1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 Saran Swami, No. 2:14-cv-00844-TLN-EFB 12 Plaintiff, 13 **ORDER** v. 14 District Attorney, 15 Defendant 16 17 This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration. (ECF No. 7.) 18 Plaintiff is a pro se litigant who has filed this action against "District Attorney." (Compl., ECF 19 No. 1.) Plaintiff requests the return of property including a computer and legal documents 20 allegedly taken from his house on April 1, 2014. Plaintiff alleges that without these documents 21 he cannot be "represented effectively." (ECF No. 3 at 2.) Plaintiff requests that "the search 22 warrant should be set aside, all the evidence should be suppressed and seized property should be 23 returned." (ECF No. 3 at 2.) This Court denied Plaintiff's motion for a temporary restraining 24 order on April 4, 2014. (ECF No. 6.) 25 Under Local Rule 230(j), any application for reconsideration must set forth "what new or 26 different facts or circumstances are claimed to exist which did not exist or were not shown upon 27 such prior motion, or what other grounds exist for the motion; and [] why the facts or 28 1

circumstances were not shown at the time of the prior motion." Here, Plaintiff does not set forth any new facts or circumstances, or any other grounds for granting his motion. Nor has Plaintiff corrected any of the deficiencies detailed in this Court's order denying his motion for a temporary restraining order. (See ECF No. 6.) Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration appears to be based only on his dissatisfaction with this Court's ruling, which is an inappropriate basis for relief. See L.R. 230(j). Therefore, Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration is DENIED. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: April 15, 2014 Troy L. Nunley United States District Judge