



1 *Trucking*, 825 F.2d 437, 441 (D.C. Cir. 1987). In order to succeed on a motion to reconsider, a party  
2 must set forth facts or law of a strongly convincing nature to induce the court to reverse its prior  
3 decision. *See Kern-Tulare Water Dist. v. City of Bakersfield*, 634 F. Supp. 656, 665 (E.D. Cal.  
4 1986), *aff'd in part and rev'd in part on other grounds* 828 F.2d 514 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1987).

5 In the instant motion, petitioner argues that the court failed to rule on certain grounds  
6 raised in his federal habeas petition and failed to consider certain facts or arguments presented by  
7 petitioner in denying relief. Respondents oppose the motion pointing to the sections of the court's  
8 order addressing the various claim identified by petitioner. In his reply, petitioner contends that the  
9 respondents opposition contains lies and if believed, the court must be incompetent or compromised.  
10 Petitioner's arguments for reversal of this court's previous decision are not persuasive. The motion  
11 for relief from the judgment shall be denied.

12 In its forty-two page Order of September 23, 2009, the court went to significant  
13 lengths to consider and address each claim raised in the petition. Petitioner's arguments contained in  
14 the instant motion attempts to re-litigate the petition, particularly the claims raised in grounds 1(5),  
15 grounds 2(D)(1), 2(D)(3) and 2(C)(1). However, petitioner has failed to demonstrate that he is  
16 entitled to the relief requested, and he presents no new evidence to warrant overturning the judgment  
17 as entered.

18 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that petitioner's motion for relief from judgment  
19 (docket #45) is **DENIED**.

20 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the motion for time (docket #47) is denied as  
21 moot.

22 Dated this 21st day of December, 2010.

23  
24   
25 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
26