1	newly discovered evidence, (2) the district court committed clear error or made an initial decision
2	that was manifestly unjust, or (3) there is an intervening change in controlling law." S.E.C. v.
3	Platforms Wireless Int'l Corp., 617 F.3d 1072, 1100 (9th Cir. 2010) (quotation omitted); see also
4	Antonetti v. Skolnik, No. 3:10-cv-00158-LRH-WCG, 2013 WL 593407, at *1 (D. Nev. Feb. 13,
5	2013) (stating that this Court applies the Rule 59(e) standard to motions for reconsideration of
6	interlocutory orders). Turpening does not make any showing that reconsideration is warranted.
7	Grounds 3, 4, 5 and 6 of his petition are patently meritless.
8	IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that petitioner's Motion for Reconsideration (ECF No. 7)
9	is <b>DENIED</b> .
10	
11	Dated February 1, 2017.
12	
13	WNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
$\sim$ $\sim$ $\sim$	