

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

SALAAM JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

LIEUTENANT PRIMMER, *et al.*

Defendants.

ORDER

10-cv-316-slc

Plaintiff Salaam P. Johnson is proceeding in this case on First Amendment claims that he was improperly denied electronics for 65 days and retaliated against for using the inmate complaint review system. On April 15, 2011, the court denied plaintiff's second motion to compel discovery. Now he moves reconsideration of that order. Dkt. 69.

In plaintiff's affidavit in support of his motion, dkt. 70, plaintiff asserts that his motion should be construed as an objection to the magistrate's order pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). However, this provision does not apply because plaintiff consented to the magistrate judge's jurisdiction over his entire case. Therefore, I will address plaintiff's motion for reconsideration. As defendant points out, plaintiff does not state *how* the court erred in deciding his motion. Rather, plaintiff suggests only that he is being denied discovery. In its order, the court addressed each of plaintiff's discovery requests and the defendant's responses. Plaintiff has not been denied discovery to which he is entitled.

Therefore, IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for reconsideration., dkt. 69, is DENIED.

Entered this 5th day of May, 2011.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

STEPHEN L. CROCKER
Magistrate Judge