling was clearly erroneous or contrary
24	¹ Initially, plaintiff filed a notice of interlocutory appeal challenging the June 28,
25	2012, order. That appeal was dismissed for lack of appellate jurisdiction. The mandate was filed in this court on August 31, 2012. Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration was filed while the
26	appeal was pending.
	1

1 to law. The June 28, 2012, order will, therefore, be affirmed.

1	to law. The suite 26, 2012, order with, therefore, be affinned.
2	On July 6, 2012, the Magistrate Judge filed findings and recommendations herein
3	which were served on the parties and which contained notice that the parties may file objections
4	within a specified time. Timely objections to the findings and recommendations have been filed.
5	In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule
6	304(f), this court has conducted a <u>de novo</u> review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the
7	entire file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by
8	proper analysis.
9	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:
10	1. Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Doc. 50) is denied;
11	2. No further motions for reconsideration of the Magistrate Judge's June 28,
12	2012, order shall be considered;
13	3. The findings and recommendations filed July 6, 2012, are adopted in full;
14	and
15	4. Plaintiff's motions for injunctive relief (Docs. 27, 37, and 41) are denied.
16	DATED: October 26, 2012
17	/s/ John A. Mendez
18	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
	2