

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
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * * * *

TYRONE HUTCHINS,)	Case No. 3:10-cv-00369-LRH-WGC
Plaintiff,)	
vs.)	<u>ORDER</u>
NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF)	
CORRECTIONS, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
Defendants.)	

Before the court is Defendants’ Motion for Reconsideration of Order Adopting Report and Recommendation (#46)¹. No opposition has been filed on behalf of Plaintiff.

The Defendants’ Motion for Reconsideration is based in significant part upon a misstatement by the court in the first page of its order (#44) adopting the Report and Recommendation (#42) of Magistrate Judge Cobb. In Order #44, the court mistakenly identified Plaintiff as having filed document #43, which was Defendants’ Objection to the Report and Recommendation by Magistrate Judge Cobb. This court further compounded the mistake by stating that Defendants had not filed an opposition to the objection. Actually document #43 was Defendants’ Objection to the Report and Recommendation and it was Plaintiff who had not filed an opposition to the objection. The court regrets this editing error; however it confirms that a *de novo* review was conducted by the court on all dispositive matters contained within the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Cobb.

Defendants’ Motion for District Judge to Reconsider the Order is **GRANTED to the**

¹ Refers to the court’s docket number.

1 **limited extent that the above stated transpositional error in Order #44 should be, and**
2 **hereby is, corrected by this order.**

3 With regard to the Defendants' challenge of the Magistrate Judge's order granting
4 Plaintiff leave to file his second amended complaint, Defendants repeat their same arguments
5 which were previously presented to Magistrate Judge Cobb as well as to this court in Defendants'
6 objection to Judge Cobb's Report and Recommendation. No other grounds for reconsideration
7 of the court's ruling have been shown, with the exception of the editing correction previously
8 ordered, and Defendants' Motion for Reconsideration (#46) is hereby DENIED.

9
10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 DATED this 4th day of June, 2012.



12
13
14 LARRY R. HICKS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE