

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 TONY ALLEN,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 ANDERSON, et al.,

15 Defendants.
16

No. 2:13-cv-1458 JAM CKD P

ORDER

17 On December 15, 2014, plaintiff filed a document the court construes as a motion for
18 reconsideration of this court's June 30, 2014 dismissal of this action for plaintiff's failure to
19 oppose defendants' motion to dismiss. A district court may reconsider a ruling under either
20 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) or 60(b). See Sch. Dist. Number. 1J, Multnomah County v.
21 ACandS, Inc., 5 F.3d 1255, 1262 (9th Cir. 1993). "Reconsideration is appropriate if the district
22 court (1) is presented with newly discovered evidence, (2) committed clear error or the initial
23 decision was manifestly unjust, or (3) if there is an intervening change in controlling law." Id. at
24 1263.

25 Plaintiff does not present newly discovered evidence suggesting this matter should not
26 have been dismissed. Furthermore, the court finds that, after a de novo review of this case, the
27 June 30, 2014 order dismissing this case is neither manifestly unjust nor clearly erroneous.

28 /////

1 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that petitioner's December 15, 2014 motion for
2 reconsideration (ECF No. 32) is denied.

3
4 DATED: February 26, 2015

/s/ John A. Mendez
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE