

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

CHRISTOPHER LIPSEY, JR.,

Plaintiff,

v.

M. KALIL, et al.,

Defendants.


No. 2:17-cv-01429-TLN-AC

ORDER

Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding *pro se*, has filed a motion for reconsideration of the February 14, 2022 order denying his motion to compel and for sanctions. (ECF No. 69.) 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 motion for reconsideration does not present any new or different facts or circumstances.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration, (ECF No. 69), is DENIED.

DATED: April 5, 2022


Troy L. Nunley
United States District Judge