vs.

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

GEORGE C. PAPPAS,

Plaintiff(s),

LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT, et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:13-cv-00607-APG-NJK

## ORDER DENYING MOTIONS TO RECUSE AND FOR RECONSIDERATION

(Docket Nos. 39, 40)

Pending before the Court are two motions filed by Plaintiff. First, Plaintiff has filed a motion for the undersigned to recuse herself from this case. *See* Docket No. 40. Plaintiff argues that recusal is warranted because the undersigned vacated the hearing on his attorney's motion to withdraw and granted the motion upon a showing of good cause. *Id.* at 2. A party's disagreement with the Court's rulings is not a sufficient basis for recusal. *See United States v. Chischilly*, 30 F.3d 1144, 1149-50 (9th Cir. 1994); *see also Liteky v. United States*, 510 U.S. 540, 555 (1994) ("judicial rulings alone almost never constitute a valid basis for a bias or partiality motion"). "[O]pinions formed by the judge on the basis of facts introduced or events occurring in the course of the current proceedings, or of prior proceedings, do not constitute a basis for a bias or partiality motion unless they display a deep-seated favortism or antagonism that would make fair judgment impossible." *Liteky*, 510 U.S. at 555. Here, the Court found good cause for the withdrawal of counsel, and also determined in its discretion that a hearing was not required. *See* Docket No. 26. The Court discerns nothing in that order requiring recusal. Accordingly, the motion to recuse is hereby DENIED.

Plaintiff also filed a motion to reconsider the Court's order at Docket No. 26 granting the motion to withdraw and vacating the hearing on that motion. *See* Docket No. 39. This is the second motion to reconsider that order. *See* Docket No. 29. The pending motion to reconsider does not provide sufficient grounds to reconsider the prior order, *see, e.g., Kabo Tools Co. v. Porauto Indus. Co., Ltd.*, 2013 U.S. Dist. Lexis 156928, \*6 (D. Nev. Oct. 31, 2013) (outlining standards for motions for reconsideration), and for the reasons already stated, the Court finds that its prior order was correct. Accordingly, the motion for reconsideration is hereby DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: December 23, 2013

NANCY J. KOPPE United States Magistrate Judge