

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
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WILL MOSES PALMER,
Petitioner,
v.
A. HEDGPETH, warden,
Respondent.

No. C 09-2900 SI (pr)


**ORDER DENYING
RECONSIDERATION AND
EXTENDING DEADLINES**

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

Petitioner has filed a “motion for relief from judgment dismissing claims two and three.” His motion seeks reconsideration of part of the Order To Show Cause On Three Claims And Dismissing Other Claims. “Reconsideration is appropriate if the district court (1) is presented with newly discovered evidence, (2) committed clear error or the initial decision was manifestly unjust, or (3) if there is an intervening change in controlling law.” School Dist. No. 1J v. ACandS, Inc., 5 F.3d 1255, 1263 (9th Cir. 1993). Reconsideration is not appropriate here because petitioner’s motion reflects nothing more than disagreement with the court’s analysis. The motion is DENIED. (Docket # 10.)

Respondent has filed an ex parte request for an extension of time to respond to the petition for writ of habeas corpus. Having considered the request and the accompanying declaration of attorney Stan Helfman, the court GRANTS respondent's request. (Docket # 9.) Respondent must file and serve his response to the petition no later than **November 24, 2010**. Petitioner must file and serve his traverse no later than **January 7, 2011**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.
DATED: November 4, 2010



SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge