

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

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

KRISHNA REDDY,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
NUANCE COMMUNICATIONS, INC., et  
al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. [5:11-cv-05632-PSG](#)

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO  
ALTER JUDGMENT**

**(Re: Docket No. 270)**

Plaintiff Krishna Reddy moves to reopen judgment under Rules 59(e) and 60(b).<sup>1</sup> Reddy argues that the undersigned lacked jurisdiction over the case after she filed her 28 U.S.C. § 144 affidavit for his disqualification,<sup>2</sup> and so all of the court’s prior rulings, orders, and judgments should be vacated, the case should be reassigned, judgment should be entered against all Defendants, and Defendants should be ordered to post a bond for the amount of judgment and Reddy’s costs.<sup>3</sup>

Reddy’s motion raises no new arguments but merely repeats the same arguments raised in her previous requests for the recusal of the undersigned and the postponement of her trial.<sup>4</sup> Reddy’s arguments did not pass “Go” on their first airing,<sup>5</sup> and they fare no better on repetition.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Docket No. 270.

<sup>2</sup> See Docket No. 261.

<sup>3</sup> See Docket No. 270 at 4-10.

<sup>4</sup> Compare Docket No. 270 with Docket Nos. 152, 193, 261, 264.

<sup>5</sup> See Docket Nos. 165, 222, 263, 268.

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

For the reasons stated in the court’s prior orders,<sup>6</sup> Reddy’s motion is DENIED.

**SO ORDERED.**

Dated: November 9, 2015

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
PAUL S. GREWAL  
United States Magistrate Judge

---

<sup>6</sup> See Docket No. 263 at 3-4; Docket No. 268.