



1 same issues and arguments upon which the court already has ruled.” *In re AgriBioTech, Inc.*, 319  
2 B.R. 207, 209 (D. Nev. 2004). Here, Plaintiff has not offered any new evidence, convinced the  
3 Court its previous rulings were in clear error, or offered any intervening change in law that would  
4 cause the Court to revisit its previous rulings. Rather, Plaintiff requests the court to reconsider on  
5 the grounds of fundamental fairness and attempts to reargue the issues the Court has already ruled  
6 upon. The Court therefore finds no basis to reconsider its previous Orders (#16, #19).

7 Accordingly,

8 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s Motion for Re-Examination (#31) is **denied**.

9 DATED this 29th day of January, 2013.

10  
11   
12 GEORGE FOLEY, JR.  
13 United States Magistrate Judge  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28