| 1        |   |                       |  |
|----------|---|-----------------------|--|
| 2        |   |                       |  |
| 3        |   |                       |  |
| 4        |   |                       |  |
| 5        |   |                       |  |
| 6        |   |                       |  |
| 7        |   |                       |  |
| 8        | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  |                       |  |
| 9        | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  |                       |  |
| 10       |   |                       |  |
| 11       | JOSHUA NEIL HARRELL,  | No. 2:15-cv-0579 DB P |  |
| 12       | Plaintiff,  |                       |  |
| 13       | v.  | ORDER                 |  |
| 14       | CALIFORNIA FORENSIC MED.<br>GROUP, INC., et al.,  |                       |  |
| 15<br>16 | Defendant.  |                       |  |
| 17       |   |                       |  |
| 18       | Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis with a civil rights   |                       |  |
| 19       | action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. In an order signed September 26 and filed September 27, 2016,  |                       |  |
| 20       | the court denied plaintiff's motion for injunctive relief. (ECF No. 43.) Plaintiff has filed an "chication" to the deniel of his motion. (ECE Nos. 44, 45.) The court construes plaintiff's   |                       |  |
| 21       | "objection" to the denial of his motion. (ECF Nos. 44, 45.) The court construes plaintiff's objections as a motion for reconsideration of the court's order.  |                       |  |
| 22       | Under Local Rule 230(j), a party may seek reconsideration of the denial of a motion by  |                       |  |
| 23       | showing, among other things, "what new or different facts or circumstances are claimed to exist<br>which did not exist or were not shown upon such prior motion, or what other grounds exist for the<br>motion," and "why the facts or circumstances were not shown at the time of the prior motion."<br>Plaintiff reiterates the arguments made previously in his April 20, 2016 motion for injunctive |                       |  |
| 24       |   |                       |  |
| 25       |   |                       |  |
| 26       |   |                       |  |
| 27       | relief (ECF No. 37). Because plaintiff has not shown that something new or different from what  |                       |  |
| 28       | 1   |                       |  |
|          |   | 1                     |  |

| 1  | he argued previously justifies reconsideration of the court's order denying his motion, IT IS |  |
|----|---|--|
| 2  | HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's "Objections" (ECF No. 44) filed here on October 17, 2016      |  |
| 3  | are denied.   |  |
| 4  | Dated: October 20, 2016   |  |
| 5  | 1 martin  |  |
| 6  | lucion  |  |
| 7  | UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  |  |
| 8  |   |  |
| 9  |   |  |
| 10 |   |  |
| 11 |   |  |
| 12 |   |  |
| 13 | DLB:9<br>DLB1/prisoner-civil rights/Harr0579.recon  |  |
| 14 |   |  |
| 15 |   |  |
| 16 |   |  |
| 17 |   |  |
| 18 |   |  |
| 19 |   |  |
| 20 |   |  |
| 21 |   |  |
| 22 |   |  |
| 23 |   |  |
| 24 |   |  |
| 25 |   |  |
| 26 |   |  |
| 27 |   |  |
| 28 | 2   |  |