

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
27
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

HAROLD D. HARDEN,

Plaintiff,

v.

HIGH DESERT STATE PRISON, et al,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:15-cv-01168-RFB-CWH

ORDER

Presently before the Court is Plaintiff’s motion to reconsider (ECF No. #159), filed on November 8, 2016. Defendants have not filed a response.

Plaintiff moves the Court to reconsider its order issued on November 2, 2016 (ECF No. 157), which denied a number of motions in this case (ECF Nos. 84, 86, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 138, 143, and 148), and granted two motions (ECF Nos. 136 and 139). Although motions for reconsideration are disfavored, the Court may reconsider an order upon a showing that (1) there is newly discovered evidence that was not available when the original motion or response was filed, (2) the court committed clear error or the initial decision was manifestly unjust, or (3) if there is an intervening change in controlling law. Local Rule 59-1(a). A motion for reconsideration must not repeat arguments already presented except to the extent necessary to explain relevant law or facts. Local Rule 59-1(b).


Here, construing the motion liberally, Plaintiff argues that the Court’s order was in error and unjust. However, Plaintiff merely repeats arguments made in the motions the Court considered in its order. The Court has considered these arguments and was not persuaded. Plaintiff does not present any new evidence, or any intervening change in controlling law. The Court therefore finds no cause to reconsider its order.

//
//

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
27
28

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (ECF No. 159) is DENIED.

DATED: March 6, 2017.



C.W. Hoffman, Jr.
United States Magistrate Judge