



1 Plaintiff's motion on the merits.

2 The Court's previous order (ECF No. 89) denied Plaintiff's motion (ECF No. 88) on the  
3 basis that Plaintiff failed to meet one of Rule 60(b)'s criteria for relief. Federal Rule of Civil  
4 Procedure 60(b) ("Rule 60") states as follows:

5 On motion and just terms, the court may relieve a party or its legal  
6 representative from a final judgment, order, or proceeding for the  
following reasons:

7 (1) mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect;

8 (2) newly discovered evidence that, with reasonable diligence,  
9 could not have been discovered in time to move for a new trial  
under Rule 59(b);

10 (3) fraud (whether previously called intrinsic or extrinsic),  
11 misrepresentation, or misconduct by an opposing party;

12 (4) the judgment is void;

13 (5) the judgment has been satisfied, released, or discharged; it is  
14 based on an earlier judgment that has been reversed or vacated; or  
applying it prospectively is no longer equitable; or

15 (6) any other reason that justifies relief.

16 Again, the Court finds that Plaintiff's motion is full of ramblings and conspiracy theories without  
17 any factual allegations that could support relief under Rule 60(b). Plaintiff has not met this  
18 burden and thus cannot be afforded relief. As such, Plaintiff's motion (ECF No. 95) is DENIED.

19 This case is closed. Should Plaintiff continue to disagree with the Court's ruling, the  
20 appropriate course of action is to seek remedy from the Ninth Circuit. Any future filings with this  
21 Court will be disregarded. No further orders will be issued in this closed case.

22  
23 IT IS SO ORDERED.

24 Dated: May 1, 2015

25  
26   
27 \_\_\_\_\_  
Troy L. Nunley  
United States District Judge

28