

1 **WO**

2

3

4

5

6

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

7

FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

8

9

Phillips & Associates, P.C., an Arizona corporation; Phillips & Associates, an Arizona corporation; and Pacific Law Center, a California corporation,

No. CV-10-781-PHX-DGC

10

ORDER

11

Plaintiffs/Counterdefendants,

12

vs.

13

Navigators Insurance Company, a New York corporation,

14

Defendant/Counterclaimant.

15

16

17

Navigators Insurance Company,

18

Third-Party Plaintiff,

19

vs.

20

Robert F. Clarke; Jeffrey L. Phillips; and Robert Arentz,

21

Third-Party Defendants.

22


23

Plaintiffs seek a declaratory judgment that insurance policies issued by Defendant provide coverage for legal malpractice claims asserted against Plaintiffs and Third-Party Defendant Robert Clark (the "Insureds") in California state court. Doc. 1-1 at 3-13. The Insureds filed motions for leave to amend their pleadings to add a bad faith claim. Docs. 26 38, 39. On November 22, 2010, the Court issued an order denying the motions to amend. 27 Doc. 50. The Insureds have filed a motion for reconsideration of that order. Doc. 54. 28

1 Motions for reconsideration “are ‘disfavored’ and will be granted only upon a
2 showing of ‘manifest error’ or ‘new facts or legal authority that could not have been raised
3 earlier with reasonable diligence.’” *In re Rosson*, 545 F.3d 764, 769 (9th Cir. 2008) (citation
4 and brackets omitted); *see S.E.C. v. Kuipers*, No. 09-36016, 2010 WL 3735788, at *3 (9th
5 Cir. Sept. 21, 2010); LRCiv 7.2(g)(1). The Insureds do not meet (or even address) this high
6 standard. They cite no new law or fact that occurred after the Court’s decision. Instead, they
7 re-urge arguments made in their motions to amend, assert new arguments that could have
8 been made in those motions, and ask the Court to rethink its analysis. In short, the Insureds
9 simply disagree with the order denying leave to amend. But “[m]ere disagreement with a
10 previous order is an insufficient basis for reconsideration.” *Guillen v. Thompson*, No. CV
11 08-1279-PHX-MHM, 2010 WL 3239419, at *2 (D. Ariz. Aug. 16, 2010).

12 **IT IS ORDERED** that the motion for reconsideration filed by Plaintiffs and Third-
13 Party Defendants (Doc. 54) is **denied**.

14 DATED this 9th day of December, 2010.

15
16
17 

18 _____
19 David G. Campbell
20 United States District Judge
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28