

1 misapplies relevant statutes, case law, or rules of procedure.” *Estate of Stephen E. Crawley v.*
2 *Robinson*, No. 13-02042, 2015 WL 3849107, at *2 (E.D. Cal. June 22, 2015) (quoting *Knutson v.*
3 *Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Minn.*, 254 F.R.D. 553, 556 (D. Minn. 2008)).

4 Here, plaintiff faults this court for adopting the magistrate judge’s findings and
5 recommendations without engaging in an independent analysis. Plaintiff misunderstands the
6 district court’s role. District courts review a magistrate judge’s recommendation on dispositive
7 rulings for any legal or factual errors and may adopt the recommendations if no errors exist.
8 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); Local Rule 304. Here, as it noted, the court independently reviewed
9 the magistrate judge’s recommended dismissal. Finding no legal or material factual errors, the
10 court largely adopted the findings and recommendations without detailed analysis, but it did
11 exercise its independent judgment in not adopting the recommendations in full.

12 Instead of dismissing the complaint with prejudice, the court granted plaintiff
13 leave to amend the complaint one more time. Given plaintiff’s consistent noncompliance with
14 Rule 8, as reviewed extensively in the magistrate judge’s order, and plaintiff’s demonstrated
15 propensity for excessive verbiage, the court imposed a 25-page limit. District Court Order at 2.
16 The magistrate judge’s order explained why plaintiff’s initial complaints were too verbose and
17 confusing to state a claim. *See* ECF No. 108. Plaintiff’s position that he does not know how to
18 adequately state his claims within the new limitation is unpersuasive.

19 Plaintiff has not identified any new facts or any plausible legal grounds to warrant
20 reconsideration here. Plaintiff’s seventeen-page motion mostly rehashes his initial objections to
21 the magistrate judge’s order. *See generally* Mot.; Pl.’s Obj. to Magistrate Order, ECF No. 111.
22 This court has no “definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed.” *Concrete*
23 *Pipe & Prods.*, 508 U.S. at 622. The court DENIES plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration.
24 Plaintiff is cautioned to abide by this court’s page limitation order, and all case management
25 orders issued by the magistrate judge. Failure to comply with court orders will result in
26 imposition of sanctions, including possible dismissal of the case.

27 IT IS SO ORDERED. This resolves ECF No. 148.

28 DATED: May 3, 2017.


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE