

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

KRISHNA REDDY, 1:12-cv-02061-AWI-SAB

Plaintiff, ORDER DENYING RECONSIDERATION

PRECYSE SOLUTIONS, INC., et al. (Doc. 108)

Defendant.

I. Introduction

On May 26, 2015, Plaintiff Krishna Reddy filed a motion “for an order to set aside and vacate the orders denying plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration and motion to disqualify Magistrate Judge [Dkt. #107], to vacate all other prior rulings, orders, and judgments, and to transfer the case to the Riverside Division of the Central District of California.” Doc. 108 (capitalization altered). That motion is made pursuant to Rule 60(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Accordingly, although not styled as such, Plaintiff seeks reconsideration of the order denying her motion seeking reconsideration. For the following reasons, Plaintiffs motion will be denied with prejudice.

II. Legal Standard

Under Rule 60(b), a district court may grant relief from its previous orders in the following circumstances: “(1) mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect; … (4) the

1 judgment is void; ... or [¶] (6) any other reason that justifies relief.” “A motion for
2 reconsideration should not be granted, absent highly unusual circumstances, unless the district
3 court is presented with newly discovered evidence, committed clear error, or if there is an
4 intervening change in the controlling law.” *Marlyn Nutraceuticals, Inc. v. Mucos Pharma GmbH*
5 & Co., 571 F.3d 873, 880 (9th Cir.2009) (internal quotations marks and citations omitted).
6 Moreover, “[a] party seeking reconsideration must show more than a disagreement with the
7 Court's decision, and recapitulation...” of that which was already considered by the Court in
8 rendering its decision. *U.S. v. Westlands Water Dist.*, 134 F.Supp.2d 1111, 1131 (E.D.Cal.2001)
9 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).

10 **III. Discussion**

11 Plaintiff notes that her motion is based on “mistakes of fact and ... law” attributed to this
12 Court and that she “re-submitt[s]” her motion to reconsideration pursuant to Rule 60. Doc. 108 at
13 2. Other than advising this Court that Plaintiff believes (1) that this Court and the Magistrate
14 Judge have committed judicial misconduct by denying her motions, (2) that senior judges are not
15 Article III Judges, and (3) that the screening requirement of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) is unfair
16 or invalid, Plaintiff has presented nothing new in support of her motions. Instead, she simply
17 reiterates the same arguments that the Court rejected in its prior order. The three new arguments
18 that Plaintiff presents are incorrect and are summarily rejected. The Court has also reviewed
19 Plaintiff’s other arguments. They are denied for the same reasons articulated in Document
20 Number 107.

21 **IV. Order**

22 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff’s motion is DENIED with prejudice.

23 IT IS SO ORDERED.

24 Dated: June 12, 2015



25 
26 SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE
27
28