1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7	UNITED STA	TES DISTRICT COURT
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
10	GREG WILSON,	
11	GREG WIESON,	
12	Plaintiff,) 2:09-cv-01385-JCM-PAL
13	VS.)) ORDER
14	NORTH LAS VEGAS DETENTION CENTER, <i>et al.</i> ,	
15	Defendants.	
16		<u>/</u>
17	Presently before the court is plaintiff Greg Wilson's motion to reconsider this court's September	
18	24, 2010, order dismissing his case. (Doc. #13). Defendant has not replied.	
19	"Reconsideration is appropriate if the district court (1) is presented with newly discovered	
20	evidence, (2) committed clear error or the initial decision was manifestly unjust, or (3) if there is an	
21	intervening change in controlling law." School Dist. No. 1J v. AcandS, Inc., 5 F.3d 1255, 1263 (9th Cir.	
22	1993); see FED. R. CIV. P. 59(e); see also FED. R. CIV. P. 60(b).	
23	The plaintiff fails to present any new law, new facts, or new evidence indicating that any of the	
24	circumstances enumerated by the Ninth Circuit are present here warranting reconsideration or any other	
25	relief. The action was dismissed due to plaintiff's failure to comply with Local Rule 2-2, which states:	
26	"The plaintiff shall immediately file with the court written notification of any change of address. The	

notification must include proof of service upon each opposing party or the party's attorney. Failure to
 comply with this rule may result in dismissal of the action with prejudice."

While the court grants much leeway to pro se litigants such as plaintiff, here, plaintiff should have apprised himself of the local rules of this court if he wished to proceed with his claims. This court's attempts to inform plaintiff of his responsibilities pursuant to Local Rule 2-2 were unsuccessful and when plaintiff failed to inform the court of his change in address, the court dismissed the action pursuant to Local Rule 2-2.

Plaintiff's brief illustrates that he is unsure whether this case was dismissed with or without
prejudice. This court's August 23, 2010, order explained the requirements of Local Rule 2-2 and
instructed plaintiff that failure to comply with the rule would result in a dismissal without prejudice.
Thus, when the plaintiff failed to comply with the rule, the September 24, 2010, dismissal was without
prejudice, leaving plaintiff free to re-file.

Accordingly,

13

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that plaintiff Greg Wilson's motion
for reconsideration of this court's September 24, 2010, order (doc. #13) be, and the same hereby is,
DENIED.

DATED this 9th day of September, 2011.

ellus C. Mahan

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE