

1 circumstances, unless the district court is presented with newly discovered evidence, committed
2 clear error, or if there is an intervening change in the controlling law.” *389 Orange St. Partners*
3 *v. Arnold*, 179 F.3d 656, 665 (9th Cir. 1999) (citation omitted). Here, no such justification exists.
4 Although plaintiff suggests his delayed response was caused by his relocation to CSATF, the
5 court’s docket indicates plaintiff’s address was updated to his CSATF address on July 6, 2018,
6 pursuant to a “Notice of Change of Address” form filed in another of his Eastern District cases,
7 *Callender v. Ramm, et al.*, 2:16-cv-00694-JAM-AC. On August 28, 2018, the Clerk’s Office re-
8 served the findings and recommendation at plaintiff’s updated address, and a notice of non-
9 delivery was never received. Therefore, as the record currently stands, plaintiff had fourteen days
10 from receipt of the findings and recommendations, re-served on August 28, 2018, to file
11 objections. He never did. Accordingly, because plaintiff presents no justification for relief from
12 judgment, his motion, ECF No. 24, is DENIED.

13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14 DATED: June 21, 2019.

15 
16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28