




1 circumstances were not shown at the time of the prior motion.” E.D. Cal., Local Rule 230(j)(3)-  
2 (4).

3 Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration fails to satisfy these standards. He argues that he  
4 was denied the opportunity to respond to Defendants’ supplemental brief addressing whether he  
5 was entitled to relief under the All Writs Act. (ECF No. 150.) The Court determined however,  
6 that because the trial had been continued to January 2020, no court order was “necessary” for the  
7 proper administration of justice, as required by the All Writs Act. (ECF No. 147.) The Court did  
8 not need a response from Plaintiff to resolve Plaintiff’s motions.

9 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration (ECF  
10 No. 150) is denied.

11  
12 Dated: July 11, 2019

13  
14 

15 Troy L. Nunley  
16 United States District Judge  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28