

1 **WO**

2

3

4

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

5

FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

6

7

Salt River Project Agricultural
Improvement and Power District, et al.,

No. CV 08-8028-PCT-JAT

8

Plaintiffs,

ORDER

9

vs.

10

11

Reynold R. Lee; et al.,

12

Defendants.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff SRP's Rule 59(e) Motion to Alter or Amend Judgment (Doc. #91). The Court will grant Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration to the limited extent to make clear that the Court did not order the Secretary of the Interior to decide the dispute between SRP and the Defendants. Rather, the Court ordered that if the Plaintiff chooses to pursue its action, it must do so before the Secretary of the Interior, as set out in the 1969 Lease. The Court denies the Rule 59(e) Motion (Doc. #91) in all other respects.¹

21

DATED this 11th day of March, 2009.

22

23


James A. Teilborg
United States District Judge

24

25

26

27

28

¹Though oral argument was requested on the Motion, because the parties submitted memoranda discussing the law and evidence in support of their positions and oral argument would not have aided the Court's decisional process, the Court will not set oral argument. See e.g., *Partridge v. Reich*, 141 F.3d 920, 926 (9th Cir. 1998).