ľ

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	ROBBIE DAVIS,	No. 2:18-cv-00090-TLN-EFB
12	Plaintiff,	
13	v.	ORDER
14	R. RACKLEY, Warden, et al.,	
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	On March 26, 2020, the Court dismissed this action as barred by the statute of limitations	
18	and the Clerk of the Court entered judgment. (ECF Nos. 26, 27.) Presently before the Court is	
19	Plaintiff's May 18, 2023 letter, requesting that the Court allow his case to move forward. (ECF	
20	No. 31.) Plaintiff previously filed such a request, which the Court construed as a motion for	
21	reconsideration under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b). (ECF Nos. 28, 29, 30.) That	
22	motion was denied by order filed December 14, 2020. (ECF No. 30.) Like the prior motion, the	
23	instant request is construed as a motion for reconsideration under Rule 60(b). So construed, the	
24	motion is hereby DENIED.	
25	Rule 60(b) provides for reconsideration of a final judgment where one of more of the	
26	following is shown: (1) mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect; (2) newly	
27	discovered evidence which, with reasonable diligence, could not have been discovered within	
28	twenty-eight days of entry of judgment; (3) fraud, misrepresentation, or misconduct of an	
		1

1	opposing party; (4) voiding of the judgment; (5) satisfaction of the judgment; and (6) any other	
2	reason justifying relief. Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b). In the instant motion, Plaintiff repeats arguments	
3	previously raised and rejected by the Court and does not address or otherwise meet the Rule 60(b)	
4	standards.	
5	Accordingly, Plaintiff's May 18, 2023 letter, construed as a motion for relief from	
6	judgment pursuant to Rule 60(b) (ECF No. 31), is DENIED.	
7	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
8	Date: June 20, 2023	
9		
10	my Hunley	
11	Troy L. Nunley	
12	United States District Judge	
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	2	
	\angle	