

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

ANTHONY W. ROBINSON,
Plaintiff,
v.
SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:12-cv-02783-MCE-GGH

ORDER

Plaintiff Anthony W. Robinson [“plaintiff”] is proceeding in this civil rights act pro se. On August 30, 2017 the magistrate judge assigned to this case entered Order denying plaintiff’s Motion to Appoint Counsel. ECF No. 136. Plaintiff now seeks reconsideration of that Order. ECF No. 137.


In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304, this Court has conducted a de novo review of this case. Having reviewed the file, and the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations, the Court makes the following findings.

Motions for Reconsideration are controlled both by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b) and Eastern District of California Local Rule 230(j). The Court will construe the plaintiff’s motion as having been brought under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b), which permits the court to relieve a party from a final judgment for one of the following reasons: (1) mistake,

1 inadvertence surprise or excusable neglect, (2) newly discovered evidence, (3) fraud,
2 misrepresentation or misconduct of an opposing party; (5) the judgment (or order in this case) is
3 void; (5) the judgment has been satisfied, released or discharged; or (6) any other reason that
4 justifies relief. None of these bases exist in the present case, and therefore the Order must stand.¹
5 For the foregoing reasons, plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration is DENIED.

6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 Dated: December 4, 2017

8 
9 MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR.
10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25
26 ¹ For petitioner's edification the court notes that it has a panel to which requests for
27 representation can be presented but in this case, as in many others, there is no panel attorney who
28 has expressed a willingness to take the case. The court remains convinced, especially in light of
the language of the motion itself, that petitioner already has a grasp of what needs to be done to
proceed with this case and will be able to do so.