1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
8	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
9		
10	DANIEL ROGER HOOD,	15cv1564-CAB-DHB
11	Petitioner,	ORDER DENYING MOTION
12	V.	PURSUANT TO RULE 60(b) [Doc.
13	DIRECTOR OF THE CALIFORNIA	No. 71]
14	DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION,	
15	Respondent.	
16		
17	On September 26, 2019, Petitioner Daniel Roger Hood filed a Motion Pursuant to	
18	Rule 60(b). [Doc. No. 71.] In the motion, Petitioner states that he is seeking relief	
19	pursuant to Rule 60(b)(1)(2)(3). [Doc. No. 71 at 1.]	
20	A. Legal Standard.	
21	Rule 60 provides for extraordinary relief and may be invoked only upon a showing	
22	of "exceptional circumstances." Engleson v. Burlington N.R. Co., 972 F.2d 1038, 1044	
23	(9th Cir. 1994). The Rule identifies six permissible grounds for relief from a final	

judgment, order, or proceeding, namely: "(1) mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect; (2) newly discovered evidence that, with reasonable diligence, could not have been discovered in time to move for a new trial under Rule 59(b); (3) fraud by the adverse party; (4) the judgment is void; (5) the judgment has been satisfied; (6) and

other reason justifying relief." Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b). Further, the Rule provides that a motion brought under it "must be made within a reasonable time - and for reasons (1), (2), and (3) no more than a year after the entry of judgment or order of the date of the proceeding." Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(c).

B. Discussion.

Here, the petition was denied, and judgment was entered accordingly, on February 13, 2017. [Doc. Nos. 52 and 53.] This motion -- seeking relief under Rule 60(b)(1), (2), and (3) – was filed two and a half years later. Therefore, pursuant to Rule 60(c), the motion is untimely.

C. Conclusion.

For the reason set forth above, the motion pursuant to Rule 60(b) is DENIED. IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 4, 2019

Hon. Cathy Ann Bencivengo United States District Judge