UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JOHN DOE,

Plaintiff,

v.

DONALD J. TRUMP,

Defendant.

No. 2:25-cv-02086-TLN-JDP

ORDER

On November 11, 2025, this Court denied Plaintiff's Motion for reconsideration of the magistrate judge's order denying Plaintiff's motion to proceed under pseudonym. (ECF No. 11.) Plaintiff has now filed a second Motion for Reconsideration of the same order. (ECF No. 12.) For the reasons set forth below, the Court DENIES Plaintiff's second Motion for Reconsideration.

As set forth in this Court's prior order, a party may object to a non-dispositive pretrial order of a magistrate judge within fourteen days after service of the order. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a). The magistrate judge's order will be upheld unless it is "clearly erroneous or contrary to law." *Id.*; 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A); E.D. Cal. L.R. 303(f). "A party seeking reconsideration must set forth facts or law of a strongly convincing nature to induce the court to reverse a prior decision." *Martinez v. Lawless*, No. 1:12-CV-01301-LJO-SKO, 2015 WL 5732549, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 29, 2015) (citing *Kern-Tulare Water Dist. v. City of Bakersfield*, 634 F. Supp. 656, 665

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

(E.D. Cal. 1986), *aff'd in part and rev'd in part on other grounds*, 828 F.2d 514 (9th Cir. 1987)).

Under the "clearly erroneous" standard, "the district court can overturn the magistrate judge's ruling only if the district court is left with the 'definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed.'" *E.E.O.C. v. Peters' Bakery*, 301 F.R.D. 482, 484 (N.D. Cal. 2014) (quoting *Burdick v. C.I.R.*, 979 F.2d 1369, 1370 (9th Cir. 1992)). "Thus, review under the 'clearly erroneous' standard is significantly deferential.'" *Concrete Pipe and Prods. of Cal., Inc. v. Constr. Laborers Pension Tr. for S. Cal.*, 508 U.S. 602, 623 (1993). "A [m]agistrate [j]udge's decision is 'contrary to law' if it applies an incorrect legal standard, fails to consider an element of applicable standard, or fails to apply or misapplies relevant statutes, case law, or rules of procedure." *Martin v. Loadholt*, No. 1:10-CV-00156-LJO-MJ, 2014 WL 3563312, at *1 (E.D. Cal. July 18, 2014) (citation omitted).

This Court previously held that absent further argument and upon review of the entire record, the magistrate judge's decision denying Plaintiff's motion to use a pseudonym was not clearly erroneous or contrary to law. (ECF No. 11.) This was not an invitation to file a second motion for reconsideration on the same issue. While the Court does not discredit Plaintiff's fears, as this Court stated previously, Plaintiff's assertions do not establish the magistrate judge's order was clearly erroneous or contrary to law. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a). As such, Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration (ECF No. 12) is DENIED. Plaintiff is advised that further motions for reconsideration of the magistrate judge's July 29, 2025 order will be disregarded and no further order will issue on the matter.

Date: December 12, 2025

TROY L. NUNLEY
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE