1		
2		
3		
4		
5	UNITED STATES D	JISTRICT COURT
6	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA	
7		
8	ANTOINNE LITTLEJOHN,	
9	Plaintiff,	CASE NO. C13-5077 BHS
10	V.	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS
11	AMY KERNKAMP,	
12	Defendant.	
12 13	Defendant.	
	This matter comes before the Court on	Plaintiff Antoinne Littlejohn's
13		-
13 14	This matter comes before the Court on	-
13 14 15	This matter comes before the Court on ("Littlejohn") motion for reconsideration (Dkt to appoint counsel (Dkt. 5).	-
13 14 15 16	This matter comes before the Court on ("Littlejohn") motion for reconsideration (Dkt to appoint counsel (Dkt. 5).	. 3), motion to amend (Dkt. 4), and motion motion to proceed <i>in forma pauperis</i> and a
13 14 15 16 17	This matter comes before the Court on ("Littlejohn") motion for reconsideration (Dkt to appoint counsel (Dkt. 5). On February 1, 2013, Littlejohn filed a	. 3), motion to amend (Dkt. 4), and motion motion to proceed <i>in forma pauperis</i> and a eased "non-conviction information" in
13 14 15 16 17 18	This matter comes before the Court on ("Littlejohn") motion for reconsideration (Dkt to appoint counsel (Dkt. 5). On February 1, 2013, Littlejohn filed a complaint alleging that certain state actors rele	. 3), motion to amend (Dkt. 4), and motion motion to proceed <i>in forma pauperis</i> and a eased "non-conviction information" in endment of the United States Constitution.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	This matter comes before the Court on ("Littlejohn") motion for reconsideration (Dkt to appoint counsel (Dkt. 5). On February 1, 2013, Littlejohn filed a complaint alleging that certain state actors releviolation of his right under the Fourteenth Am	. 3), motion to amend (Dkt. 4), and motion motion to proceed <i>in forma pauperis</i> and a eased "non-conviction information" in endment of the United States Constitution.

1 Motions for reconsideration are governed by Local Rule CR 7(h), which provides 2 as follows: 3 Motions for reconsideration are disfavored. The court will ordinarily deny such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not 4 have been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable diligence. 5 Local Rule CR 7(h)(1). 6 In this case, Littlejohn has failed to show that the Court's order contains a 7 manifest error of law. In fact, the material that Littlejohn has submitted reinforces the 8 Court's conclusion that Littlejohn has failed to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. There is no general constitutional right to privacy of police investigations. 10 Therefore, the Court **DENIES** Littlejohn's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. 3) and 11 **DENIES** Littlejohn's other motions (Dkts. 4 & 5) as moot because his complaint has 12 been dismissed. 13 IT IS SO ORDERED. 14 Dated this 27th day of February, 2013. 15 16 17 United States District Judge 18 19 20 21

22