

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

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

GRACE WANG,

Plaintiff,

v.

US BANK, NA, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:10-CV-01741-KJD-PAL

ORDER

Before the Court is the Motion for Reconsideration (#19) of Plaintiff Grace Wang. Defendant US Bank and CCB Libor Series 2005-1 Trust (“Defendants”) have filed an opposition (#20).

The background of this case is set forth fully in the Court’s June 7, 2009 Order (#17) granting Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss. Plaintiff seeks reconsideration of that Order.

A Plaintiff may seek reconsideration pursuant to Fed. R. Civ P. 59(e) or 60(b). However, this type of relief is warranted only if “extraordinary circumstances” exist. Maraziti v. Thorp, 52 F.3d 252, 255 (9th Cir. 1995), citing Ackermann v. United States, 340 U.S. 193, 199-201, 71 S.Ct. 209, 212-13, 95 L.Ed. 207 (1950); Waggoner v. R. McGray, Inc., 743 F.2d 643, 645 (9th Cir.1984). A motion for reconsideration should not merely present arguments previously raised; that is, a motion for reconsideration is not a vehicle permitting the unsuccessful party to reiterate arguments

1 previously presented. See Maraziti, at 52 F.3d 255; Beentjes v. Placer County Air Pollution Control
2 District, 254 F.Supp.2d 1159, at 1161 (E.D. Cal. 2003). In order for a party to demonstrate clear
3 error, the moving party's arguments cannot be the same as those made earlier. See Glavor v.
4 Shearson Lehman Hutton, Inc., 879 F. Supp. 1028, 1033 (N.D. Cal. 1994).

5 Plaintiff's single paragraph motion argues that Plaintiff's Complaint stated a claim that was
6 "apparently not ... conveyed with the upmost clarity." Plaintiff then provides a summary of the
7 argument previously made in opposition to the Motion to Dismiss. The Court understood Plaintiff's
8 claim and explained the reasons for granting the Motion to Dismiss in its June 7, 2009 Order (#17).
9 Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration does not cite any law or rule showing grounds for
10 reconsideration. Reconsideration should not be granted to a party "merely because he or she is
11 unhappy with the judgment." Khan v. Fasano, 194 F. Supp. 2d 1134, 1136 (S.D. Cal. 2001)

12 Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration (#19)
13 is **DENIED**.

14 DATED this 9th day of December 2011.

15
16 

17 _____
18 Kent J. Dawson
19 United States District Judge
20
21
22
23
24
25
26