UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

CHRISTOPHER A. JONES,

Plaintiff,

v.

DWIGHT NEVEN, et al.,

Defendant.

2:07-CV-1088 JCM (GWF)

Date: N/A
Time: N/A

ORDER

Presently before the court is *pro se* plaintiff Christopher A. Jones' motion for district judge to reconsider magistrate judge's order. (Doc. #224). Defendants filed a response. (Doc. #225). Plaintiff then filed a "supplement" to his motion. (Doc. #226).

In the instant motion, plaintiff moves the court to reconsider Magistrate Judge Foley's order on the sufficiency of defendants' answers. (Doc. #209). Plaintiff objects to the magistrate judge's findings, arguing that many of defendants' answers are insufficient. (Doc. #224).

When reviewing the magistrate judge's order, this court determines whether it is clearly erroneous or contrary to law. *See* FED. R. CIV. P. 72(a); Local Rule IB 3-1. The magistrate judge's order is "clearly erroneous" if this court is left with "a definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed." *See United States v. U.S. Gypsum Co.*, 333 U.S. 364, 395 (1948); *Burdick v. Comm'r IRS*, 979 F.2d 1369, 1370 (9th Cir. 1992). However, "[w]hen reviewing discovery disputes . . . the [m]agistrate is afforded broad discretion, which will be overruled only if abused." *Tafas v. Dudas*, 530 F. Supp. 2d 786, 792 (E.D. Va. 2008).

James C. Mahan
U.S. District Judge

After reviewing the moving papers and defendants' answers, the court is not left with "a definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed." *U.S. Gypsum Co.*, 333 U.S. at 395. The magistrate judge has not abused his "broad discretion," and the court declines to overturn the magistrate judge's order. *See Tafas*, 530 F. Supp. 2d at 792.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that plaintiff Christopher A. Jones' motion for district judge to reconsider magistrate judge's order (doc. #224) be, and the same hereby is, DENIED.

DATED this 31st day of October, 2011.

James C. Mahan

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE