

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
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WALTER HOWARD WHITE,
Plaintiff,
v.
D. SMYERS, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:12-cv-2868-MCE-AC-P

ORDER

On February 4, 2016 and March 8, 2016, respectively, this Court denied (at ECF Nos. 179 and 180) Plaintiff's reconsideration requests (ECF Nos. 173 and 157) as to orders made by the assigned Magistrate Judge in this matter and filed on April 16, 2015 and July 14, 2015, respectively. See ECF Nos. 144 and 126. Plaintiff's reconsideration requests were denied on grounds that, after reviewing the entire file, this Court could not say that the Magistrate Judge's challenged decisions were clearly erroneous. Then, on April 1, 2016 and April 18, 2016, Plaintiff filed two additional requests that the court reconsider its prior denials of reconsideration. Plaintiff has cited no authority authorizing successive reconsideration requests, and there is none. Plaintiff's additional motions for

1 reconsideration (ECF Nos. 182 and 184) are consequently DENIED.¹

2 IT IS SO ORDERED.

3 Dated: September 27, 2016

4 
5 MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR.
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

¹ The Court notes that to the extent Plaintiff's April 1, 2016 reconsideration request asks the Court to review and consider additional exhibits pertaining to a continued stay of this matter, those exhibits have now been submitted by a supplemental filing (ECF No. 181) and were considered by the Magistrate Judge in connection with Plaintiff's Eighth Motion to Stay. See August 23, 2016 Order and Findings and Recommendations, ECF No. 190, 3:18-4:11. Consequently, to the extent Plaintiff's reconsideration request asked the Court to consider those exhibits, that request has now been rendered moot.