

1 **WO**

2

3

4

5

6

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

7

8

9

Billy Taylor,)

No. CV-09-2567-PHX-DGC

10

Plaintiff/Counterdefendant,)

ORDER

11

vs.)

12

AFS Technologies, Inc.; Kurien Jacob;)
Walter Barandarian; Kimberly Curtis;)
and Rebecca Barr,)

13

14

Defendants/Counterclaimant.)

15

16

On August 18, 2010, the Court issued an order (Doc. 176) denying Plaintiff’s motion for “severe” sanctions against Defendants for “willful perjurious, false, and misleading testimony during depositions” (Doc. 164). Plaintiff filed a motion for reconsideration of that order on November 12, 2010. Doc. 241. The motion was denied as untimely. Doc. 242. Plaintiff has now filed a second motion for reconsideration, claiming that material facts occurred since the Court’s order of August 18. Doc. 254.

22

Motions for reconsideration are disfavored. LRCiv 7.2(g)(1); *S.E.C. v. Kuipers*, No. 09-36016, 2010 WL 3735788, at *3 (9th Cir. Sept. 21, 2010). They are to be granted only in *rare* circumstances. *Stetter v. Blackpool*, No. CV 09-1071-PHX-DGC, 2009 WL 3348522, at *1 (D. Ariz. Oct. 15, 2009). No such circumstances exist in this case.

26

As the Court previously has explained (Doc. 176 at 2), if Plaintiff disagrees with deposition testimony given by witnesses, he is free to challenge that testimony through his own factual assertions, impeach it through other evidence, and cross-examine the witnesses

27


28

1 vigorously at trial. Plaintiff's repeated motions for sanctions and for reconsideration are
2 "needlessly multiplying litigation in this case." *Id.* Any further motion for reconsideration
3 of this issue will be summarily denied.

4 **IT IS ORDERED** that Plaintiff's second motion for reconsideration (Doc. 254) is
5 **denied.**

6 DATED this 1st day of December, 2010.

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28



David G. Campbell
United States District Judge