1		
2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
3	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
4	ASPIC ENGINEERING AND	
5	CONSTRUCTION COMPANY,	Case No. 17-cv-00224-YGR
6	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING MOTION TO RECONSIDER
7	v.	VACATING THE ARBITRATION AWARD
8 9	ECC CENTCOM CONSTRUCTORS, LLC AND ECC INTERNATIONAL, LLC,	
10	Defendants.	
11	Plaintiff Aspic Engineering and Construction Company has filed a Motion to Reconsider	
12	Vacating the Arbitration Award entered against defendants ECC International, LLC and ECC	
13	CENTCOM Constructors, LLC, and in favor of plaintiff. (Dkt. No. 44.) Under Federal Rule of Civil	
14	Procedure 54(b), "[r]econsideration is appropriate if the district court (1) is presented with newly	
15		
16	discovered evidence, (2) committed clear error or the initial decision was manifestly unjust, or (3) if	
17	there is an intervening change in controlling law." School Dist. No. 1J v. ACandS, Inc., 5 F.3d 1255,	
18	1263 (9th Cir. 1993).	
19	Pursuant to Local Rule 7-9(a), "[n]o party may notice a motion for reconsideration without	
20	first obtaining leave of Court to file the motion." This Court has not granted plaintiff leave to file a	
21	motion for reconsideration nor has plaintiff satisfied the standard. The Court thus finds that plaintiff	
22	has not complied with Local Rule 7-9(a) and DENIES plaintiff's motion.	
23	This terminates Dkt. No. 44.	
24	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
25		
26	Dated: July 25, 2017	Jonene Gual Alle
27		United States District Court Judge
28		_

Dockets.Justia.com