-VCF Hall v Schumacher et al Doc. 70 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA 3 DEBBIE HALL, 4 Plaintiff, 5 Case No.: 2:10-cv-01353-GMN-PAL VS. 6 CAROL SCHUMACHER, KAILEE DIAZ, **ORDER** 7 KELLY NEWMAN, DIANE CAMARDELLA, SAMANTHA MILLER, JOHN CROCKER, 8 STEPHANIE CALACAL, IBEW PLUS CREDIT) UNION, et al., 9 10 Defendants. 11 Pending before the Court is pro se Plaintiff Debbie Hall's Motion to Reconsider (ECF 12 No. 62). Defendants filed a Response (ECF NO. 63) and Plaintiff filed a Reply (ECF No. 64). 13 On April 4, 2012, this Court entered its Order (ECF No. 59) granting summary judgment 14 in favor of Defendants and closing the case. Plaintiff filed a timely motion to reconsider that 15 order. 16 As Plaintiff recognizes in her motion, the legal standard governing motions for relief 17 from a judgment or order provides: 18 On motion and just terms, the court may relieve a party or its legal representative 19 from a final judgment, order, or proceeding for the following reasons: 20 (1) mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect; (2) newly discovered evidence that, with reasonable diligence, could not have 21 been discovered in time to move for a new trial under Rule 59(b); (3) fraud (whether previously called intrinsic or extrinsic), misrepresentation, or 22 misconduct by an opposing party; 23 (4) the judgment is void; (5) the judgment has been satisfied, released or discharged; it is based on an earlier 24 judgment that has been reversed or vacated; or applying it prospectively is no longer equitable; or 25 (6) any other reason that justifies relief. Page 1 of 2

Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 60(b).

Here, after consideration of the motion and accompanying briefs, the Court finds that Plaintiff has presented no grounds justifying relief from the Court's Order. Accordingly, the motion will be denied.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion to Reconsider (ECF No. 62) is **DENIED**.

DATED this 14th day of June, 2012.

Gløria M. Navarro

United States District Judge