28

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
8	
9	TONY PHAT NGOC NGUYEN, No. C-10-4081-EDL
10	Plaintiff, ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
11	v. LEAVE TO FILE MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION
12	WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A. et al.,
13	Defendants.
14	
15	On November 1, 2010, Plaintiff filed a "Motion for Leave To File A Motion For
16	Reconsideration" pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-9(b)(3). This rule requires the moving party to
17	"specifically show [a] manifest failure by the Court to consider material facts or dispositive legal
18	arguments which were presented to the Court before such interlocutory order." Plaintiff's motion
19	points to two statements in the Court's order denying remand and granting Defendants' motion to
20	dismiss, but does not attempt to explain, let alone "specifically show," how these statements are
21	erroneous or any failure of the Court to consider previously-presented facts or legal arguments.
22	Therefore, Plaintiff's motion fails to meet the requirements of Civil Local Rule 7-9(b)(3) and the
23	motion is DENIED.
24	IT IS SO ORDERED.
25	Dated: November 2, 2010 Elizabeth D. Laporte ELIZABETH D. LAPORTE
26	United States Magistrate Judge
27	