

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

10 ROBERT JOSEPH MCCARTY,
11 Plaintiff(s),
12 vs.
13 JOHN V. ROOS, et al.,
14 Defendant(s).
15

)
)
) Case No. 2:11-cv-01538-JCM-NJK
)
) ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
) RECONSIDERATION
)
) (Docket No. 210)
)

16 Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration of the Court's order
17 granting in part and denying in part Defendants' motions to stay. Docket No. 210. Reconsideration
18 of an order is appropriate if the Court "(1) is presented with newly discovered evidence, (2)
19 committed clear error or the initial decision was manifestly unjust, or (3) if there is an intervening
20 change in controlling authority." *Sch. Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah County, Or. v. AC&S, Inc.*, 5 F.3d
21 1255, 1263 (9th Cir. 1993). The Court has carefully reviewed Plaintiff's arguments in his motion for
22 reconsideration and finds that they do not warrant reconsideration of the Court's order.
23 Accordingly, the motion for reconsideration is hereby **DENIED**.

24 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25 DATED: October 1, 2013

26
27 
28 NANCY J. KOPPE
United States Magistrate Judge