

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SYLVIA THOMAS,
Plaintiff,
v.
UNITED AIR LINES, INC., et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:13-cv-00745-MCE-EFB

ORDER

On April 17, 2013, Plaintiff Sylvia Thomas (“Plaintiff”), proceeding pro se, filed a Complaint against Defendants United Air Lines, Inc. (“United”) and Rafael Padilla Cruz (“Cruz”) (collectively “Defendants”). ECF No. 1. The Court dismissed Plaintiff’s claims against Defendants as barred by the statute of limitations. See ECF Nos. 14, 19, 39, 45. Judgment was entered against Plaintiff on January 29, 2014. ECF No. 46.

On February 25, 2014, Plaintiff moved to amend this Court’s judgment pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e). See Mot., Feb. 25, 2014, ECF No. 47. In her motion, Plaintiff requested that the Court re-open this action to account for new evidence and to correct clear error or prevent manifest injustice. Id. The Court denied Plaintiff’s Motion because Plaintiff’s purportedly new evidence was previously available, and even if those documents were to be considered new evidence, they did not allow Plaintiff to overcome the statute of limitations. Order, ECF No. 55.

1 On May 9, 2014, Plaintiff again asked the court to reconsider its prior orders in
2 this matter. Mot., ECF No. 56.¹ Plaintiff's instant motion presents no new arguments or
3 evidence and is a mere recital of her previously rejected arguments. Plaintiff's Motion for
4 Reconsideration, ECF No. 56, is therefore DENIED. See Pritchett v. McEwen, 1:10-CV-
5 02008-JLT HC, 2011 WL 2115647, at *1 (E.D. Cal. May 27, 2011) (explaining that a
6 motion for reconsideration "must set forth facts or law of a strongly convincing nature to
7 induce the court to reverse its prior decision"); E.D. Cal. Local Rules 230(j). The Court
8 will not entertain any further motions for reconsideration on these grounds.

9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 Dated: June 24, 2014

11
12
13 
14 MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR., CHIEF JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

¹ Because oral argument will not be of material assistance, the Court ordered this matter submitted on the briefs. E.D. Cal. Local R. 230(g). See ECF No. 59.