1

2 | 3 |

5

6

7

9

10

11 12

13

VS.

14

15

16

1718

19

20

2122

2324

25

26

2728

12 OCT 16 AM IO: 50

BY:

DEPUTY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Cathy Reis, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

Fannie Mae, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 04-CV-1883 BEN (BLM)

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO REOPEN CASE

[ECF No. 32]

Presently before the Court is Plaintiff Cathy Reis's "Motion to Reopen Case No. __ Due to Patent Dispute and Loss of Value of Assets," which the Court construes as a motion for relief from a judgment or order pursuant to Rule 60(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. ECF No. 32. Plaintiff's motion comes more than seven years after this Court dismissed the underlying action for improper venue, and six years after it denied Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration.

"Rule 60(b) allows a party to seek relief from a final judgment, and request re-opening of his case, under a limited set of circumstances." *Gonzalez v. Crosby*, 545 U.S. 524, 528 (2005). If the request is based on fraud, mistake, or newly discovered evidence, the motion "shall be made . . . not more than one year after the judgment, order, or proceeding was entered or taken." FED. R. CIV. P. 60(c)(1). If based on various other enumerated reasons, or "any other reason that justifies relief," the motion must be made "within a reasonable time." FED. R. CIV. P. 60(c)(1).

Plaintiff has attached several hundred pages of supporting documents, yet the basis for her motion is difficult to discern. She appears largely to repeat claims of intellectual property theft from

2006. See ECF No. 23. Plaintiff did not file the motion within a reasonable time and has not demonstrated that the requested relief is justified. Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion is **DENIED**. The motion hearing scheduled for November 5, 2012 before this Court is vacated.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: October 2012

