

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**

CONNI CAMPBELL, an individual,

CASE NO. 14cv2359-GPC(RBB)

Plaintiff,

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART  
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR  
RECONSIDERATION**

vs.

LOCKHEED MARTIN  
CORPORATION; THE CITY OF  
SAN DIEGO; UNITED STATES OF  
AMERICA; AND DOES 1-50,

[Dkt. No. 82.]

Defendants.

On April 1, 2016, Plaintiff filed a motion for reconsideration of the Court's order filed on March 28, 2016 regarding Defendant United States' motion to clarify. (Dkt. No. 82.) Defendant United States filed a response on April 14, 2016. (Dkt. No. 85.) Plaintiff filed a reply on April 22, 2016. (Dkt. No. 86.)

**Discussion**

A district court may reconsider a grant of summary judgment under either Federal Rule of Civil Procedure ("Rule") 59(e) or Rule 60(b). Sch. Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah County, Or. v. AcandS, Inc., 5 F.3d 1255, 1262 (9th Cir. 1993). Plaintiff moves for reconsideration pursuant to Rule 60(b)(1) arguing that the Court committed clear error.

Rule 60(b)(1) provides in part: "[T]he court may relieve a party . . . from a[n] . . . order, or proceeding for . . . (1) mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable

1 neglect.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(1). Errors of law are cognizable under Rule 60(b).  
2 Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. v. E.E.O.C., 691 F.2d 438, 441 (9th Cir. 1982).

3 The Court has discretion in granting or denying a motion for reconsideration.  
4 Fuller v. M.G. Jewelry, 950 F.2d 1437, 1441 (9th Cir. 1991). A motion for  
5 reconsideration should not be granted absent highly unusual circumstances. 389  
6 Orange St. Partners v. Arnold, 179 F.3d 656, 665 (9th Cir. 1999). “A motion for  
7 reconsideration cannot be used to ask the Court to rethink what the Court has already  
8 thought through merely because a party disagrees with the Court’s decision. Collins  
9 v. D.R. Horton, Inc., 252 F. Supp. 2d 936, 938 (D. Az. 2003) (citing United States v.  
10 Rezzonico, 32 F. Supp. 2d 1112, 1116 (D. Az. 1998)).

11 Here, Plaintiff argues that the Court’s order on clarification filed on March 28,  
12 2016 concluded that there was no triable issue on whether the United States  
13 “controlled” the property at issue which contradicts its order filed on February 3, 2016  
14 finding there are triable issues of fact whether the United States created the dangerous  
15 condition. She explains that creation of a dangerous condition constitutes control.  
16 According to Plaintiff, the clarification order contradicts the Court’s finding on  
17 summary judgment that there was a reasonable inference that the United States created  
18 the dangerous condition. (Dkt. No. 86 at 2.)

19 In the Court’s summary judgment order, it specifically concluded the following,  
20 “Plaintiff has not raised a genuine issue of material fact as to whether the United States  
21 conducted maintenance that amounts to an exercise of control over the dirt pathway.”  
22 (Dkt. No. 71 at 11:4-6.) On the issue of whether the Defendant United States created  
23 the dangerous condition, the Court concluded there are triable issues of fact. (Id. at  
24 13:5-7.)

25 The Court agrees with Plaintiff that, in its order on clarification, it made a  
26 broader statement than its ruling on summary judgment by stating “[p]ursuant to Rule  
27 56(g), the Court concludes that there are no triable issues of fact on whether the United  
28 States owned the relevant property and whether the United States controlled the

1 relevant property.” (Dkt. No. 81 at 3.) However, the Court’s order did not dispose of  
2 the remaining triable issue of fact as to whether the United States created the dangerous  
3 condition.


4 Interestingly, Plaintiff asks the Court to amend its March 28, 2016 order to  
5 specifically state that “there is a triable dispute of fact regarding Defendant USA’s  
6 *control* of the property but there is no triable issue of fact regarding Defendant USA’s  
7 *maintenance* of the property.” (Dkt. No. 82-1 at 5) (emphasis in original). Plaintiff  
8 improperly seeks to broaden the Court’s ruling on summary judgment.

9 **Conclusion**

10 In conclusion, the Court GRANTS in part Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration.  
11 The Court amends its Order filed on March 28, 2016 to align with the Court’s ruling  
12 on summary judgment filed on February 3, 2016, and concludes that there are no triable  
13 issues of fact whether Defendant United States maintained the property that amounted  
14 to an exercise of control over the dirt pathway. However, there are triable issues of fact  
15 as to whether Defendant United States created the dangerous condition. The hearing  
16 set for April 29, 2016 shall be **vacated**.

17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18  
19 DATED: April 27, 2016

20   
21 HON. GONZALO P. CURIEL  
22 United States District Judge  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28