

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Plaintiff,
v.
DONALD M. WANLAND, JR.,
Defendant.

No. 2:13-cv-2343-KJM-KJN PS

ORDER

On September 21, 2015, defendant filed objections to the court’s September 4, 2015 order denying defendant’s motion to modify the pretrial scheduling order. (ECF No. 42.) Although the order did not specifically provide for the filing of objections, the court liberally construes defendant’s objections as a motion for reconsideration.

Upon requesting reconsideration of a prior order, a party must show, *inter alia*, “what new or different facts or circumstances are claimed to exist which did not exist or were not shown upon such prior motion, or what other grounds exist for the motion.” E.D. Cal. L.R. 230(j). Here, defendant’s motion does not set forth any new facts or newly-discovered evidence, or an intervening change of law. The court has reviewed the arguments in support of defendant’s contention that the court committed clear error in denying modification of the scheduling order, but finds that those arguments lack merit and/or do not affect the court’s analysis and resolution of defendant’s motion. Therefore, there is no basis for the court to reconsider its prior order.


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

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Defendant's motion for reconsideration (ECF No. 42) is DENIED.
2. No further motions for reconsideration with respect to the court's September 4, 2015 order will be entertained.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 23, 2015


KENDALL J. NEWMAN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE