

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
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

| | | |
|---------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| ROBERT MITCHELL, |) | Case No. 2:08-CV-1196-JAM-EFB |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | <u>ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS'</u> |
| |) | <u>MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION</u> |
| v. |) | |
| |) | |
| TOM FELKER, et al., |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |
| |) | |
| |) | |
| |) | |


This matter is before the Court on Defendants' Tom Felker, J. Walker, C. Buckley, D. Vanderville, D. Leiber, J. Mayfield, A. Masuret, T. Barnard, J. Owen, D. Hellwig, T. Kimzey, D. Cade, R. Blanthorn, R. Beamon, T. Lockwood, J. McClure, J. Tilton, M. Wright and F. Foulk (collectively "Defendants") Request for Reconsideration by the District Court of the Magistrate Judge's Ruling (Doc. #86). Defendants seek reconsideration of the Magistrate Judge's September 22, 2011 order granting Plaintiff leave to amend his complaint to add additional parties, dismiss some parties, allege certain claims on behalf of a state-wide class, and dismiss some claims (Doc. #83). Plaintiff Robert

1 Mitchell ("Plaintiff") opposes the request (Doc. #89).

2 Eastern District of California Local Rule 303(f) and Federal
3 Rule of Civil Procedure 72(a) provide that the District Court may
4 modify or set aside a magistrate judge's order if the order is
5 clearly erroneous or contrary to law. Having reviewed the papers,
6 the Court does not find the Magistrate Judge's order to be clearly
7 erroneous or contrary to law. Accordingly, the Defendants' Request
8 for Reconsideration is DENIED.

9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 Dated: October 27, 2011


11 JOHN A. MENDEZ,
12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28