

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

6 * * *

7 ANNETTE WALKER-GOGGINS,

8 Plaintiff(s),

9 v.

10 SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,

11 Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:15-CV-1839 JCM (CWH)

ORDER

12
13 Presently before the court is plaintiff's motion for reconsideration of this court's order
14 adopting the magistrate judge's recommendation to dismiss the complaint with prejudice. (ECF
15 No. 16). Also before the court is plaintiff's motion for injunctive relief. (ECF No. 17) Defendant
16 has not filed a response and the deadline to do so has passed.

17 Magistrate Judge Hoffman recommended that plaintiff be allowed to proceed in forma
18 pauperis but that defendant's complaint be dismissed with prejudice. Magistrate Judge Hoffman
19 found that plaintiff's complaint contained "incoherent, fanciful, and delusional claims and
20 descriptions [that] do not state a claim upon which relief can be granted." (ECF No. 8).

21 Plaintiff filed an "objection" but did not object to any of the magistrate judge's findings.
22 Instead, plaintiff simply listed "appealed" next to the motions that Magistrate Judge Hoffman
23 recommended denying after concluding that plaintiff's complaint was frivolous. (ECF. No. 11).
24 This court agreed with the magistrate judge's findings and dismissed plaintiff's complaint with
25 prejudice. (ECF No. 13).

26 Plaintiff has now filed a motion to reconsider (ECF No. 16) and motion for injunctive
27 relief. (ECF No. 17).
28

1 “Reconsideration is appropriate if the district court (1) is presented with newly discovered
2 evidence, (2) committed clear error or the initial decision was manifestly unjust, or (3) if there is
3 an intervening change in controlling law.” Morgan Stanley & Co. v. Shriners Hosp. For Children,
4 No. 2:09-cv-398, 2012 WL 642523, *2 (D. Nev. Feb. 28, 2012) (quoting School Dist. No. 1J v.
5 AcandS, Inc., 5 F.3d 1255, 1263 (9th Cir.1993); see generally FED. R. CIV. P. 60(b)(1) and (6)
6 (stating that a court may relieve a party from an order for “mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or
7 excusable neglect” or “any other reason that justifies relief.”).

8 In her motions for reconsideration and injunctive relief, plaintiff merely recites statements
9 that she has included in previous motions. (ECF Nos. 16, 17). Plaintiff claims she “was instructed
10 to reproduce *5th (fifth) time, the “Divorce Set Aside” of the holy matrimony of the victim Terry
11 V Annette Walker, Superior Court The County of Muscogee, State of Georgia Case No. SU 98DM
12 2341-8.” (ECF No. 16). In 2009, she claims she submitted an SSI application but received an
13 “unfavorable decision” because “her husband’s deemed income was too high for her to qualify....”
14 (Id.). Consequently, plaintiff claims “The defendants Social Security Administration, Ms.
15 Anderson, & State of Nevada * but not limited to have Obstructed Justice that has caused
16 irreversible pain and suffering.” (Id.).

17 Plaintiff’s motion provides this court with no newly discovered evidence nor has there been
18 any intervening change in controlling law. Morgan Stanley, 2012 WL 642523 at *2. Having
19 weighed plaintiff’s arguments on several occasions, there is no evidence that the order dismissing
20 the complaint was a “clear error or . . . manifestly unjust.” Morgan Stanley, 2012 WL 642523 at
21 *2. Furthermore, as plaintiff’s complaint has been dismissed with prejudice and judgment has been
22 entered, her request for injunctive relief is inappropriate. Therefore, plaintiff’s requests for
23 reconsideration and injunctive relief are denied.

24 . . .

25 . . .

26 . . .

27 . . .

28 . . .

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

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that plaintiff's motion to reconsider (ECF No. 16) and motion for injunctive relief (ECF No. 17) be, and the same hereby are, DENIED.

DATED July 18, 2016.


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE