

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

AARON LAMONT STRIBLING,
Plaintiff,
v.
R. MOTT, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:16-cv-0400 MCE CKD P

ORDER

On September 17, 2018, plaintiff filed a motion for reconsideration of the magistrate judge’s order filed August 29, 2018, granting in part and denying in part plaintiff’s February 12, 2018 motion to compel (ECF No. 75). ECF No. 77. 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 only argument is that he believes the magistrate judge ignored his reply in support of his motion to compel. ECF No. 77. Plaintiff does not put forth any new facts or circumstances and his motion does not meet the requirements for a motion for reconsideration or warrant a different outcome.


///
///

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

Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (ECF No. 77) is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 15, 2018


MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE