

- 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

ANDRE JAMAL ROBINSON,
 Plaintiff,

 v.

MATTHEW CATES, et al.,
 Defendants.

No. 2:11-cv-2555 MCE AC P

ORDER

On December 30, 2014, plaintiff filed a request for reconsideration of the magistrate judge’s order filed December 23, 2014, denying plaintiff’s request for counsel. Pursuant to E.D. Local Rule 303(f), a magistrate judge’s orders shall be upheld unless “clearly erroneous or contrary to law.” *Id.* Upon review of the entire file, the Court finds that the magistrate judge’s ruling was not clearly erroneous or contrary to law.

///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///

1 Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the motion for reconsideration (ECF No. 65) is
2 DENIED.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 Dated: January 15, 2015



5
6 MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR., CHIEF JUDGE
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28