

1 The evidence of the record reflects that matters have been ‘screened.’ No facts or finding
2 conclude that a finding exist of any merits of a claim against any party as of 2012 as decided
3 under 42 USC 1983 against a specific person or party.” ECF No. 10, p. 1.

4 Relief under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60 “is to be used sparingly as an
5 equitable remedy to prevent manifest injustice and is to be utilized only [in] extraordinary
6 circumstances” *Harvest v. Castro*, 531 F.3d 737, 749 (9th Cir. 2008) (internal quotation
7 marks and citations omitted). The moving party “must demonstrate both injury and circumstances
8 beyond his control” *Id.* (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). Under Local Rule
9 230(j), the moving party must show “what new or different facts or circumstances are claimed to
10 exist which did not exist or were not shown . . . or what other grounds exist for the motion,” and
11 “why the facts or circumstances were not shown at the time of the prior motion.”

12 Here, plaintiff does not show new or different facts or circumstances, or other
13 grounds for the present motion. Further, plaintiff does not explain why he did not raise his
14 objections in response to the Magistrate Judge’s findings and recommendations. As the
15 Magistrate Judge explained in the findings and recommendations, several courts have properly
16 determined plaintiff is barred from proceeding in forma pauperis pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1985(g).
17 ECF No. 8, p. 2. This court adopted the Magistrate Judge’s findings regarding plaintiff’s status
18 under 28 U.S.C. § 1985(g). ECF No. 9, pp. 1-2. Plaintiff presents no evidence here that calls
19 those conclusions into question.

20 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff’s motion for
21 reconsideration (ECF No. 10) is DENIED.

22 DATED: October 30, 2017.

23
24 
25 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
26
27
28