

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

HAROLD D. HARDEN,	)	2:14-cv-00560-JAD-NJK
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	<b>ORDER</b>
vs.	)	(Docket No. 77)
	)	
SOBORO, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff’s motion for the undersigned to reconsider her order extending the time to file dispositive motions. *See* Docket No. 77; *see also* Docket No. 76 (order extending the time to file dispositive motions). Defendants filed a response in opposition. Docket No. 79.<sup>1</sup> No reply was filed. The Court finds the motion properly resolved without oral argument. *See* Local Rule 78-2. For the reasons discussed below, the motion is hereby DENIED.

Motions for reconsideration are disfavored. *E.g., Kabo Tools Co. v. Porauto Indus. Co.*, 2013 WL 5947138, \*2 (D. Nev. Oct. 31, 2013) (citing *Japan Cash Mach. Co. v. Mei, Inc.*, 2008 U.S. Dist. Lexis 98778, \*7 (D. Nev. Nov. 20, 2008)). “Reconsideration is appropriate if the district court (1) is presented with newly discovered evidence; (2) committed clear error or the initial decision was manifestly unjust; or (3) if there is an intervening change in controlling law.” *Kabo Tools*, 2013 WL 5947138, at \*2 (quoting *Frasure v. United States*, 256 F. Supp. 2d 1180, 1183 (D. Nev. 2004)). Having

---

<sup>1</sup> Defendants acknowledge that their response was untimely. Docket No. 29 at 2 n.1. The Court will consider the opposition in this case, but reminds counsel that the Court expects strict compliance with the Local Rules in the future.

1 reviewed Plaintiff's pending motion, the Court finds that none of those circumstances exist such that the  
2 Court's prior order should be changed.

3 Accordingly, the motion for reconsideration is hereby DENIED.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 DATED: May 4, 2015

6

7

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
8 NANCY J. KOPPE  
9 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26