

1 **WO**

2

3

4

5

6

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

7

8

9

Christine Baker,

)

No. CV-08-8091-PCT-DGC

10

Plaintiff,

)

**ORDER**

11

vs.

)

12

IC System, Inc.; Karen Doe; Turonda Doe;  
and Dave Doe,

)

13

Defendants.

)

14

\_\_\_\_\_

15

16

On August 8, 2008, the Court issued an order denying Plaintiff’s motion to allow electronic filing. Dkt. #11; *see* Dkt. #8. Plaintiff has filed a motion for reconsideration and clarification of that order. Dkt. #12.

19

Motions for reconsideration are disfavored and should be granted only in rare circumstances. Mere disagreement with an order is an insufficient basis for reconsideration. Nor should reconsideration be used to make new arguments or to ask the Court to rethink its analysis. *See Ross v. Arpaio*, No. CV 05-4177-PHX-MHM (ECV), 2008 WL 1776502, at \*2 (D. Ariz. April 15, 2008) (citations omitted); *N.W. Acceptance Corp. v. Lynnwood Equip., Inc.*, 841 F.2d 918, 925-26 (9th Cir. 1988).

25

The Court will deny Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration because it simply asserts new arguments that could have been presented in Plaintiff’s initial motion. With respect to Plaintiff’s request for clarification, the motion to allow electronic filing was denied because

28

1 this Court's policy is to require pro se litigants to submit documents in paper form so that the  
2 Clerk's Office can insure that the documents are properly filed.

3 **IT IS ORDERED:**

- 4 1. Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. #12) is **denied**.  
5 2. Plaintiff's motion for clarification (Dkt. #12) is **granted**.

6 DATED this 9th day of September, 2008.

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