

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**

CHAD COWAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOVERNOR JERRY BROWN,  
JUDGE MAUREEN HALLAHAN,  
COMMISSIONER PENNIE  
MCLAUGHLIN, SDCSS LAWYER  
NATASHA ESSES, SDCSS  
LAWYER DIONNE MOCHON,  
SDCSS CASE MANAGER MIA-LEE  
CABRERA, TRAC PHAM, SAN  
DIEGO CHILD SUPPORT SERVICE,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:14-cv-1886-GPC-WVG

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION FOR  
RECONSIDERATION**

**[ECF No. 98]**

On July 10, 2015, Plaintiff Chad Cowan (“Plaintiff”), proceeding pro se, filed an “Exparte Motion to Vacate Order and Judgments.” (ECF No. 98.) The Court construes Plaintiff’s motion as a motion for reconsideration of the Court’s June 25, 2015, order granting the defendants’ motions to dismiss, (ECF No. 95). Under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 59 and 60, federal district courts may reconsider final orders to correct “manifest errors of law.” *Turner v. Burlington N. Sante Fe R.R.*, 338 F.3d 1058, 1063 (9th Cir. 2003). Generally, parties must show either: (1) an intervening change in the law; (2) additional evidence that was not previously available; or (3) that the prior decision was based on clear error or would work manifest injustice. *Marlyn*

1 *Natraceuticals, Inc. v. Mucos Pharma GmbH & Co.*, 571 F.3d 873, 880 (9th Cir. 2009);  
2 *Sch. Dist. No. 1J v. ACandS, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1263 (9th Cir. 1993); *Pyramid Lake*  
3 *Paiute Tribe of Indians v. Hodel*, 882 F.2d 364, 369 n.5 (9th Cir. 1989).

4         However, Plaintiff has shown none of these. Instead Plaintiff has erroneously  
5 referred to the Court’s June 25 order as a “proposed order,” (*see, e.g.*, ECF No. 98, at  
6 1, 4), and repeated the same incorrect arguments that this Court already rejected,  
7 (*compare* ECF No. 98, at 3–9 *with* ECF No. 95, at 4–5). Specifically, Plaintiff argues  
8 that he “was forced in to [sic] signing the ‘judgment’ fraud was committed to obtain  
9 the signature of the plaintiff.” (ECF No. 98, at 10.) As the Court previously noted,  
10 Plaintiff has failed to allege any facts to support fraud. (*See* ECF No. 95, at 5.)  
11 Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration, (ECF No. 98).

12             **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

13  
14 DATED: July 13, 2015

15   
16 HON. GONZALO P. CURIEL  
17 United States District Judge  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28