1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7	DISTRICT OF NEVADA
8	* * *
9	GREGORY K. ADAMSON, Case No. 2:11-cv-00781-MMD-CWH
10	Plaintiff, v. ORDER
11	AMATI, et al.,
12	Defendants.
13	
14	The Court issued an Order addressing a number of consolidated motions pending
15	at the time, including motion for extension of time, motion for competency evaluation,
16	motion to change judge and motion for appointment of counsel. (Dkt. no. 64.) Plaintiff
17	promptly filed a consolidated motion objecting to the Order, requesting an extension of
18	time to file a more thorough objection and renewed requests to change judge and for
19	appointment of counsel. (Dkt. nos. 67, 68, 69, 70.) Defendant filed a response (dkt. no.
20	73) and Plaintiff filed a motion to extend time to file his reply and a motion to offer
21	additions to his earlier motion (dkt. no. 74, 75.) Plaintiff has continued his practice of
22	seeking extensions of time instead of addressing the underlying claims. (See dkt. no.
23	64.)
24	Plaintiff offers no valid reason for the Court to reconsider. Mere disagreement with
25	an order is an insufficient basis for reconsideration. Nor should reconsideration be used
26	to make new arguments or ask the Court to rethink its analysis. See N.W. Acceptance
27	Corp. v. Lynnwood Equip., Inc., 841 F.2d 918, 925-26 (9th Cir. 1988). The Court
28	therefore declines to reconsider its Order.

It is therefore ordered that the following motions are denied: motion to reconsider (dkt. no. 67); motion to extend time (dkt. no. 68); renewed motion for recusal (dkt. no. 69); renewed motion for change of judge (dkt. no. 70); renewed motion for appointment of counsel (dkt. no. 71); motion to extend time (dkt. no. 74); motion for additions to motion (dkt. no. 75). Any future motions raising similar issues that the Court has considered will be summarily denied. DATED THIS 2nd day of March 2016. MIRANDA M. DU UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE