

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHARLES D. VILLACRES,  
Plaintiff,

v.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF  
CORRECTIONS, et al.,  
Defendant.

No. 2:16-cv-0305 JAM AC P

ORDER

On April 12, 2017, the Clerk of the Court filed plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration of the order adopting the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations and dismissing various portions of the complaint without leave to amend (ECF No. 18).<sup>1</sup> ECF No. 19. Local Rule 230(j) requires that a motion for reconsideration state “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; and . . . why the facts or circumstances were not shown at the time of the prior motion.” L.R. 230(j)(3)-(4). Plaintiff’s request for reconsideration does not put forth any new evidence or law and merely rehashes the arguments made in his complaint.

<sup>1</sup> Although the motion is captioned as objections to the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations, it was filed well after the time for filing objections had passed and has a copy of the order adopting the findings and recommendations attached as an exhibit. ECF No. 19 at 9-10.

1 Accordingly, he has not meet the requirements for a motion for reconsideration or shown that a  
2 different outcome is warranted.

3 Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (ECF  
4 No. 19) is denied.

5 DATED: May 26, 2017

/s/ John A. Mendez\_\_\_\_\_

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28