

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

H. DYMITRI HARASZEWSKI,
Plaintiff,
v.
KNIPP, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:13-cv-2494 JAM DB P

ORDER

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On September 15, 2020, this court issued an order denying plaintiff’s motion to inspect sealed documents. (ECF No. 139.) On October 23, 2020, plaintiff filed a request for reconsideration of that order. (ECF No. 141.) Defendants have filed an opposition. (ECF No. 143.)

While defendants construe plaintiff’s motion as seeking reconsideration by the district judge, plaintiff makes clear that he is asking this court to “reconsider its denial of [his] motion to unseal documents.” A motion for reconsideration must demonstrate: “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; and [] why the facts or circumstances were not shown at the time of the prior motion.” E.D. Cal. R. 230(j)(3), (4). Plaintiff makes no attempt to meet this standard. He does not explain why he failed to make these arguments

1 previously. Even if this court considers those arguments, they do not change this court's denial of
2 plaintiff's motion to unseal the exhibits.

3 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's request for reconsideration (ECF
4 No. 141) is denied.

5 Dated: November 15, 2020

6
7
8 
9 DEBORAH BARNES
10 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 DLB:9
18 DB/prisoner-civil rights/hara2494.recon
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28