Cox v. Palmer et al Doc. 92

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA RENO, NEVADA

MICHAEL-STEVE COX,) 3:08-CV-00663-ECR-RAM
Plaintiff,) MINUTES OF THE COURT
VS.) DATE: July 28, 2010
J. PALMER, et al.,)
Defendants.)))
PRESENT: EDWARD C. REED, JR.	U. S. DISTRICT JUDGE
Deputy Clerk: COLLEEN LARSEN	Reporter: NONE APPEARING
Counsel for Plaintiff(s)	NONE APPEARING
Counsel for Defendant(s)	NONE APPEARING
MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS	
On October 27, 2009, Plaintiff fireconsideration of the Magistrate Judg motion (#19) to compel.	
"A district judge may reconsider magistrate judge in a civil or crimina has been shown that the magistrate judge contrary to law." Local Rule IB 3-1; so "contrary to law" standard only applied conclusions, which are reviewed de now	dge's ruling is clearly erroneous or see 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A). The es to the Magistrate Judge's legal
The Magistrate Judge's decision (nor contrary to law.	(#47) was neither clearly erroneous
IT IS, THEREFORE, HEREBY ORDERED DENIED.	that Plaintiff's motion (#53) is
	LANCE S. WILSON, CLERK
	By/s/ Deputy Clerk
	Deputy Clerk