

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE**  
7 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
8

9  
10 KRISHNA REDDY,

1:12-cv-02061-AWI-SAB

11 Plaintiff,

**ORDER DENYING  
RECONSIDERATION**

12 v.

13 PRECYSE SOLUTIONS, INC., et al.,

(Doc. 108)

14 Defendant.  
15  
16

17 **I. Introduction**

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

26 **II. Legal Standard**

27 Under Rule 60(b), a district court may grant relief from its previous orders in the  
28 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  
24 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25 Dated: June 12, 2015

  
26  
27  
28 SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE