

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

James Denerick Nelson, Jr.,
Petitioner,
v.
Patrick Covello, Warden.,
Respondent.

Case No. 2:24-cv-0758-KJM-AC (P)

ORDER

The court previously denied James Denerick Nelson Jr.’s petition for habeas corpus. *See* Order (Feb. 7, 2025), ECF No. 25. Nelson has now filed an “Inscription for relief,” (Mot.) ECF No. 27 at 1, which the court construes as a motion for reconsideration under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(6). “A motion for reconsideration should not be granted, absent highly unusual circumstances, unless the district court is presented with newly discovered evidence, committed clear error, or if there is an intervening change in the controlling law.” *Marlyn Nutraceuticals, Inc. v. Mucos Pharma GmbH & Co.*, 571 F.3d 873, 880 (9th Cir. 2009) (quoting *389 Orange St. Partners v. Arnold*, 179 F.3d 656, 665 (9th Cir. 1999)). While the court does not question the sincerity of Nelson’s filing, his requests as relevant to this case are difficult to understand and at least part of the submission seems to be directed to the Ninth Circuit and not this court. *See* Mot. at 16–80. Nelson has not provided evidence of an intervening change in the law, new evidence, or evidence of clear error by this court. His motion for reconsideration is **denied**.

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

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Nelson’s motion for reconsideration, ECF No. 27, is **denied**; and
2. The clerk of the court is instructed to not docket similar submissions from Nelson in the future.

This order resolves ECF No. 27.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: March 4, 2025.



UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE