

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TERRYLYN MCCAIN,
Plaintiff,
v.
MANGHAM, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:11-cv-01265-KJM-AC

ORDER


This matter is before the undersigned in accordance with Local Rule 302(c)(21). On February 22, 2016, plaintiff filed a document captioned “Partial Objection and Strike Hearsay Allegations in Alternative Demands Offer of Proof from Tow Defendants. Fed. R. Evid. Rule 103 and 1001.” ECF No. 222. Plaintiff’s filing is difficult to understand, but it seems to be a motion for a court order requiring defendants to produce “offers of proof” in support of certain assertions they have made in certain filings. Such a motion has no basis in the federal rules or applicable law, and is simply not cognizable in this court or any other.

To the extent that plaintiff purports to object to the court’s order at ECF No. 209, there is no basis for objection. The order was not a recommendation to the district judge, to which objections are entertained pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B)&(C). Rather, the order was within the authority of the undersigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(a)(1)(A). Plaintiff has presented no grounds for reconsideration of that order.

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

Accordingly, THE COURT HEREBY ORDERS that plaintiff's motion, ECF No. 222, is DENIED.

DATED: February 23, 2016



ALLISON CLAIRE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE