UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHARLES WUNDERLICH,

Plaintiff,

v.

ALLRED, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:24-cv-01847-TLN-CKD

ORDER

On July 14, 2026, the magistrate judge assigned to this matter terminated two motions filed by Plaintiff pursuant to a limiting order prohibiting Plaintiff from filing additional motions for thirty days from June 11, 2026. (ECF No. 75; *see* ECF No. 66.) That order was based on the magistrate judge's finding that Plaintiff had filed a number of frivolous motions in the preceding month. (ECF No. 66.) Before the court is Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration of the July 14, 2026, order. (ECF No. 102.)

Pursuant to E.D. Cal. Local Rule 303(f), a magistrate judge's orders shall be upheld unless "clearly erroneous or contrary to law." The Court finds that the motions were properly struck as violating the magistrate judge's limiting order. *See Ready Transp., Inc. v. AAR Mfg., Inc.*, 627 F.3d 402, 404 (9th Cir. 2010) (discussing the district court's "power to strike items from the docket as a sanction for litigation conduct"). Thus, upon review of the entire file, the Court finds it does not appear that the magistrate judge's ruling is clearly erroneous or contrary to law.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

1. Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (ECF No. 102) is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATE: October 26, 2026

TROY L. NUNLEY
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE