1	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	DISTRICT OF NEVADA
10	RANDY JOHNSON, ) Case No. 2:14-cv-01326-JCM-NJK
11	Plaintiff(s), ORDER
12	vs. (Docket No. 59)
13	JAMES COX, et al.,
14	Defendant(s).
15	
16	Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion to reconsider. Docket No. 59. Defendants filed
17	a response in opposition. Docket No. 60; see also Docket No. 61. No reply has been filed. The Court
18	finds this motion properly decided without oral argument. See Local Rule 78-2. For the reasons
19	discussed below, the motion is hereby <b>DENIED</b> .
20	Motions for reconsideration are disfavored. E.g., Kabo Tools Co. v. Porauto Indus. Co., 2013
21	WL 5947138, *2 (D. Nev. Oct. 31, 2013) (citing <i>Japan Cash Mach. Co. v. Mei, Inc.</i> , 2008 U.S. Dist.
22	Lexis 98778, *7 (D. Nev. Nov. 20, 2008)). "Reconsideration is appropriate if the district court (1) is
23	presented with newly discovered evidence; (2) committed clear error or the initial decision was
24	manifestly unjust; or (3) if there is an intervening change in controlling law." Kabo Tools, 2013 WL
25	5947138, at *2 (quoting <i>Frasure v. United States</i> , 256 F. Supp. 2d 1180, 1183 (D. Nev. 2004)).
26	

Johnson v. Cox et al

Doc. 64

2 dd 3 rd 4 D 5 a 6 7 w 8 2 9 s 10 a 11 u 12 D 13 td 14 P 15 C 16 D 16

1

The Court construes the pending motion broadly as seeking reconsideration of both the order denying without prejudice Plaintiff's motion to file a supplemental complaint and the report and recommendation that this case proceed without the claims against Defendants Baca and Donat. *See* Docket No. 59 at 3 (referring to Docket Nos. 54 and 55). The Court finds reconsideration not proper as to either the order or the report and recommendation.

At bottom, Plaintiff's motion indicates that he was unable to meet certain deadlines because he was in administrative segregation and lacked an instrument with which to write. *See* Docket No. 59 at 2-4. Such assertions are inapposite to the order denying Plaintiff's motion for leave to file a supplemental complaint. *See* Docket No. 54 (noting three deficiencies with the motion, none of which are addressed in the motion for reconsideration). With respect to the report and recommendation, the undersigned determined that it was necessary to proceed without the claims against Defendants Baca and Donat because other alternatives were not available to move the case forward given Plaintiff's failure to comply with numerous orders to file a proper amended complaint. *See, e.g.*, Docket No. 56 at 3. Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration fails to provide any indication that Plaintiff will comply with the Court's order to file a proper amended complaint with the corrected names of Defendants Baca and Donat, and instead asks for yet another 60-day extension. *See, e.g.*, Docket No. 59 at 4. In light of the history of this case and the multiple opportunities to file a proper amended complaint already extended Plaintiff, the Court finds there are insufficient grounds to reconsider the report and recommendation.

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

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: April 20, 2016

22

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

26

NANCY J. KOPPE

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE