




1           The Magistrate Judge recommended dismissing plaintiff's Eighth Amendment  
2 claim against Dr. Nangalama, Dr. Venes and Dr. Hamkar. F&R at 11. This court's order  
3 declined to adopt the recommendation as to Dr. Venes and Hamkar, but does not mention Dr.  
4 Nangalama. *See* Order at 2-4. Plaintiff is now confused as to Dr. Nangalama's status and  
5 liability. Mot. at 1. The court's order, however, twice stated that "the findings and  
6 recommendations filed October 6, 2016, are adopted to the extent consistent with this order."  
7 Order at 1-2, 6. Because the order did not discuss Dr. Nangalama or make any findings contrary  
8 to the Magistrate Judge's conclusions as to him, the recommendation to dismiss plaintiff's Eighth  
9 Amendment claim against Dr. Nangalama was adopted. No claim remains against Dr.  
10 Nangalama.

11           Because plaintiff's one-page motion does not identify any legal or factual error  
12 warranting reconsideration of this court's order, the court DENIES plaintiff's motion for  
13 reconsideration. *See* Local Rule 230(j) (requiring a party to show the "new or different facts or  
14 circumstances [] claimed to exist which did not exist or were not shown upon such prior motion,  
15 or what other grounds exist for [reconsideration.]").

16           IT IS SO ORDERED.

17           This resolves ECF No. 105.

18 DATED: August 16, 2017.

19  
20   
21 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28