(PC) Diaz v. Fox et al		
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	MIGUEL ENRIQUE DIAZ,	No. 2:14-cv-2705 JAM CKD P
12	Plaintiff,	
13	v.	<u>ORDER</u>
14	R. FOX, et al.,	
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	On March 4, 2016, plaintiff filed a request for reconsideration of the magistrate judge's	
18	order filed February 24, 2016, staying discovery pending the resolution of defendants' motion to	
19	dismiss the Second Amended Complaint for failure to state a claim. Pursuant to E.D. Local Rule	
20	303(f), a magistrate judge's orders shall be upheld unless "clearly erroneous or contrary to law."	
21	Upon review of the entire file, the court finds that it does not appear that the magistrate judge's	
22	ruling was clearly erroneous or contrary to law.	
23	Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, upon reconsideration, the order of the	
24	magistrate judge filed February 24, 2016 is affirmed.	
25	DATED: March 25, 2016	
26	,	/s/ John A. Mendez
27		UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
28		
		1