

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
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DAVID W. WILSON,
Plaintiff,
v.
LARRY LESANE, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:16-cv-1795 JAM KJN P

ORDER

Plaintiff filed a request for reconsideration of this court’s December 27, 2016 order.

Legal Standards

Although motions to reconsider are directed to the sound discretion of the court, Frito-Lay of Puerto Rico, Inc. v. Canas, 92 F.R.D. 384, 390 (D.C. Puerto Rico 1981), considerations of judicial economy weigh heavily in the process. Thus Local Rule 230(j) requires that a party seeking reconsideration of a court’s order must brief the “new or different facts or circumstances [which] were not shown upon such prior motion, or what other grounds exist for the motion.” Id. “[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.” Marlyn Nutraceuticals, Inc. v. Mucos Pharma GmbH & Co., 571 F.3d 873, 880 (9th Cir. 2009) (quotation omitted).

///

