



1 Rule 12, Rules Governing § 2254 Proceedings. Courts construing Federal Rule of Civil  
2 Procedure 59(e) have noted that a motion to reconsider is not a vehicle permitting the  
3 unsuccessful party to “rehash” arguments previously presented, or to present “contentions which  
4 might have been raised prior to the challenged judgment.” Costello v. United States, 765 F.Supp.  
5 1003, 1009 (C.D.Cal. 1991); see also F.D.I.C. v. Meyer, 781 F.2d 1260, 1268 (7th Cir. 1986);  
6 Keyes v. National R.R. Passenger Corp., 766 F. Supp. 277, 280 (E.D. Pa. 1991). These holdings  
7 “reflect[] district courts’ concerns for preserving dwindling resources and promoting judicial  
8 efficiency.” Costello, 765 F.Supp. at 1009. Here, petitioner fails to demonstrate circumstances  
9 warranting reconsideration. His motion must therefore be denied.

10 In addition, the court takes no on petitioner’s request for the appointment of counsel as  
11 this case is now closed. Petitioner is hereby informed that the court will not respond to future  
12 filings in this action that are not authorized by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or the Federal  
13 Rules of Appellate Procedure.

14 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that petitioner’s January 24, 2014 Rule 59(e)  
15 motion to alter the judgment (ECF No. 11) is denied.

16 DATED: April 9, 2014.

17  
18  
19 

20 LAWRENCE K. KARLTON  
21 SENIOR JUDGE  
22 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28