

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Christopher Perez v. Cpl. Beck, et al.

Perez v. Beck · No. 1:25-cv-0162 JLT HBK · Decided September 12, 2025

OPINION

Beck

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 CHRISTOPHER PEREZ,) Case No.: 1:25-cv-0162 JLT HBK) 12 Plaintiff,) ORDER
CONSTRUING PLAINTIFF’S

) OBJECTIONS AS A MOTION FOR

13 v.) RECONSIDERATION UNDER RULE 59 AND

) DENYING RECONSIDERATION

14 CPL. BECK, et al.,)) (Doc. 20) 15 Defendants.)) 16 17 Christopher Perez seeks to hold the
defendants liable for violations of his civil rights at Madera 18 County Jail. (See generally Doc.
17.) The magistrate judge screened Plaintiff’s second amended 19 complaint pursuant to 28
U.S.C. § 1915A(a) and found he failed to state a cognizable claim under 20 federal law. (Id. at 4-
10.) The magistrate judge found that further leave to amend would be futile 21 because the Court
previously provided the applicable legal standards and Plaintiff failed to cure the 22 pleading
deficiencies. (Id. at 11.) The magistrate judge observed that Plaintiff also “stated claims of 23
negligence throughout his complaint” and recommended the Court decline to exercise
supplemental 24 jurisdiction over the claims under state law. (Id.) After the deadline for filing
objections expired, the 25 Court performed a de novo review, adopted the Findings and
Recommendations in full, and dismissed 26 the action on September 4, 2025. (Docs. 18, 19.) 27
Following the entry of judgment, the Court received Plaintiff’s objections to the Findings and 28
Recommendations, which were dated after the deadline to for Plaintiff to submit the filing to
prison 1 || for reconsideration under Rule 59 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

2 Rule 59(e) permits a party to move a court to alter or amend its judgment. “A district court ms
3 || grant a Rule 59(e) motion if it is presented with newly discovered evidence, committed clear
error, 0 4 there is an intervening change in the controlling law.” Wood v. Ryan, 759 F.3d 1117,
1121 (9th Cir 5 2014) (internal quotation marks, citation omitted) (emphasis in original).
Reconsideration is an 6 || “extraordinary remedy, to be used sparingly in the interests of finality
and conservation of judicial 7 || resources.” Kona Enters., Inc. v. Estate of Bishop, 229 F.3d 877,

890 (9th Cir. 2000). Ultimately, 8 || whether to grant or deny a motion for reconsideration is in the “sound discretion” of the district 9 court. Navajo Nation v. Norris, 331 F.3d 1041, 1046 (9th Cir. 2003) (citing Kona, 229 F.3d at 883). 10 Plaintiff does not identify allegations in the SAC that support a conclusion that he states a 11 || cognizable claim. Plaintiff does not identify new facts for the Court to consider, which would support 12 || conclusion that he could cure the deficiencies identified related to his claims under federal law. 13 || Finally, Plaintiff does not dispute the determination that the Court should not exercise jurisdiction ov: 14 || the claims for negligence arising under state law. Ultimately, Plaintiff fails to identify any newly 15 || discovered evidence, show the Court committed a clear error in evaluating the allegations in his SAC 16 || or argue an intervening change in controlling law necessitates an amendment of the Court’s order. 17 || Consequently, Plaintiff fails to show reconsideration is warranted. See Wood, 759 F.3d at 1121. 18 Based upon the foregoing, the Court ORDERS: Plaintiff's objections, construed as motion 19 || under Rule 59(e) to alter or amend judgment (Doc. 20) is DENIED. The action shall remain closed. 20 21 ☐☐ IS SO ORDERED. 22 |! Dated: _ September 12, 2025 (LAW pA L. wan
23 TED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
24 25 26 27 28