1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Defendant.

10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

IN THE UNITED STATE	ES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DIS	TRICT OF CALIFORNIA
JANE DOE,	
Plaintiff,	No. C 09-03655 JSW
v.	
WILLITS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION FOR

RECONSIDERATION

Now before the Court is the motion filed by Plaintiff Jane Doe for leave to file a motion for reconsideration of this Court's order dated May 27, 2010 granting Defendant Willits Unified School District's motion for summary judgment. Having carefully considered the motion and the relevant legal authority, the Court hereby DENIES Plaintiff's motion for leave to file a motion for reconsideration.

A motion for reconsideration may be made on one of three grounds: (1) a material difference in fact or law exists from that which was presented to the Court, which, in the exercise of reasonable diligence, the party applying for reconsideration did not know at the time of the order; (2) the emergence of new material facts or a change of law; or (3) a manifest failure by the Court to consider material facts or dispositive legal arguments presented before entry of the order. Civ. L.R. 7-9(b)(1)-(3). In addition, the moving party may not reargue any written or oral argument previously asserted to the Court. Civ. L.R. 7-9(c).

Plaintiff moves for reconsideration for the Court to consider dispositive legal arguments and factual considerations that she alleges the Court failed to consider initially with regard to

the motion. The Court considered the arguments now raised when considering Plaintiff's opposition to the motion for summary judgment and found them unpersuasive. The Court finds the same legal and factual arguments similarly unpersuasive in the context of the motion to reconsider. Plaintiff may not move for reconsideration on the basis of any written or oral argument previously asserted to the Court. Civ. L.R. 7-9(c). Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion for leave to file a motion for reconsideration is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 11, 2010

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE