

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MICHAEL A. BRUZZONE,  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
JAMES MCMANIS, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. 18-cv-01235-PJH

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO  
VACATE**

Re: Dkt. No. 85

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

Before the court is plaintiff's motion to vacate. The matter is fully briefed and suitable for decision without oral argument. Having read the parties' papers and carefully considered their arguments and the relevant legal authority, and good cause appearing, the court hereby rules as follows.

On October 31, 2018, this court entered judgment and terminated this case. Dkt. 59. On the same date, the court entered an order imposing pre-filing review. Dkt. 58. The court's final judgment in this case is thus over five (5) years old, affirmed by the Ninth Circuit, with writ of certiorari denied. See Bruzzone v. McManis, No. 18-cv-01235-PJH, 2018 WL 5734546, at (N.D. Cal. Oct. 31, 2018), aff'd, 785 F. App'x 503 (9th Cir. 2019), cert. denied, 141 S.Ct. 283.

In August 2022, plaintiff filed a motion for "reexamination" pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 52 and 60(b)(2). Dkt. 71. The court denied the motion, finding that it was untimely, and that even if had been timely filed, it did not contain any new facts that would meet the requirements of Rules 52 or 60. See Dkt. 77 at 2. The court's order also specifically stated that "[t]he court will not entertain any motions for reconsideration

1 of this order.” Id.

2 Plaintiff has now filed a “motion to vacate” under Rule 60. Dkt. 85. As with  
3 plaintiff’s motion for “reexamination,” plaintiff’s motion is untimely, and even if it had been  
4 timely filed, it does not contain any new facts that meet the requirements of Rule 60. See  
5 Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(c)(1) (deadline to file a motion under this rule based on alleged  
6 mistakes, newly discovered evidence, fraud, or misconduct is one year from the date of  
7 judgment).

8 Therefore, the court DENIES plaintiff’s motion.

9 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

10 Dated: December 15, 2023

11 */s/ Phyllis J. Hamilton*  
12 PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON  
13 United States District Judge  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28