

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  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

RONALD MARTINEZ,

Plaintiff,

v.

R. MADDEN, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:12-cv-1298-GPC-MDD

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION TO RECONSIDER**

**[ECF No. 76]**

On April 20, 2015, Plaintiff Ronald F. Martinez's ("Plaintiff") filed an "Objection to the Courts [sic] Order Denying Motion to Enforce Settlement." (ECF No. 76.) The Court construes this as a motion to reconsider.<sup>1</sup> As Plaintiff has failed to show that reconsideration is warranted, *see Marlyn Natraceuticals, Inc. v. Mucos Pharma GmbH & Co.*, 571 F.3d 873, 880 (9th Cir. 2009); *Sch. Dist. No. 1J v. ACandS, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1263 (9th Cir. 1993); *Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe of Indians v. Hodel*, 882 F.2d 364, 369 n.5 (9th Cir. 1989), Plaintiff's motion to reconsider is **DENIED**. However, as Plaintiff declares that he has not received a copy of the executed


---

<sup>1</sup> The Court does not generally entertain objections to its orders unless the order specifically so allows. However, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 59 and 60 do allow parties to file motions for reconsideration. *See* FED. R. CIV. P. 59, 60.

1 settlement agreement, though Defendants R. Madden and A.B. Gervin (“Defendants”)  
2 declare it has been sent, the Court does find it appropriate to direct Defendants to send  
3 Plaintiff a copy of the executed settlement, on or before **May 1, 2015**.

4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5 DATED: April 20, 2015

6  
7   
8 HON. GONZALO P. CURIEL  
9 United States District Judge  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28