и v. ы	eweretai	D
	Case 2:21-cv-01413-KJM-KJN Document 2	2 Filed 01/17/23 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	Raymond Alford Bradford,	No. 2:21-cv-01413-KJM-KJN
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER
13	V.	
14	K. Brewer, et al.,	
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	Plaintiff Raymond Bradford moves for reconsideration of this court's previous order,	
18	which adopted the Magistrate Judge's recommendation to deny Bradford's application to proceed	
19 20	in forma pauperis. <i>See generally</i> Mot. Recons., ECF No. 21; Prev. Order, ECF No. 20; F&Rs,	
20 21	ECF No. 19. In that previous order, this court noted that Bradford had not filed objections to the Magistrate Judge's findings and recommendations. <i>See</i> Prev. Order at 1. Bradford claims he	
21	could not object because correctional officers stole his legal materials and personal belongings.	
22	See Mot. at 2.	
24	The court assumes without deciding that factors beyond Bradford's control prevented him	
25	from filing timely objections. The court also construes Bradford's motion to reconsider as	
26	objections to the Magistrate Judge's findings and recommendations and considers those	
27	objections now. They do not show Bradford should be permitted to proceed in forma pauperis.	
28	As the Magistrate Judge correctly explained, at least three of Bradford's previous lawsuits were	
	1	
	I	

Case 2:21-cv-01413-KJM-KJN Document 22 Filed 01/17/23 Page 2 of 2

dismissed as "frivolous or malicious" or because they "failed to state a claim upon which relief
may be granted." F&Rs at 1–2 (citing cases). For that reason, Bradford could proceed in forma
pauperis in this action only if he is "under imminent danger of serious physical injury." *Id.* at 2
(quoting 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g)). He has not shown that he faces any such danger, neither in his
original request nor in his motion for reconsideration.

6 Bradford's motion might also be construed as a late request to reconsider the Magistrate 7 Judge's order denying his motions for injunctive relief and to consolidate. See MJ Order, ECF 8 No. 18. The court assumes without deciding that Bradford is entitled to relief from the deadlines 9 imposed by this district's local rules. See E.D. Cal. L.R. 303(b) (setting deadlines for 10 reconsideration by district judges). When asked to reconsider a magistrate judge's pretrial orders, 11 a district court must determine whether the Magistrate Judge's order is "clearly erroneous" or 12 "contrary to law." Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a). Bradford identifies no legal errors in the Magistrate 13 Judge's order. The Magistrate Judge correctly applied the legal standard for pretrial motions for 14 injunctive relief, see MJ Order at 1-3, and consolidation, see id. at 3. The Magistrate Judge 15 denied relief because Bradford did not "explain why he requires a medical hold, or how a transfer 16 might pose a threat of harm." *Id.* at 3. The Magistrate Judge also found no evidence in the record 17 to support Bradford's claims of imminent harm. See id. As for consolidation, the Magistrate 18 Judge could see no "common questions of law or fact" in the matters Bradford would consolidate. 19 See id. These findings were not clearly in error.

20 The motion for reconsideration (ECF No. 21) is **denied**. This matter is referred again to
21 the assigned Magistrate Judge for further proceedings.

22

IT IS SO ORDERED.

23 DATED: January 17, 2023.

24

CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE