

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

BRIAN MARTINS,
Plaintiff,

v.

NORTHWEST DEVELOPMENT
COMPANY, a California corporation
d/b/a NEW WEST INVESTMENT
GROUP, INC., a California corporation,
et al.,
Defendants.

Case No.: 18-cv-01731-AJB-AHG

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S
AMENDED EX PARTE
APPLICATION FOR
RECONSIDERATION OF
STRICKEN MOTION**

(Doc. No. 144)

Before the Court is Plaintiff Brian Martins’ (“Plaintiff”) ex parte application for reconsideration. (Doc. No. 144.) Plaintiff seeks the Court’s reconsideration of its decision to strike a filing for failure to comply with chambers’ rules. (Doc. No. 132.) Because Plaintiff presents no clear error of fact or law in the decision, and because the Court’s striking of the document does not prevent Plaintiff from submitting a new filing in accordance with chambers’ rules, there is no manifest injustice, and the Court denies his request for reconsideration.¹ See *Wood v. Ryan*, 759 F.3d 1117, 1121 (9th Cir. 2014)

¹ Plaintiff is free to correct and refile any stricken document, and the Court will accept it so long as the new filing complies with the appropriate rules.

1 (reconsideration may be granted “if it is presented with newly discovered evidence,
2 committed *clear error*, or if there is an intervening change in the controlling law.”)
3 (internal quotation marks omitted) (emphasis in original).

4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5 Dated: June 3, 2021

6 
7 Hon. Anthony J. Battaglia
8 United States District Judge
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28