

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

TERRENCE L. DAVIS,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-11-1027 CKD P

vs.

SAC. CO. JAIL, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

\_\_\_\_\_ /

Plaintiff has filed a motion for reconsideration of the court’s November 21, 2011 screening order. A court may reconsider a ruling under either Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) or 60(b). See Sch. Dist. Number. 1J, Multnomah County v. ACandS, Inc., 5 F.3d 1255, 1262 (9th Cir. 1993). “Reconsideration is appropriate if the district 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.” Id. at 1263.

Plaintiff fails to point to anything suggesting reconsideration of the November 21, 2011 screening order is warranted. Plaintiff’s motion is vague and contains pages of extraneous and confusing material. Plaintiff is cautioned that if he continues to file documents similar in content to this, the court will impose page limitations on the documents plaintiff may file, limit the number of documents plaintiff may file, or impose other sanctions.

1                   Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's December 23, 2011  
2 motion for reconsideration is denied.

3                   Dated: January 3, 2012

4                     
5                   \_\_\_\_\_  
6                   CAROLYN K. DELANEY  
7                   UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

8                   l/mp  
9                   davi1027.mfr

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26