

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
28UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIAROBERT AMATRONE, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
RANDY CHAMPION, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 15-cv-01356-JST

**ORDER RE: OBJECTIONS TO ORDER
GRANTING MOTIONS TO DISMISS**


Re: ECF No. 128

Plaintiffs have filed a document entitled “Objections to Order Granting Motions to Dismiss,” ECF No. 128, that references the Court’s February 18, 2016 order granting two motions to dismiss, ECF No. 122, as well as the Court’s February 26, 2016 order dismissing several defendants for failure to effect service, ECF No. 126. Plaintiffs’ “Objections” offer several disagreements with the Court’s conclusions in both orders.

Although Plaintiffs have not sought leave under Civil L.R. 7-9(a), the Court construes this document as a Motion for Reconsideration of both the Court’s February 18 and February 26 orders. So construed, the motion is denied. Plaintiffs have not demonstrated, under Civil L.R. 7-9(b), that (1) “a material difference in fact or law exists from that which was presented to the Court before entry” of the orders; (2) “emergence of new material facts or a change of law occurring after the time” of the orders; or (3) a “manifest failure by the Court to consider material facts or dispositive legal arguments which were presented to the Court” before the orders.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 18, 2016



JON S. TIGAR
United States District JudgeUnited States District Court
Northern District of California