

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
3 OAKLAND DIVISION

4 ROY A. MELANSON,

5 Plaintiff,

6 vs.

7 MARY JOHNSON,

8 Defendants.
9

Case No: C 11-0446 SBA (pr)

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
RENEWED REQUEST FOR
APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL**

Docket 31


10 On February 1, 2012, the Court denied Plaintiff's request for appointment of
11 counsel. Dkt. 23. On September 27, 2012, Plaintiff submitted a one-page letter
12 which stated, inter alia: "I am pro se on [sic] this case and need the assistance of
13 counsel." Dkt. 30. Because the Court previously denied Plaintiff's motion for
14 appointment of counsel, the Court liberally construes Plaintiff's letter as a as request
15 for reconsideration of the order denying his prior motion for the appointment of
16 counsel.

17 Before a party may file a motion for reconsideration, he or she must first seek
18 leave to do so under Civil Local Rule 7-9. Plaintiff has not complied with this
19 requirement, and the instant motion otherwise fails to make the requisite showing
20 under Local Rule 7-9. The Court may summarily deny motions that are not filed in
21 compliance with the Court's local rules. See Tri-Valley CAREs v. U.S. Dept. of
22 Energy 671 F.3d 1113, 1131 (9th Cir. 2012). Even if Plaintiff had sought and
23 obtained leave in accordance with Civil Local Rule 7-9, he has failed to provide any
24 reasons why reconsideration is warranted. See 389 Orange Street Partners v. Arnold,
25 179 F.3d 656, 665 (9th Cir. 1999) ("A motion for reconsideration should not be
26 granted, absent highly unusual circumstances, unless the district court is presented
27 with newly discovered evidence, committed clear error, or if there is an intervening
28 change in the controlling law."). Accordingly,

1 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT Plaintiff's renewed motion for
2 appointment of counsel (Dkt. 31) is DENIED.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 Dated: 2/15/13


SAUNDRA BROWN ARMSTRONG
United States District Judge