

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TYRONE ADAMS,)	
)	2:11-cv-00826-GEB-CKD
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	<u>ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR</u>
)	<u>RECONSIDERATION</u>
CHARLES L. EASLEY, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

Plaintiff requests reconsideration of the Magistrate Judge's January 4, 2012 Order, which denied Plaintiff's motions filed December 30, 2011 (ECF Nos. 78-81) and limited Plaintiff's future filings to the following documents:


- a. One opposition to any motion filed by defendants (and clearly titled as such);
- b. Only one motion pending at any time. Such motion must be properly noticed for hearing. Plaintiff is limited to one memorandum of points and authorities in support of the motion and one reply to any opposition; and
- c. One set of objections to any findings and recommendations.

(ECF No. 87.)

Pursuant to E.D. Cal. R. 303(f) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(a), a Magistrate Judge's orders shall be upheld unless "clearly erroneous" or "contrary to law." Upon review of the entire file, the court finds that Plaintiff has not shown the Magistrate

1 Judge's ruling was clearly erroneous or contrary to law. Therefore,
2 Plaintiff's request for reconsideration is DENIED.

3 Dated: January 26, 2012

4
5 
6 _____
7 GARLAND E. BURRELL, JR.
8 United States District Judge
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28