



1 (internal quotations and citation omitted). The “Rule is to be used sparingly as an equitable remedy to  
2 prevent manifest injustice and is to be utilized only where extraordinary circumstances prevented a  
3 party from taking timely action to prevent or correct an erroneous judgment.” *Id.* (internal quotations  
4 and citation omitted).

5 Plaintiff’s mere disagreement with the Court’s ruling on his motion to join Brian DeCoud  
6 pursuant to Rule 20 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, does not provide a basis for  
7 reconsideration. Reconsideration is not a vehicle by which to obtain a second bite at the apple; it is  
8 reserved for extraordinary circumstances. United States v. Westlands Water Dist., 134 F.Supp.2d  
9 1111, 1131 (E.D. Cal. 2001); see also In re Pacific Far East Lines, Inc., 889 F.2d 242, 250 (9th Cir.  
10 1989) (Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(6) may provide relief where parties were confronted with extraordinary  
11 circumstances but it does not provide a second change for parties who made deliberate choices).  
12 Plaintiff’s disagreement with the Court’s decision is not grounds for reconsideration. Plaintiff has  
13 failed to set forth a basis upon which relief may be granted under Rule 60(b)(6), or under any of the  
14 grounds provided for in Rule 60(b). The fact that Plaintiff may have requested and was denied the  
15 ability to communicate with certain inmate witnesses, such rulings do not provide a basis for joinder  
16 and/or reconsideration of the Court’s decision. Accordingly, Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration  
17 must be DENIED.

18  
19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20 Dated: April 23, 2014



21 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE