| 1 | |
|----|---|
| 2 | |
| 3 | |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT |
| 7 | DISTRICT OF NEVADA |
| 8 | |
| 9 | MARJORIE ESCARENO, |
| 10 | Petitioner,) 2:07-cv-00696-LRH-RJJ |
| 11 | vs.) <u>ORDER</u> |
| 12 | SHERYE FOSTER, <i>et al.</i> , |
| 13 | Respondents. |
| 14 | |
| 15 | This closed action is a pro se petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. |
| 16 | §2254, by a Nevada state prisoner. This action was dismissed without prejudice, and judgment was |
| 17 | entered, on December 12, 2008, because petitioner failed to comply with the Court's order to pay the |
| 18 | filing fee for this action (docket #8 and #9). |
| 19 | Petitioner has filed a motion to reopen the case (docket #10), which the Court treats as a |
| 20 | motion for reconsideration. Where a ruling has resulted in final judgment or order, a motion for |
| 21 | reconsideration may be construed either as a motion to alter or amend judgment pursuant to Federal |
| 22 | Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e), or as a motion for relief from judgment pursuant to Federal Rule |
| 23 | 60(b). School Dist. No. 1J Multnomah County v. AC&S, Inc., 5 F.3d 1255, 1262 (9th Cir. 1993). |
| 24 | Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b) the court may relieve a party from a final |
| 25 | judgment or order for the following reasons: |
| 26 | (1) mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect; (2) newly |
| 27 | 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 (whether previously called intrinsic or extrinsic), |
| | |

| 1 2 | misrepresentation, or misconduct by an opposing party; (4) the judgment is void; (5) the judgment has been satisfied, released, or discharged, it is based on an earlier judgment that has been reversed or vacated, or applying it prospectively is no longer equitable; or (6) any |
|--------|--|
| 3 | other reason that justifies relief. |
| 4 | Motions to reconsider are generally left to the discretion of the trial court. See Herbst v. Cook, 260 |
| 5 | F.3d 1039, 1044 (9th Cir. 2001). Rule 59(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides that |
| 6 | any "motion to alter or amend a judgment must be filed no later than 10 days after entry of the |
| 7 | judgment." Furthermore, a motion under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) "should not be granted, absent highly |
| 8 | unusual circumstances, unless the district court is presented with newly discovered evidence, |
| 9 | committed clear error, or if there is an intervening change in the controlling law." Herbst, 260 F.3d |
| 10 | at 1044 (quoting McDowell v. Calderon, 197 F.3d 1253, 1255 (9th Cir. 1999)). |
| 11 | Petitioner seeks reconsideration of this Court's order dismissing the case without prejudice |
| 12 | for failure to pay the filing fee. The Court ordered petitioner to pay the \$5 filing fee on April 8, 2008 |
| 13 | (docket #3). Petitioner had eight months in which to submit the filing fee. However, there is no |
| 14 | record of the filing fee being paid in this case. Petitioner has not demonstrated that she is entitled to |
| 15 | reversal of this Court's order dismissing the case without prejudice for failure to pay the filing fee. |
| 16 | The Court will deny the motion for reconsideration. |
| 17 | IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that petitioner's motion for reconsideration (docket #10) |
| 18 | is DENIED. |
| 19 | DATED this 12 th day of May, 2009. $Jlin$ |
| 20 | Outouro |
| 21 | LARRY R. HICKS |
| 22 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |
| 27 | |
| | 2 |
| | |