

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

3
4 **MARIA RUTENBURG,**
5 Plaintiff,
6 v.
7 **TWITTER, INC.,**
8 Defendant.

Case No. 4:21-cv-00548-YGR

**ORDER DENYING SECOND MOTION FOR
LEAVE TO FILE SECOND AMENDED
COMPLAINT**

Re: Dkt. No. 27

9
10 The Court previously dismissed this case for lack of subject matter jurisdiction (Dkt. No.
11 21), denied plaintiff Maria Rutenburg's first motion for leave to file a second amended complaint
12 (Dkt. No. 25), and subsequently entered judgment in this action. (Dkt. No. 26.) Now before the
13 Court is Rutenburg's second motion for leave to file a second amended complaint, filed post
14 judgment. (Dkt. No. 27.) Having reviewed the motion as well as the docket of this action, the
15 second motion for leave to file a second amended complaint is **DENIED**.

16 Rutenburg's second motion is nothing more than an improper motion for reconsideration
17 of the Court's earlier decisions. (*See* N.D. Cal. L.R. 7-9.) Specifically, Rutenburg does not
18 demonstrate any (1) material difference now in fact or law, (2) the emergence of new material
19 facts or a change in law occurring after the time of the orders, or (3) a manifest failure of the
20 Court to consider material facts or dispositive legal arguments which were previously presented.
21 The second motion is otherwise appropriately denied under the grounds and reasoning previously
22 articulated by the Court in the prior orders. (*See* Dkt. Nos. 21, 25.)

23 Accordingly, the second motion for leave to file a second amended complaint is **DENIED**.

24 This Order terminates Docket Number 27.

25 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

26 Dated: June 22, 2021

27 
28 **YVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS**
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE