1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 FRANCOIS P. GIVENS, No. 2:15-cv-0720-JAM-KJN PS 12 Plaintiff. 13 v. **ORDER** 14 COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 On November 7, 2016, the court issued a 13-page order analyzing the claims asserted in 18 plaintiff's first amended complaint, and directing that this action shall proceed with the following 19 claims: (a) an excessive force claim in violation of the Fourth Amendment pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 20 § 1983 against defendants Taylor and Becker; (b) a retaliatory arrest claim in violation of the First 21 Amendment pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against defendants Taylor and Becker; and (c) a claim 22 under Title II of the ADA against the County of Sacramento. For the reasons extensively 23 discussed in that order, all other claims and defendants were dismissed with prejudice. (ECF No. 25.) 24 On December 5, 2016, plaintiff filed a request for reconsideration of the court's 25 26 November 7, 2016 order. (ECF No. 30.) More specifically, plaintiff contends that the court 27 should reinstate plaintiff's claims against defendants Jones, Witherspoon, and Torretta, and also

allow him leave to assert additional claims against a deputy clerk at the Sacramento County

28

Superior Court and other sheriff's deputies. Upon requesting reconsideration of a prior order, a party must show, *inter alia*, "what new or different facts or circumstances are claimed to exist which did not exist or were not shown upon such prior motion, or what other grounds exist for the motion." E.D. Cal. L.R. 230(j). The court has carefully reviewed plaintiff's arguments, but finds that they lack merit and/or do not affect the court's analysis in its prior November 7, 2016 order. Therefore, the court denies the request for reconsideration.

No further requests for reconsideration with respect to the November 7, 2016 order will be entertained, and plaintiff is strongly encouraged to focus his efforts on the prosecution of his remaining active claims.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's request for reconsideration (ECF No. 30) is DENIED.

Dated: December 12, 2016

KENDALL J. NEWMAN

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE