

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

11 PATRICIA A. McCOLM,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 TRINITY COUNTY, et al.,

15 Defendants.
16
17

No. 2:14-cv-0773 KJM CKD P

ORDER

18 Plaintiff, a former state prisoner proceeding pro se, filed this civil rights action under 42
19 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff has requested that this court reconsider its February 9, 2015 order
20 dismissing this action and closing the case. (ECF No. 25.)

21 This action was dismissed on February 9, 2015, due to plaintiff's failure to file an
22 amended complaint. (*See* ECF Nos. 21, 23.) Plaintiff's complaint was dismissed with leave to
23 amend by order filed May 29, 2014. (ECF No. 10.) Plaintiff received extensions of time, to and
24 including December 23, 2014, to file an amended complaint. (*See* ECF Nos. 14, 18.) She did not
25 file an amended complaint by that deadline and her request for reconsideration is not
26 accompanied by a proposed amended complaint.

27 /////
28

1 A district court may reconsider a ruling under either Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e)
2 or 60(b). *See Sch. Dist. Number. 1J, Multnomah County v. ACandS, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1262 (9th
3 Cir. 1993). “Reconsideration is appropriate if the district court (1) is presented with newly
4 discovered evidence, (2) committed clear error or the initial decision was manifestly unjust, or
5 (3) if there is an intervening change in controlling law.” *Id.* at 1263. The February 9, 2015
6 decision dismissing this action was not clearly erroneous nor manifestly unjust, and none of the
7 other factors applies.

8 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff’s motion for
9 reconsideration (ECF No. 25) is denied.

10 DATED: April 28, 2015.

11
12 
13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28