

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

TODD ASHKER and DANNY TROXELL,  
Plaintiffs,  
v.  
ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, et al.,  
Defendants.

---

No. 05-03286 CW  
ORDER DENYING  
PLAINTIFFS'  
MOTION FOR LEAVE  
TO FILE MOTION  
FOR  
RECONSIDERATION

Plaintiffs Todd Ashker and Danny Troxell move for leave to file a motion for reconsideration of the portion of the Court's March 25, 2009 Order Granting, in Part, Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment and Denying Plaintiffs' Cross-Motion For Summary Judgment which denied Plaintiffs' due process claim arising from the validation of Plaintiffs as members of the Aryan Brotherhood prison gang.<sup>1</sup> Defendants oppose the motion. The matter was taken under submission and decided on the papers. Having considered all the papers filed by the parties, the Court denies Plaintiffs' motion.

Civil Local Rule 7-9(a) states as follows: "No party may

---

<sup>1</sup>Mr. Troxell's claim was barred by the statute of limitations. Plaintiffs do not move for reconsideration of this part of the Order.

1 notice a motion for reconsideration without first obtaining leave  
2 of Court to file the motion." A request for leave to file a motion  
3 for reconsideration may only be granted if the moving party shows:

4 (1) That at the time of the motion for leave, a material  
5 difference in fact or law exists from that which was presented  
6 to the Court before entry of the interlocutory order for which  
7 reconsideration is sought. The party also must show that in  
8 the exercise of reasonable diligence the party applying for  
9 reconsideration did not know such fact or law at the time of  
the interlocutory order; or (2) The emergence of new material  
facts or change of law occurring after the time of such order;  
or (3) A manifest failure by the Court to consider material  
facts or dispositive legal arguments which were presented to  
the Court before such interlocutory order.

10 Civil L.R. 7-9(b).

11 No motion for leave to file a motion for reconsideration  
12 may repeat any oral or written argument made by the  
13 applying party in support of or in opposition to the  
interlocutory order which the party now seeks to have  
reconsidered.

14 Civil L.R. 7-9(c).

15 Plaintiffs argue that reconsideration is proper under Local  
16 Rule 7-9(a)(2) because a new material fact has emerged which was  
17 not available at the time the Court ruled on the motions for  
18 summary judgment. Plaintiffs refer to the March 30, 2009 Findings  
19 of Fact and Conclusions of Law issued after a bench trial by  
20 another judge of this Court in Lira v. Cate, C 00-0905 SI, which  
21 addressed that plaintiff's validation as a gang member.

22 Contrary to Plaintiffs' argument, the findings of fact and  
23 conclusions of law in another district court case do not constitute  
24 new evidence in this case. Furthermore, the circumstances of the  
25 plaintiff in Lira v. Cate are factually different from Mr. Ashker's  
26 circumstances; Lira was not given the opportunity to meet with the  
27 Institutional Gang Investigator (IGI) regarding his validation as a  
28

1 gang member, whereas Mr. Ashker refused to participate in  
2 interviews with the IGI. Also, this Court has carefully reviewed  
3 the evidence submitted in this case, including confidential  
4 memoranda submitted under seal for the Court's in camera review,  
5 and has found that it meets the "some evidence" standard supporting  
6 Mr. Ashker's continued gang validation. In Lira, the Court found  
7 that none of the evidence met the "some evidence" standard.

8 In addition to proffering Lira as new evidence, Plaintiffs'  
9 motion merely attempts to relitigate the arguments they made in  
10 their cross-motion for summary judgment. This is not allowed  
11 pursuant to Local Rule 7-9(c).

12 Therefore, Plaintiffs' request for leave to file a motion for  
13 reconsideration (docket # 382) is denied.

14  
15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16  
17 Dated: May 28, 2010



18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  

---

CLAUDIA WILKEN  
United States District Judge

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 FOR THE  
3 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

4 ASHKER ET AL et al,

5 Plaintiff,

6 v.

7 SCHWARZENEGGER ET AL et al,

8 Defendant.

Case Number: CV05-03286 CW

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

9 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court,  
10 Northern District of California.

11 That on May 28, 2010, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said copy(ies)  
12 in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing said envelope in  
13 the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptacle located in the Clerk's  
14 office.

15 Danny Troxell B-76578  
16 Pelican Bay State Prison  
17 P.O. Box 7500, C-8-101  
18 Crescent City, CA 95531

19 Todd Ashker C-58191  
20 Pelican Bay State Prison  
21 P.O. Box 7500, D1-119  
22 Crescent City, CA 95531

23 Dated: May 28, 2010

24 Richard W. Winking, Clerk  
25 By: Ronnie Hersler, Administrative Law Clerk  
26  
27  
28