

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

KENNETH WASHINGTON,

Plaintiff,

v.

ANDREW NANGALAMA, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:14-cv-0232 CKD P

ORDER

On February 20, 2014, plaintiff filed a motion asking that the court reconsider the January 31, 2014 denial of plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel. A ruling may be reconsidered under either Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) or 60(b). See Sch. Dist. Number. 1J, Multnomah County v. ACandS, Inc., 5 F.3d 1255, 1262 (9th Cir. 1993). Reconsideration is appropriate if the court (1) is presented with newly discovered evidence, (2) committed clear error or the initial decision was manifestly unjust, or (3) if there is an intervening change in controlling law. Id. at 1263.

While plaintiff points to additional evidence in support of his request for the appointment of counsel, the court still does not find that there are exceptional circumstances warranting this court requesting the voluntary assistance of counsel pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1515(e)(1).

Accordingly, after a de novo review of the denial of plaintiff's request for the appointment of counsel precipitated by plaintiff's February 20, 2014 motion for reconsideration (ECF No. 6),

1 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the court's January 31, 2014 order denying plaintiff's motion for  
2 the appointment of counsel is affirmed.

3 Dated: March 25, 2014



4 \_\_\_\_\_  
5 CAROLYN K. DELANEY  
6 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

6

7

8

9

1  
wash232.mfr

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28