

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

TOMMIE LEE MCDOWELL, JR.,

Plaintiff,

v.

MR. REMINGTON, et al.,

Defendants.

3:09-CV-00315-LRH-VPC

ORDER

Before the court is Plaintiff’s objection to magistrate judge’s ruling pursuant to Local Rule IB 3-1 (#70¹). Defendants filed a response (#71), and Plaintiff filed a reply (#72). The objection seeks reconsideration of the magistrate judge’s ruling (#69) denying Plaintiff’s motion for leave to file an amended complaint (#42).

The magistrate judge’s denial of leave to amend is a final determination of a pretrial matter pursuant to the magistrate judge’s authority under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A) and Local Rule IB 1-3. Accordingly, a district judge may reconsider the magistrate judge’s order only if it is “clearly erroneous or contrary to law.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a); LR IB 3-1(a).

Having considered the parties’ briefing, the court concludes that the magistrate judge’s denial of leave to amend the complaint is neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law. Plaintiff’s

¹Refers to the court’s docket entry number.

1 allegations in support of his Eighth Amendment claim are identical to the allegations in his original
2 complaint. Also, notwithstanding the amended allegations supporting Plaintiffs' claims under the
3 First and Fourteenth Amendments, the allegations fail to state a claim for the same reasons stated
4 in this court's screening order of March 11, 2010 (#13). Because the proposed amendments would
5 be futile, leave to amend was properly denied.

6 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff's objection to magistrate judge's ruling (#70)
7 is DENIED.

8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 DATED this 17th day of November, 2010.

10
11 

12
13 _____
LARRY R. HICKS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE