

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

RANDY JOHNSON,)	Case No. 2:14-cv-01326-JCM-NJK
)	
Plaintiff(s),)	ORDER
)	
vs.)	(Docket No. 59)
)	
JAMES COX, et al.,)	
)	
Defendant(s).)	

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff’s motion to reconsider. Docket No. 59. Defendants filed a response in opposition. Docket No. 60; *see also* Docket No. 61. 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**.

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)).

