

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

Katherine Williams,

NO. C 08-00026 WHA

Plaintiff,

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE
RELIEF**

v.

John E. Potter, Postmaster General,

Defendant.

Presently before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion for Administrative Relief.¹ Plaintiff contends that the Court should strike down or vacate Plaintiff's decision to settle her case, because she settled under duress. Plaintiff further contends that she has been taken advantage of by court officials.

On March 19, 2009, Judge Alsup issued an Order Denying Plaintiff's Motions for Relief from Settlement. (See Docket Item No. 78.) In that Order, the court found that Plaintiff had "entered a voluntary, valid, binding agreement to settle all claims." (Id. at 2.) On May 4, 2009, Judge Alsup issued an Order Denying Plaintiff's Second Request for Relief from Settlement. (See Docket Item No. 81.) In that Order, the court found that Plaintiff had raised no new arguments regarding the settlement. (Id. at 1.) On July 2, 2010, Plaintiff appealed the denial of relief from settlement to the Ninth Circuit. (See Docket Item No. 86.) On August 24, 2010, the Ninth Circuit affirmed the district court's order denying Plaintiff's motion for relief from the settlement. (See


¹ In light of Plaintiff's *pro se* status, the Court liberally construes Plaintiff's March 7, 2011 letter to the Court as a Motion.

1 Docket Item No. 90.) On October 19, 2010, Plaintiff filed a petition for a writ of certiorari in the
2 United States Supreme Court. (See Docket Item No. 93.) On December 13, 2010, the United States
3 Supreme Court denied Plaintiff's petition for a writ of certiorari. (See Docket Item No. 94.)

4 Upon review, the Court does not find good cause to vacate Plaintiff's settlement, as the Ninth
5 Circuit has affirmed the district court's order denying Plaintiff's motion for relief from the
6 settlement. Further, the Court finds that Plaintiff's contentions that she has been taken advantage of
7 by court officials are unfounded. Accordingly, the Court DENIES Plaintiff's Motion for
8 Administrative Relief.

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Dated: March 21, 2011



JAMES WARE
United States District Chief Judge

1 **THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT COPIES OF THIS ORDER HAVE BEEN DELIVERED TO:**

2 Abraham A. Simmons abraham.simmons@usdoj.gov

3 Katherine Williams
4 445 Fordham Circle
5 Vallejo, CA 94589

6 **Dated: March 21, 2011**

Richard W. Wieking, Clerk

7 **By: /s/ JW Chambers**
8 **Elizabeth Garcia**
9 **Courtroom Deputy**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28