1         1         3         4         5         6         0         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1 <td< th=""><th></th><th></th></td<>		
3       4         5       6         6       UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT         7       DISTRICT OF NEVADA         8       ******         9       FELTON MATTHEWS,         11       vs.         12       STATE OF NEVADA LEGISLATURE, et al.,         13       Defendants.         14       1         15       Before the court is Plaintiff's Notice of Appeal of U.S. Magistrate's Ruling to U.S.         16       District Court Judge on Orders Dated: 4-02-09 (#73'), which the court will treat as a motion to reconsider Magistrate's Order #69.         18       The Court has conducted its review in this case, has fully considered the Plaintiff's motion (#73) is denied.         19       The Magistrate Judge's ruling was neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law.         11       TI IS SO ORDERED.         12       DATED this 20 <sup>th</sup> day of May, 2009.         14       LARRY R. HICKS         15       DATED this 20 <sup>th</sup> day of May, 2009.	1	
4       5         6       UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT         7       DISTRICT OF NEVADA         8       *****         9       FELTON MATTHEWS,         10       Plaintiff,         11       vs.         12       STATE OF NEVADA LEGISLATURE, et al.,         13       Defendants.         14	2	
5       6       UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT         7       DISTRICT OF NEVADA         8       ******         9       FELTON MATTHEWS,       3:08-ev-00387-LRH-VPC         10       Plaintiff,       ORDER         11       vs.       ORDER         12       STATE OF NEVADA LEGISLATURE, et al.,       ORDER         13       Defendants.       ORDER         14       State of Nevada LegisLature, et al.,       Defendants.         15       Before the court is Plaintiff's Notice of Appeal of U.S. Magistrate's Ruling to U.S.         16       District Court Judge on Orders Dated: 4-02-09 (#73 <sup>1</sup> ), which the court will treat as a motion to reconsider Magistrate's Order #69.         18       The Court has conducted its review in this case, has fully considered the Plaintiff's motion to are consider Magistrate Judge's ruling was neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law.         19       motion, and other relevant matters of record pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b) (1), and concludes that the Magistrate Judge's Order (#69) will, therefore, be sustained and Plaintiff's motion (#73) is denied.         12       IT IS SO ORDERED.         24       DATED this 20 <sup>th</sup> day of May, 2009.         25       DATED this 20 <sup>th</sup> day of May, 2009.         26       LARRY R. HICKS         27       LARRY R. HICKS         28       <	3	
6       UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT         7       DISTRICT OF NEVADA         8       *****         9       FELTON MATTHEWS,         10       Plaintiff,         11       vs.         12       STATE OF NEVADA LEGISLATURE, et al.,         13       Defendants.         14	4	
7       DISTRICT OF NEVADA         8       ******         9       FELTON MATTHEWS,       3:08-cv-00387-LRH-VPC         10       Plaintiff,       ORDER         11       vs.       ORDER         12       STATE OF NEVADA LEGISLATURE, et al.,       ORDER         13       Defendants.       Defendants.         14       Strict Court Judge on Orders Dated: 4-02-09 (#73 <sup>1</sup> ), which the court will treat as a motion to         15       Before the court is Plaintiff's Notice of Appeal of U.S. Magistrate's Ruling to U.S.         16       District Court Judge on Orders Dated: 4-02-09 (#73 <sup>1</sup> ), which the court will treat as a motion to         17       reconsider Magistrate's Order #69.         18       The Court has conducted its review in this case, has fully considered the Plaintiff's motion distrate Judge's ruling was neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law.         19       The Magistrate Judge's Order (#69) will, therefore, be sustained and Plaintiff's motion (#73) is denied.         12       IT IS SO ORDERED.         14       DATED this 20 <sup>th</sup> day of May, 2009.       JULARY R. HICKS         15       DATED this 20 <sup>th</sup> day of May, 2009.       LARRY R. HICKS         16       LARRY R. HICKS       UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE         17       Image: Complex and the proved tof the protence of the protence of the protence of the	5	
8       ******         9       FELTON MATTHEWS,       3:08-cv-00387-LRH-VPC         10       Plaintiff,       ORDER         11       vs.       STATE OF NEVADA LEGISLATURE, et al.,       ORDER         12       STATE OF NEVADA LEGISLATURE, et al.,       Defendants.       Defendants.         14	6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9       FELTON MATTHEWS,       3:08-cv-00387-LRH-VPC         10       Plaintiff,       ORDER         11       vs.       STATE OF NEVADA LEGISLATURE, et al.,       ORDER         13       Defendants.       Defendants.       Defendants.         14       Image: Strict Court Judge on Orders Dated: 4-02-09 (#73 <sup>1</sup> ), which the court will treat as a motion to       reconsider Magistrate's Order #69.         16       District Court Judge on Orders Dated: 4-02-09 (#73 <sup>1</sup> ), which the court will treat as a motion to       reconsider Magistrate's Order #69.         18       The Court has conducted its review in this case, has fully considered the Plaintiff's motion, and other relevant matters of record pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b) (1), and concludes         19       motion, and other relevant matters of record pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b) (1), and concludes         10       the Magistrate Judge's ruling was neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law.         11       The Magistrate Judge's Order (#69) will, therefore, be sustained and Plaintiff's motion         12       IT IS SO ORDERED.         13       DATED this 20 <sup>th</sup> day of May, 2009.         14       LARRY R. HICKS         15       UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE         16       It Is No Context of the states of the sta	7	DISTRICT OF NEVADA
10       Plaintiff,       3:08-cv-00387-LRH-VPC         11       vs.       ORDER         12       STATE OF NEVADA LEGISLATURE, et al.,       ORDER         13       Defendants.       Defendants.         14       Image: Strate of the court is Plaintiff's Notice of Appeal of U.S. Magistrate's Ruling to U.S.       District Court Judge on Orders Dated: 4-02-09 (#73'), which the court will treat as a motion to reconsider Magistrate's Order #69.         18       The Court has conducted its review in this case, has fully considered the Plaintiff's motion, and other relevant matters of record pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b) (1), and concludes that the Magistrate Judge's Order (#69) will, therefore, be sustained and Plaintiff's motion         12       (#73) is denied.         13       IT IS SO ORDERED.         14       DATED this 20 <sup>th</sup> day of May, 2009.         15       LARRY R. HICKS         16       UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	8	* * * *
10       Plaintiff,       ORDER         11       vs.       STATE OF NEVADA LEGISLATURE, et al.,         12       STATE OF NEVADA LEGISLATURE, et al.,         13       Defendants.         14	9	FELTON MATTHEWS,
11       vs.         12       STATE OF NEVADA LEGISLATURE, et al.,         13       Defendants.         14       Defendants.         15       Before the court is Plaintiff's Notice of Appeal of U.S. Magistrate's Ruling to U.S.         16       District Court Judge on Orders Dated: 4-02-09 (#73 <sup>1</sup> ), which the court will treat as a motion to reconsider Magistrate's Order #69.         18       The Court has conducted its review in this case, has fully considered the Plaintiff's motion, and other relevant matters of record pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b) (1), and concludes that the Magistrate Judge's ruling was neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law.         21       The Magistrate Judge's Order (#69) will, therefore, be sustained and Plaintiff's motion         22       (#73) is denied.         23       IT IS SO ORDERED.         24       DATED this 20 <sup>th</sup> day of May, 2009.         25       EARRY R. HICKS         26       EARRY R. HICKS         27       EARRY R. HICKS         28       EARRY R. HICKS	10	Plaintiff,
13       Defendants.         14         15       Before the court is Plaintiff's Notice of Appeal of U.S. Magistrate's Ruling to U.S.         16       District Court Judge on Orders Dated: 4-02-09 (#73 <sup>1</sup> ), which the court will treat as a motion to         17       reconsider Magistrate's Order #69.         18       The Court has conducted its review in this case, has fully considered the Plaintiff's         19       motion, and other relevant matters of record pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b) (1), and concludes         20       that the Magistrate Judge's ruling was neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law.         21       The Magistrate Judge's Order (#69) will, therefore, be sustained and Plaintiff's motion         22       (#73) is denied.         23       IT IS SO ORDERED.         24       DATED this 20 <sup>th</sup> day of May, 2009.         25       LARRY R. HICKS         26       UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE         28	11	
14	12	STATE OF NEVADA LEGISLATURE, et al.,
<ul> <li>Before the court is Plaintiff's Notice of Appeal of U.S. Magistrate's Ruling to U.S.</li> <li>District Court Judge on Orders Dated: 4-02-09 (#73<sup>1</sup>), which the court will treat as a motion to</li> <li>reconsider Magistrate's Order #69.</li> <li>The Court has conducted its review in this case, has fully considered the Plaintiff's</li> <li>motion, and other relevant matters of record pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b) (1), and concludes</li> <li>that the Magistrate Judge's ruling was neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law.</li> <li>The Magistrate Judge's Order (#69) will, therefore, be sustained and Plaintiff's motion</li> <li>(#73) is denied.</li> <li>IT IS SO ORDERED.</li> <li>DATED this 20<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2009.</li> </ul> LARRY R. HICKS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	13	Defendants.
<ul> <li>District Court Judge on Orders Dated: 4-02-09 (#73<sup>1</sup>), which the court will treat as a motion to</li> <li>reconsider Magistrate's Order #69.</li> <li>The Court has conducted its review in this case, has fully considered the Plaintiff's</li> <li>motion, and other relevant matters of record pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b) (1), and concludes</li> <li>that the Magistrate Judge's ruling was neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law.</li> <li>The Magistrate Judge's Order (#69) will, therefore, be sustained and Plaintiff's motion</li> <li>(#73) is denied.</li> <li>IT IS SO ORDERED.</li> <li>DATED this 20<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2009.</li> </ul> EARRY R. HICKS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	14	,
<ul> <li>reconsider Magistrate's Order #69.</li> <li>The Court has conducted its review in this case, has fully considered the Plaintiff's</li> <li>motion, and other relevant matters of record pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b) (1), and concludes</li> <li>that the Magistrate Judge's ruling was neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law.</li> <li>The Magistrate Judge's Order (#69) will, therefore, be sustained and Plaintiff's motion</li> <li>(#73) is denied.</li> <li>IT IS SO ORDERED.</li> <li>DATED this 20<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2009.</li> </ul> LARRY R. HICKS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	15	Before the court is Plaintiff's Notice of Appeal of U.S. Magistrate's Ruling to U.S.
<ul> <li>The Court has conducted its review in this case, has fully considered the Plaintiff's</li> <li>motion, and other relevant matters of record pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b) (1), and concludes</li> <li>that the Magistrate Judge's ruling was neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law.</li> <li>The Magistrate Judge's Order (#69) will, therefore, be sustained and Plaintiff's motion</li> <li>(#73) is denied.</li> <li>IT IS SO ORDERED.</li> <li>DATED this 20<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2009.</li> </ul> EARRY R. HICKS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	16	District Court Judge on Orders Dated: 4-02-09 (#73 <sup>1</sup> ), which the court will treat as a motion to
<ul> <li>motion, and other relevant matters of record pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b) (1), and concludes</li> <li>that the Magistrate Judge's ruling was neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law.</li> <li>The Magistrate Judge's Order (#69) will, therefore, be sustained and Plaintiff's motion</li> <li>(#73) is denied.</li> <li>IT IS SO ORDERED.</li> <li>DATED this 20<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2009.</li> </ul>	17	reconsider Magistrate's Order #69.
<ul> <li>that the Magistrate Judge's ruling was neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law.</li> <li>The Magistrate Judge's Order (#69) will, therefore, be sustained and Plaintiff's motion</li> <li>(#73) is denied.</li> <li>IT IS SO ORDERED.</li> <li>DATED this 20<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2009.</li> <li><i>JUDIED</i></li> <li><i>LARRY R. HICKS</i></li> <li>UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE</li> </ul>	18	The Court has conducted its review in this case, has fully considered the Plaintiff's
<ul> <li>The Magistrate Judge's Order (#69) will, therefore, be sustained and Plaintiff's motion</li> <li>(#73) is denied.</li> <li>IT IS SO ORDERED.</li> <li>DATED this 20<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2009.</li> <li><i>United states district of the states distribution.</i></li> </ul>	19	motion, and other relevant matters of record pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b) (1), and concludes
<ul> <li>(#73) is denied.</li> <li>IT IS SO ORDERED.</li> <li>DATED this 20<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2009.</li> <li><i>LARRY R. HICKS</i> UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE</li> </ul>	20	that the Magistrate Judge's ruling was neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law.
<ul> <li>IT IS SO ORDERED.</li> <li>DATED this 20<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2009.</li> <li>LARRY R. HICKS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE</li> </ul>	21	The Magistrate Judge's Order (#69) will, therefore, be sustained and Plaintiff's motion
<ul> <li>24 DATED this 20<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2009.</li> <li>25</li> <li>26</li> <li>27</li> <li>28</li> </ul>	22	(#73) is denied.
<ul> <li>25</li> <li>26</li> <li>27</li> <li>28</li> </ul>	23	IT IS SO ORDERED.
<ul> <li>25</li> <li>26</li> <li>27</li> <li>28</li> </ul>		DATED this 20 <sup>th</sup> day of May, 2009.
27   LARRY R. HICKS     28   UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		
28		
		UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
<sup>1</sup> Refers to this court's docket number.	28	
		<sup>1</sup> Refers to this court's docket number.