

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

RANDY JOHNSON,)	Case No. 2:14-cv-01326-JCM-NJK
)	
Plaintiff(s),)	ORDER
)	
vs.)	(Docket No. 43)
)	
JAMES COX, et al.,)	
)	
Defendant(s).)	

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff’s third motion for appointment of counsel. Docket No. 43. Defendants filed a response in opposition. Docket No. 48. No reply has been filed. The Court finds this motion properly decided without oral argument. See Local Rule 78-2. For the reasons discussed below, the motion is hereby **DENIED**.

United States District Judge James C. Mahan previously denied Plaintiff’s motions for appointment of counsel in this case. Docket No. 7 at 11 (denying motions at Docket Nos. 2, 6). As such, Plaintiff’s motion is more properly framed as one seeking reconsideration. 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

1 there is an intervening change in controlling law.” *Kabo Tools*, 2013 WL 5947138, at *2 (quoting
2 *Frasure v. United States*, 256 F. Supp. 2d 1180, 1183 (D. Nev. 2004)).

3 In this instance, Plaintiff argues that this is a complex case in which Plaintiff is not able to
4 adequately present his claims. See Docket No. 43 at 2. These are the same considerations that were
5 already presented to Judge Mahan,¹ and he rejected them. See Docket No. 7 at 11. Accordingly, it
6 appears that the issues raised have already been resolved and Plaintiff provides no reason to reconsider
7 the previous ruling.

8 The motion for reconsideration is therefore **DENIED**.

9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 DATED: January 27, 2016

11
12 
13 _____
14 NANCY J. KOPPE
15 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 _____
26 ¹ Indeed, it appears that the pending motion is identical to the motion previously filed, other than
the date. Compare Docket No. 43 with Docket No. 2.