WO 1 2 3 4 5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 7 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 8 9 Alvin R. Ross, No. CV-1-08-0306-MHM 10 Plaintiff, **ORDER** 11 v. 12 William McGuinness, M.D., et al., 13 Defendants. 14 15 Pending before the Court is Plaintiff Alvin R. Ross' Motion in Opposition of the 16 17 Court's Order in Part as a Matter of Record, and Request Reconsideration and Enlargement of Time. (Doc. # 55) After reviewing Plaintiff's motion, the Court rules as 18 19 follows. 20 On May 18, 2010, Petitioner filed the instant motion, which the Court will 21 construe as a motion for reconsideration pursuant to Rule 60(b) of the Federal Rule of 22 Civil Procedure ("FRCP"). FRCP 60(b) "provides for reconsideration only upon a 23 showing of (1) mistake, surprise, or excusable neglect; (2) newly discovered evidence; (3) 24 fraud; (4) a void judgment; (5) a satisfied or discharged judgment; or (6) extraordinary 25 circumstances which would justify relief." Fuller v. M.G. Jewelry, 950 F. 2d 1437, 1442 (9th Cir. 1985); see Sch. Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah County, Or. v. ACandS, Inc., 5 F. 3d 26 27 1255, 1262 (9th Cir. 1993) ("Reconsideration is appropriate if the district court (1) is 28 presented with newly discovered evidence, (2) committed clear error or the initial

decision was manifestly unjust, or (3) if there is an intervening change in controlling law."). A motion for reconsideration may not be used to re-litigate old matters or to raise arguments or present evidence that could have been raised prior to entry of judgment.

See, e.g., Collins v. D.R. Horton, Inc., 252 F. Supp. 2d 936, 938 (D. Ariz. 2003) (citing Northwest Acceptance Corp. v. Lynnwood Equip., Inc., 841 F. 2d 918, 925-26 (9th Cir.1988)); 1 Wright, Miller, & Kane, Federal Practice and Procedure: Civil 2d § 2810.1 at 127-28. As such, courts only grant motions for reconsideration in rare circumstances.

See Sullivan v. Faras-RLS Group, Ltd., 795 F. Supp. 305, 308-09 (D. Ariz. 1992).

In his motion, Plaintiff requests reconsideration of part of the Court's April 30,

2010 Order (Doc. # 54) denying his Motion Declaring Admissions Admitted and Motion Requesting Appointment of Counsel. Plaintiff does not present the Court with newly discovered evidence nor does he allege that controlling law has changed or that the Court committed clear error in its decision. Rather, Plaintiff's arguments merely reiterate the arguments set forth in his motions regarding admissions and appointment of counsel. (Doc. ## 29, 44) A motion for reconsideration cannot be used to ask the Court to rethink what the Court has already thought through merely because a party disagrees with the Court's decision. Id. (citing United States v. Rezzonico, 32 F. Supp. 2d 1112, 1116 (D. Ariz. 1998).

The instant action does not meet any of the narrow instances in which reconsideration is appropriate. The moving party must show more than a mere disagreement with the Court's decision; the Court should not grant a motion for reconsideration unless there is need to correct a clear error or prevent manifest injustice.

See, e.g., Database Am., Inc., 825 F. Supp. at 1220; Refrigeration Sales Co., Inc. v.

Mitchell-Jackson, 605 F. Supp. 6, 7 (N.D. Ill. 1983). As such, the Court finds that Plaintiff has failed to set forth sufficient grounds to cause the Court to reconsider its April 30, 2010 Order.

Plaintiff also requests an enlargement of time in which to respond to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment. The Court will grant Plaintiff's request in this regard.

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED denying Plaintiff's Motion in Opposition of the Court's Order in Part as a Matter of Record. (Doc. # 55) IT IS FURTHER ORDERED granting Plaintiff until July 2, 2010, to file a response to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment. DATED this 1st day of June, 2010.