

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 LEON HARDIN,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 D. BOUGHMAN, et al.,

15 Defendants.
16

No. 2:17-cv-1340 MCE AC P

ORDER

17 Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed a motion for reconsideration of the
18 July 15, 2021, Order denying his requests to withdraw from the settlement agreement and re-open
19 the case. ECF No. 49.


20 Local Rule 230(j) requires that a motion for reconsideration state “what new or different
21 facts or circumstances are claimed to exist which did not exist or were not shown upon such prior
22 motion, or what other grounds exist for the motion; and . . . why the facts or circumstances were
23 not shown at the time of the prior motion.” L.R. 230(j)(3)-(4). Plaintiff’s motion for
24 reconsideration merely repeats the same arguments that were raised in his original motion to
25 withdraw from the settlement agreement and objections.¹

26
27 ¹ To the extent plaintiff now attempts to claim that the parties agreed to a payment of \$69,500.00
28 and that the signed settlement agreement has been altered to show that the agreement was for
\$9,500.00 and that he agreed to voluntarily dismissed two other cases, ECF No. 49 at 8, the
(continued)

1 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for reconsideration, ECF
2 No. 49, is DENIED.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4
5 Dated: August 25, 2021

6 
7 MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR.
8 SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 _____
28 November 4, 2019 recording of the terms of the settlement conference clearly reflect that plaintiff
agreed to settle the case for \$9,500.00 and to dismiss his two other cases.