

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

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

\* \* \*

DEANGELO LAMONT MITCHELL, )  
 )  
 Petitioner, )  
 )  
 v. )  
 )  
 D.W. NEVENS, *et al.*, )  
 )  
 Respondents. )  
 \_\_\_\_\_ )

2:06-cv-00066-RCJ-LRL

**ORDER**

Before the court is petitioner’s Motion for Reconsideration of this Court’s Order Dated March 26th Denying Appellant’s Motion for Appointment of Counsel (#18). No opposition was filed.

“Reconsideration is appropriate if the 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, Multnomah County v. ACandS, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1263 (9th Cir. 1993) (citation omitted). The court does not find clear error in its prior ruling; nor has there been an intervening change in controlling law or the presentation of newly discovered evidence.

Accordingly, and for good cause shown,

IT IS ORDERED that petitioner’s Motion for Reconsideration of this Court’s Order Dated March 26th Denying Appellant’s Motion for Appointment of Counsel (#18) is DENIED.

DATED this 1<sup>st</sup> day of February, 2008.



\_\_\_\_\_  
**LAWRENCE R. LEAVITT  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**