wo	
IN THE UNITED STATES	S DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA	
Gilbert Mota,	No. CV-17-00555-TUC-EJM
Plaintiff,	ORDER
v.	
Commissioner of Social Security Administration,	
Defendant.	
Pending before the Court is Defendant's Motion to Alter or Amend Judgment	
5 Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e). (Doc. 29).	
Under Rule 59(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, a party may file a	
"motion to alter or amend a judgment." The Ninth Circuit has explained that [s]ince	
specific grounds for a motion to amend or alter are not listed in the rule, the district court	
enjoys considerable discretion in granting or denying the motion." McDowell v.	
Calderon, 197 F.3d 1253, 1255 n.1 (9th Cir	. 1999) (en banc) (per curiam) (internal
quotation marks omitted). But amending a	judgment after its entry remains "an
extraordinary remedy which should be used	sparingly." Id. (internal quotation marks
omitted). In general, there are four basic ground	ls upon which a Rule 59(e) motion may be
granted: (1) if such motion is necessary to correct manifest errors of law or fact upon	
which the judgment rests; (2) if such motion is necessary to present newly discovered or	
previously unavailable evidence; (3) if such	motion is necessary to prevent manifest
injustice; or (4) if the amendment is justified by	an intervening change in controlling law.
	IN THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRIC Gilbert Mota, Plaintiff, v. Commissioner of Social Security Administration, Defendant. Pending before the Court is Defendant Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e). (Doc. 29). Under Rule 59(e) of the Federal Rules "motion to alter or amend a judgment." The specific grounds for a motion to amend or alter enjoys considerable discretion in granting Calderon, 197 F.3d 1253, 1255 n.1 (9th Cir quotation marks omitted). But amending a extraordinary remedy which should be used omitted). In general, there are four basic ground granted: (1) if such motion is necessary to co

1	Id.; Allstate Ins. Co. v. Herron, 634 F.3d 1101, 1112 (9th Cir. 2011). Rule 59(e) "may not
2	be used to relitigate old matters, or to raise arguments or present evidence that could have
3	been made prior to the entry of judgment." Exxon Shipping Co. v. Baker, 554 U.S. 471,
4	485 n.5 (2008) (citation omitted).
5	The Court's previous Order (Doc. 26) fully explained the Court's reasoning for its
6	decision. The Court will not repeat itself again here. Accordingly,
7	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED denying Defendant's Motion to Alter or Amend
8	Judgment Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e). (Doc. 29).
9	Dated this 9th day of September, 2019.
10	
11	Ein J Marta
12	
13	Eric J. Markovich United States Magistrate Judge
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27 28	
28	
	- 2 -