

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

QUINTON JOEY WATTS,
Plaintiff,
v.
TAYMOUR E. MALAK, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:16-cv-0926 JAM AC P

ORDER

On August 16, 2017, plaintiff filed a motion for reconsideration of the order adopting the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations and dismissing the case without leave to amend. ECF No. 17. 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 should be given at least one chance to amend the complaint because he is a pro se prisoner. ECF No. 17. This 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. 17) is denied.

DATED: September 28, 2017

/s/ John A. Mendez

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE