"A motion for reconsideration should not be granted, absent highly unusual circumstances, unless the district court is presented with newly discovered evidence, committed clear error, or if there is an intervening change in the controlling law," and it "may *not* be used to raise arguments or present evidence for the first time when they could reasonably have been raised earlier in the litigation." Marlyn Nutraceuticals, Inc. v. Mucos Pharma GmbH & Co., 571 F.3d 873, 880 (9th Cir. 2009) (internal quotations marks and citations omitted) (emphasis in original).

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Plaintiff does not argue that newly discovered evidence or an intervening change of the law requires reinstatement of this action. All papers and files in this action were considered in deciding

Doc. 76

1	the motion to dismiss for failure to exhaust administrative remedies. In his motion filed June 3,
2	2011, Plaintiff has not demonstrated that he can cure the defects with respect to any federal claim
3	alleged in his complaint.
4	Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion to alter judgment, filed June
5	3, 2011, is DENIED.
6	
7	IT IS SO ORDERED.
8	Dated: June 8, 2011 /s/ Sandra M. Snyder UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
9	UNITED STATES MADISTRATE JUDGE
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27 28	
/X	