

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 FRANCIS JOHNSON,)
4)
5 Plaintiff,)
6 vs.)
7 STATE OF NEVADA, et al.,)
8 Defendants.)

Case No.: 2:14-cv-1425-GMN-PAL

ORDER

9
10 Pending before the Court is a Motion to Reconsider, (ECF No. 102), filed by pro se
11 Plaintiff Francis Johnson ("Plaintiff").¹ Defendants Officer Miguel Flores-Nava, Jennifer
12 Nash, and Sheryl Foster (collectively "Defendants") filed a Response, (ECF No. 103), and
13 Plaintiff filed a Reply, (ECF No. 102). For the reasons discussed below, Plaintiff's Motion is
14 DENIED.

15 I. BACKGROUND

16 This is an inmate civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
17 (See Am. Compl., ECF No. 19) (Plaintiff's amended complaint). On January 10, 2017, the
18 Court issued an Order granting Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment on the ground the
19 Plaintiff had failed to exhaust his administrative remedies. (Order, ECF No. 99). On February
20 6, 2017, Plaintiff filed the instant Motion for Reconsideration, (ECF No. 102).

21 II. LEGAL STANDARD

22 "[A] motion for reconsideration should not be granted, absent highly unusual
23 circumstances." Carroll v. Nakatani, 342 F.3d 934, 945 (9th Cir. 2003). Reconsideration is

24
25 ¹ In light of Plaintiff's status as a pro se litigant, the Court has liberally construed his filings, holding him to
standards less stringent than formal pleadings drafted by attorneys. See Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. 89, 94
(2007).

1 appropriate where: (1) the court is presented with newly discovered evidence, (2) the court
2 committed clear error or the initial decision was manifestly unjust, or (3) if there is an
3 intervening change in controlling law. *School Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah County v. ACandS, Inc.*,
4 5 F.3d 1255, 1263 (9th Cir. 1993). However, a motion for reconsideration is not a mechanism
5 for rearguing issues presented in the original filings, *Backlund v. Barnhart*, 778 F.2d 1386,
6 1388 (9th Cir. 1985), or “advancing theories of the case that could have been presented earlier,
7 *Resolution Trust Corp. v. Holmes*, 846 F.Supp. 1310, 1316 (S.D. Tex. 1994). Thus, Rule 59(e)
8 and 60(b) and are not “intended to give an unhappy litigant one additional chance to sway the
9 judge.” *Durkin v. Taylor*, 444 F.Supp. 879, 889 (E.D. Va. 1977).

10 **III. DISCUSSION**

11 In his Motion, Plaintiff argues that the Court erred in granting summary judgment to
12 Defendants because “Plaintiff’s grievance did not need to “contain [sic] every fact necessary to
13 prove each element of an eventual legal claim,” and because he was not required to include
14 “legal terminology or legal theories.” (Mot. to Reconsider at 3, ECF No. 102). Plaintiff further
15 argues that the Court should reconsider its order because the affirmative defense of exhaustion
16 must be brought in a Rule 12 motion rather than a motion for summary judgment. (Id. at 2).


17 Plaintiff’s first argument misunderstands the Court’s Order. The Court did not find that
18 Plaintiff failed to exhaust his retaliation claim because he did not list “every fact necessary to
19 prove each element” of his claim or because he failed to provide “legal terminology or legal
20 theories.” Rather, the Court determined that his grievances failed to describe the key factual
21 basis of his retaliation claim in any detail whatsoever, and instead “merely complain[ed] of an
22 employment dispute.” (Order 10:16–19, ECF No. 99). As to Plaintiff’s second point, “the
23 appropriate device [for determination of whether administrative remedies have been exhausted
24 under the PLRA] is a motion for summary judgment under Rule 56.” *Albino v. Baca*, 747 F.3d
25 1162, 1168 (9th Cir. 2014).

1
2 The Court has reviewed its prior Order and the arguments presented by Plaintiff in his
3 Motion and has not found any reason to overturn its previous Order. The Court finds neither
4 clear error nor manifest injustice in the reasoning of its previous Order. Accordingly,
5 Plaintiff's Motion to Reconsider is **DENIED**.

6 **IV. CONCLUSION**

7 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion to Reconsider, (ECF No. 102), is
8 **DENIED**.

9 **DATED** this 20 day of July, 2017.

10
11 
12 _____
13 Gloria M. Navarro, Chief Judge
14 United States District Judge
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25