Martin v. Baca et al

Doc. 31

4 dec 5 aff 6 Ru 7 tha 8 not 9 disc 10 Hec 11 125 12 13 apr 14 13)

Motions to reconsider are generally left to the discretion of the trial court. *See Combs v. Nick Garin Trucking*, 825 F.2d 437, 441 (D.C. Cir. 1987). In order to succeed on a motion to reconsider, a party must set forth facts or law of a strongly convincing nature to induce the court to reverse its prior decision. *See Kern-Tulare Water Dist. v. City of Bakersfield*, 634 F. Supp. 656, 665 (E.D. Cal. 1986), aff'd in part and rev'd in part on other grounds 828 F.2d 514 (9th Cir. 1987). Rule 59(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides that any "motion to alter or amend a judgment shall be filed no later than 28 days after entry of the judgment." Furthermore, a motion under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) "should not be granted, absent highly unusual circumstances, unless the district court is presented with newly discovered evidence, committed clear error, or if there is an intervening change in the controlling law." *Herbst v. Cook*, 260 F.3d 1039, 1044 (9th Cir. 2001), quoting *McDowell v. Calderon*, 197 F.3d 1253, 1255 (9th Cir. 1999).

This court had noted previously that it appeared that Martin indicated on his motion for appointment of counsel that he had prepared it and that the motion was clear and organized (ECF No. 13). Now Martin asserts that another inmate prepared his motion for counsel and that he has had inmate legal assistance with all his pleadings. Even assuming Martin has had inmate legal assistance, this court has reviewed the docket and remains unconvinced that appointment of counsel is warranted here. Petitioner has failed to make an adequate showing under either Rule 60(b) or 59(e) that this court's order denying his motion for appointment of counsel should be reversed.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that petitioner's motion for reconsideration of this court's order denying his motion for appointment of counsel (ECF No. 14) is **DENIED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that respondents' motion to extend time to respond to the petition (ECF No. 15) is **GRANTED** *nunc pro tunc*.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that respondents' motion to seal (ECF No. 17) is GRANTED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that petitioner's motion for extension of time to oppose the motion to dismiss (ECF No. 30) is GRANTED. Within sixty (60) days of the date of this order, petitioner shall file and serve his opposition.

DATED: This 9th day of November, 2015.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

-2-