

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

BRYAN DAMON PATTERSON,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  
Defendants.

No. 2:14-cv-2349 MCE CKD P

ORDER

On May 7, 2015, Plaintiff filed a Motion to Vacate. ECF No. 15. Plaintiff’s Motion requests that the Court reconsider its April 16, 2015 Order (ECF No. 13), which closed this action. A district court may reconsider a ruling under either Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) or 60(b). See Sch. Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah Cnty. v. ACandS, Inc., 5 F.3d 1255, 1262 (9th Cir. 1993). “Reconsideration is appropriate if the district 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.

///  
///  
///  
///

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

Plaintiff does not present newly discovered evidence or suggest that there was an intervening change in controlling law. Furthermore, after conducting a de novo review of the case, the Court finds that the April 16, 2014 Order is neither manifestly unjust nor clearly erroneous.

Accordingly, Plaintiff's May 7, 2015 Motion to Vacate (ECF No. 15) is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 19, 2015

  
MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR., CHIEF JUDGE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT