1 2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 3 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 4 5 EDWARD BRIDGEMAN, No. 2:16-cy-0928 JAM AC P 6 Plaintiff, 7 **ORDER** v. 8 R. FOX, et al., 9 Defendants. 10 11 On June 23, 2016, plaintiff filed a request for reconsideration of the order adopting the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations and dismissing the case as duplicative of 12 13 Bridgeman v. Department of California Corrections, Case No. 2:15-cv-02579 JAM AC (ECF No. 14 6). ECF No. 4. Local Rule 230(j) requires that a motion for reconsideration state "what new or 15 different facts or circumstances are claimed to exist which did not exist or were not shown upon 16 such prior motion, or what other grounds exist for the motion; and . . . why the facts or 17 circumstances were not shown at the time of the prior motion." L.R. 230(j)(3)-(4). Plaintiff's only allegations are that he filed an amended complaint as directed and that he needs an attorney 18 19 to assist him. ECF No. 8. These allegations do not meet requirements for a motion for 20 reconsideration or warrant a different outcome. 21 Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (ECF No. 8) is denied. 22 23 DATED: March 29, 2017 24 /s/ John A. Mendez_ 25 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE 26 27 The court notes that an amended complaint was filed in Bridgeman v. Department of California 28 Corrections, Case No. 2:15-cv-02579 JAM AC, which still remains pending. 1