



1     **II.     STANDARDS**

2             Motions for reconsideration are disfavored. Local Rule 59-1(b); *see also Koninklijke Philips Elecs.*  
3 *N.V. v. KXD Tech., Inc.*, 245 F.R.D. 470, 472 (D. Nev. 2007) (“Reconsideration is an extraordinary remedy,  
4 to be used sparingly” (citation and internal quotations omitted)). The Local Rules provide the applicable  
5 standards in addressing whether the Court should reconsider an interlocutory order, indicating that  
6 reconsideration may be appropriate if (1) there is newly discovered evidence that was not available when  
7 the original motion or response was filed, (2) the Court committed clear error or the initial decision was  
8 manifestly unjust, or (3) there is an intervening change in controlling law. Local Rule 59-1(a). The party  
9 seeking reconsideration bears the burden of establishing appropriate grounds for that relief. *See ESCO*  
10 *Corp. v. Cashman Equip. Co.*, 158 F. Supp. 3d 1051, 1076 (D. Nev. 2016) (the motion must set forth both  
11 (1) a “valid reason” for reconsideration and (2) facts or law of a “strongly convincing nature to persuade  
12 the court to reverse its prior decision” (quoting *Frasure v. United States*, 256 F. Supp. 2d 1180, 1183 (D.  
13 Nev. 2003)); *see also 389 Orange Street Partners v. Arnold*, 179 F.3d 656, 665 (9th Cir. 1999) (the movant  
14 bears the burden of establishing grounds for reconsideration).

15     **III.     ANALYSIS**

16             Plaintiff has not shown that reconsideration is appropriate. The gist of Plaintiff’s position is that  
17 its motion to compel was untimely filed because of various delays in responses to its discovery requests and  
18 violations of the Court’s orders, which Plaintiff attributes to Defendants. Docket No. 455 at 10, 12-13.  
19 Plaintiff further submits that it can obtain the requested discovery only from Snell because Defendant GEM,  
20 as well as Defendants Christelle Pigeat and Vincent Tessier, have proved to be incredible sources. *Id.* at  
21 11, 13-14.

22             In response, Snell submits that Plaintiff fails to discuss each factor established in *Days Inn*  
23 *Worldwide, Inc.* and, therefore, cannot show that “unusual circumstances” exist to reverse the Court’s  
24 decision. Docket No. 460 at 4. Snell further submits that Plaintiff fails to provide “[c]hanges in ... factual  
25 circumstances ... or ‘newly discovered evidence that was not available when the original motion or response  
26 was filed.’” *Id.* at 5 (internal citations omitted). Additionally, Snell requests attorneys’ fees incurred in  
27 responding to the instant motion, pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 45(d)(1). *Id.* at 6-7.

1 In reply, Plaintiff discusses all seven of the *Days Inn Worldwide, Inc.* factors and submits that they  
2 lean in its favor, although it submits that a “formulaic recitation” of each is not required in asking the Court  
3 to reconsider its order. Docket No. 462 at 3. Plaintiff further submits that attorneys’ fees should not be  
4 awarded because it sought the discovery from Snell in good faith, has “substantial justification and need  
5 for the documents requested in the Subpoena and Notice,” and because Snell should have provided the  
6 documents when Plaintiff first requested them from the original Defendants. *Id.* at 7-9.

7 The Court finds that Plaintiff has failed to meet its burden of establishing that appropriate grounds  
8 for reconsideration of the Court’s prior order exist. Plaintiff has failed to establish that newly discovered  
9 evidence exists that was not available when it filed its motion to compel, that the Court committed clear  
10 error or its decision was manifestly unjust, or that an intervening change in controlling law has occurred.

11 Accordingly, Plaintiff’s motion to reconsider the Court’s order denying Plaintiff’s motion to compel  
12 is **DENIED**. Docket No. 455. Further, Snell’s request for attorneys’ fees is **DENIED**. Docket No. 460.

13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14 Dated: April 13, 2018

15   
16 \_\_\_\_\_  
17 NANCY J. KOPPE  
18 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28