

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**

JOSEPH ANTONETTI,

Plaintiff,

v.

DWIGHT NEVEN, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:08-CV-01020-KJD-LRL

ORDER

Presently before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion to Reconsider (#9). Defendants filed a response in opposition (#11) to which Plaintiff replied. Having read and considered Plaintiff's motion and good cause lacking it is denied. Motions for reconsideration are committed to the discretion of the trial court. See School Dist. No. 1J. Mutlinomah County v. ACandS, Inc., 5 F.3d 1255, 1262 (9th Cir. 1993). Where reconsideration of a non-final order is sought, the court has inherent jurisdiction to modify, alter or revoke it. See United States v. Martin, 226 F.3d 1042, 1049 (9th Cir. 2000); Glavor v. Shearson Lehman Hutton, Inc., 879 F. Supp. 1028, 1032 (N.D. Cal. 1994) ("District courts are authorized to reconsider interlocutory orders at any time prior to final judgment."). Plaintiff has failed to demonstrate that the Court's screening of his proposed amended complaint was in clear error.

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

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion to Reconsider (#9) is

DENIED.

DATED this 14TH day of May 2010.



Kent J. Dawson
United States District Judge